

JPRS-UPA-89-005  
23 JANUARY 1989



**FOREIGN  
BROADCAST  
INFORMATION  
SERVICE**

# ***JPRS Report***

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT 1**  
Approved for public release  
Distribution Unlimited

# **Soviet Union**

***Political Affairs***

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19980202 167

# Soviet Union Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-005

CONTENTS

23 JANUARY 1989

## PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

- Draft Basic Principles of USSR, Union Republic Criminal Law [IZVESTIYA, 17 Dec 88] ..... 1  
Premier Toome on Estonian Economic Accountability [L. Levitskiy; IZVESTIYA, 24 Dec 88] ..... 17  
Estonian Supsov Session Debates Constitution [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 18, 19, 20 Nov 88] ..... 18

## CULTURE

- Newspaper Begins Public Forum Column [F. Makivchuk; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 4 Dec 88] ..... 39  
UkSSR Official On Republic's Video Boom [RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 18 Nov 88] ..... 39

## REGIONAL ISSUES

- Armenians Fault Editors' Response to Charge of Publishing Anti-Armenian Article  
[V. Aloyan; KOMMUNIST, 16 Nov 88] ..... 40  
Armenian Daily Reports Sumgait Trial Events [S. Zheltov; KOMMUNIST, 16 Nov 88] ..... 41  
Tallinn Russian Section of Estonian Popular Front Formed [MOLODEZH ESTONII, 16 Nov 88] ..... 43  
Medvedev Converses With Latvian Students [V. A. Medvedev; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 16 Nov 88] ..... 44  
Medvedev Addresses Latvian Scientists [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 18 Nov 88] ..... 55  
Latvian Popular Front's Creation, Future Policy Direction Examined  
[E. Govorushko, A. Kamenev; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 6 Dec 88] ..... 59  
LaSSR Supsov Commission Head Interviewed on State Language Decree  
[A. Y. Blinkena; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 4 Nov 88] ..... 64  
LiSSR Plenum Removes First Secretary, Procedures Detailed [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 27 Oct 88] ..... 66  
Vilnius Prisoners 'Provoke' Riot in Hard Labor Prison [TIESA, 11 Dec 88] ..... 75  
Rumors of Chemical Explosions Spread in UkSSR [RABOCHAYA GAZETA, 13 Nov 88] ..... 75  
BSSR Commission Chief Defends Militia at Minsk Demonstration  
[N.I. Roshka; SELSKAYA GAZETA, 4 Dec 88] ..... 75

**Draft Basic Principles of USSR, Union Republic  
Criminal Law**

*18000276a Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
17 Dec 88 pp 1-3*

[Text of the "Draft Basic Principles of USSR and Union  
Republic Criminal Law"]

[Text] The shaping and development of the socialist legal state, providing guarantees for the rights and freedoms of the Soviet person, and the responsibility of the state to the citizen and of the citizen to the state are inextricably bound up with consolidation of the legal basis of state and public life, strict observance of socialist legality and law and order, and intensifying the struggle against crime and eliminating the causes of crime.

Relying on the support of the labor collectives, public organizations and all workers the Soviet state is implementing a set of social and legal measures aimed at preventing crime and educating citizens in a spirit of implacability toward violations of the law and a readiness to be involved actively in safeguarding law and order. In the struggle against crime full use must be made of public opinion and the force of the law.

While safeguarding socialist law and order against criminal encroachments, the criminal legislation of the USSR and the union republics promotes social justice and effective control over the measure of labor and consumption and the responsibility of citizens for their own acts. Soviet criminal legislation helps in the struggle against crimes against the peace and safety of mankind and in strengthening cooperation between peoples.

Each Soviet person must be quite certain that his rights and legitimate interests are safeguarded and feel the concern of the state for the inviolability of his person and property and respect for his honor and dignity. No one who violates the law should escape the liability laid down by law and no innocent person should be made criminally liable or sentenced.

Criminal punishment must be applied strictly in accordance with the law and giving due consideration to the seriousness of the crime committed and the personality of the defendant, on the basis of the principles of democracy and socialist humanism. When strict measures of punishment are used against persons committing socially dangerous crimes and who have previous records and are reluctant to live an honest life of labor it is essential to make use of the opportunities available under the law to assign punishments not associated with deprivation of liberty for persons guilty of less dangerous crimes and capable of being reformed without isolation from society. A person committing a crime and paying the penalty for that crime can again become a full-fledged citizen of Soviet society.

**SECTION I**

**General Provisions**

**Article 1. The Criminal Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics**

1) The criminal legislation of the USSR and the union republics consists of these Basic Principles, which define the principles and establish the general provisions of the criminal legislation of the USSR and the union republics, of all-union laws that establish responsibility for particular crimes, and of the criminal codes of the union republics.

2) All-union criminal laws shall establish responsibility for crimes against the state and military offenses, and if necessary, also for other crimes directed against the interests of the USSR, and also for crimes against the peace and safety of mankind.

3) The criminal legislation of the USSR and the union republics is established in line with the provisions of international treaties to which the USSR is party.

**Article 2. The Tasks of Soviet Criminal Legislation**

1) The criminal legislation of the USSR and the union republics has the task of protecting the social order of the USSR and its political and economic systems, the individual, the rights and freedoms of citizens, and state cooperative property, and also the property of public organizations, the environment, and all socialist law and order against criminal encroachments, and also to safeguard the peace and safety of mankind. The criminal legislation promotes crime prevention and the education of citizens in a spirit of strict observance of the USSR Constitution and Soviet laws and respect for the rules of socialist communal living.

2) In order to accomplish these tasks the criminal legislation of the USSR and the union republics defines which socially dangerous acts are crimes and establishes the punishment, and also makes provisions for other measures of influence that may be used against persons who have committed crimes.

**Article 3. Principles of Criminal Legislation**

1) The criminal legislation of the USSR and the union republics is based on the principles of legality, democracy, inevitability, responsibility, the equality of citizens under the law, personal and culpable liability, justice and humanism.

2) No one can be adjudged guilty of the commissioning of a crime nor subject to criminal punishment otherwise than by sentence of the court and in accordance with the law.

**Article 4. Grounds for Criminal Responsibility**

1) The grounds for criminal responsibility is the committing of an act that has all the attributes of a crime as laid down by criminal law.

2) A person committing a crime bears criminal responsibility regardless of origin, social, official or property position, race and national affiliation, sex, education, language, attitude toward religion, nature and kind of employment, place of residence and other circumstances.

3) No one can be subject to criminal responsibility twice for the same crime.

**Article 5. Applicability of the Criminal Laws of the USSR and Union Republics with Regard to Acts Committed on the Territory of the USSR**

1) Persons who have committed crimes on the territory of the USSR are responsible in accordance with the criminal laws in force at the place where the crime was committed. In the event of the commissioning of a crime on a Soviet airliner or on a seagoing or river vessel outside the USSR, responsibility is incurred in accordance with law in the union republic at whose port the vessel was registered.

2) When a crime is committed on the territories of two or more union republics the law of the union republic where the crime was completed or interdicted is applied.

3) The question of criminal responsibility of diplomatic representatives of foreign states and other citizens who under the provisions of existing laws and international treaties do not fall within the jurisdiction of the Soviet criminal courts will be settled along diplomatic lines if those persons commit crimes on the territory of the USSR.

**Article 6. Applicability of the Criminal Laws of the USSR and Union Republics with Regard to Actions Committed Outside the Boundaries of the USSR**

1) Citizens of the USSR who have committed crimes abroad bear responsibility in accordance with the criminal laws in force in the union republic within whose territory criminal proceedings were initiated against them or where they are committed for trial.

2) Stateless persons living permanently in the USSR who have committed crimes outside the boundaries of the USSR bear criminal responsibility on exactly the same bases.

3) If the persons indicated in Paragraphs 1 and 2 above have undergone punishment abroad for crimes committed, the court may correspondingly reduce the punishment imposed on them or remit it totally.

4) Foreign citizens, and also stateless persons, not living permanently in the USSR bear responsibility for crimes committed outside the boundaries of the USSR in accordance with Soviet criminal laws in cases where provision is made for this by international treaties.

**Article 7. Applicability of Criminal Law with Respect to the Time of the Commissioning of a Crime**

1) The criminality and punishability of an act are determined by the law in force at the time that the crime was commissioned. The time of the commissioning of an act is deemed to be the time when a socially dangerous act (or omission) takes place, regardless of the time at which the consequences ensued.

2) A law providing that a certain act shall no longer be criminal or mitigating the punishment or in any other way improving the position of an individual is retroactive, that is, it applies to persons who committed acts so covered before promulgation of that law and who are serving or have served a sentence for a conviction.

3) A law establishing the criminality of an act that increases the punishment or in any other way worsens the position of an individual shall not be retroactive.

**SECTION II**

**On Crime**

**Article 8. Definition of Crime**

1) A crime is a socially dangerous act (action or omission) culpably commissioned, as defined by criminal law, directed against the social system of the USSR, its political and economic system, the person, the rights and freedoms of citizens, state and cooperative property, and also the property of public organizations, and the environment, and likewise any other socially dangerous act as provided by criminal law and directed against socialist law and order or the peace and security of mankind.

2) An action or omission that formally involves the attributes of some act as provided for by criminal law but by dint of its insignificance is not socially dangerous is not considered a crime.

**Article 9. Classification of Crimes**

1) Depending on the degree to which they are socially dangerous, crimes are categorized as not serious socially dangerous acts, less serious socially dangerous acts, serious socially dangerous acts, and particularly serious socially dangerous acts. Assignment of specific crimes to these categories is done by legislative enactments of the USSR and the union republics in accordance with the provisions set forth in Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of this Article.

2) Crimes that are not serious socially dangerous acts are intentional crimes for which the law provides punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty for a period not exceeding 2 years or other light punishment, and also crimes committed through negligence for which the law provides punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty for a period not exceeding 5 years or some lighter punishment.

3) Less serious crimes include intentional crimes for which the law provides punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty for a period not exceeding 5 years, and also crimes committed through negligence for which the law provides punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty for a period of more than 5 years.

4) Serious crimes include intentional crimes for which the law provides punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty for a period not exceeding 10 years.

5) Particularly serious crimes includes crimes for which the law provides punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty for a period of more than 10 years or the death sentence.

#### Article 10. Forms of Guilt

Only a person who has committed an act intentionally or through negligence can be deemed guilty of a crime.

#### Article 11. Crimes Committed Intentionally

1) A crime is considered to have been committed intentionally when the act is committed with direct or indirect intent.

2) A crime is considered to have been committed with direct intent if the person committing it was aware of the socially dangerous nature of his action or omission and foresaw its socially dangerous consequences and wished them to arise.

3) A crime is considered to have been committed with indirect intent if the person committing it was aware of the socially dangerous nature of his action or omission and, although not desiring the consequences still deliberately allowed them to arise.

#### Article 12. Crimes Committed through Negligence

1) A crime is considered to have been committed through negligence if the act is committed through overconfidence or carelessness.

2) A crime is considered to have been committed through overconfidence if the person committing it foresaw the possibility of socially dangerous consequences resulting from his action but light-heartedly relied on their being avoided.

3) A crime is considered to have been committed through carelessness if the person committing it failed to foresee the possibility of socially dangerous consequences resulting from his action even though he should have and could have foreseen them.

#### Article 13. The Age at Which Criminal Responsibility Starts

1) Persons who at the time of the commissioning of a crime had attained the age of 16 years are criminally responsible.

2) Persons who have committed crimes when aged between 14 years and 16 years are criminally responsible only for intentional murder (except for intentional murder when exceeding the limits of necessary self-defense or when in a state of strong emotional disturbance), intentional grievous or less grievous bodily harm (except for intentional grievous or less grievous bodily harm caused when exceeding the limits of necessary self-defense or when in a state of strong emotional disturbance), rape, robbery, intentional destruction of or damage to state, public or personal property of citizens entailing serious consequences, and also looting and larceny committed in aggravating circumstances.

3) For particular crimes criminal responsibility may be established from the age of 18 years by legislation of the USSR and the union republics.

#### Article 14. Non-imputability

1) A person who at the time of the committing of a socially dangerous act was in a state of non-imputability, that is, was incapable of being aware of his own actions or was led to them as the result of chronic mental illness, temporary disturbance of the mind or mental deficiency or other pathological condition, is not criminally responsible.

2) By order of the court compulsory measures of a medical nature as provided for in Article 75 of these Basic Principles may be applied to a person deemed non-imputable.

#### Article 15. Preparation of a Crime and Attempt To Commit a Crime

1) Preparation of a crime is seeking or procuring the means or tools or otherwise intentionally bringing about the conditions for committing a crime. Criminal responsibility ensues only for preparations for a particularly serious or serious crime.

2) Attempt to commit a crime is an intentional act directly aimed at the commission of a crime even though the crime is not completely carried out because of circumstances that are independent of the will of the person [making the attempt].

3) Responsibility for preparation of a crime or attempt to commit a crime ensues in accordance with the same criminal law as for a crime that is brought to a conclusion.

#### Article 16. Desisting from the Commission of a Crime

1) Voluntary desistance from a crime is when a person who has initiated a crime desists from that crime when he knows that it is possible to complete it.

2) A crime that has been undertaken and in respect of which there is voluntary desistance does not entail criminal responsibility. A person voluntarily desisting from final completion of a crime is criminally responsible only where the action he has actually committed falls within the definition of another crime.

#### Article 17. Participation in a Crime

1) Participation [in a crime] is the partaking by two or more persons intentionally in the commission of an intentional crime.

2) Participants in a crime are, together with the perpetrators of it, the organizers, abettors and accomplices.

3) The perpetrator is the person who actually commits an act covered by criminal law or by using other persons who are not criminally responsible under the law.

4) An organizer is a person who organizes or directs the commission of a crime.

5) An abettor is a person who instigates the commission of a crime.

6) An accomplice is a person who aids the commission of a crime by giving advice or instruction, by supplying the means or by removing obstacles, and also a person who has promised beforehand to hide the criminal and the instruments and means used to commit the crime, and the traces of the crime or objects acquired by means of the crime.

7) Other participants [in a crime] are not criminally responsible for acts committed by the perpetrator and not covered by the intent of the participants.

#### Article 18. Concealment

1) Concealment of a person who has committed a crime, and likewise the instruments and means by which that crime was committed, and traces of the crime or objects criminally acquired, not promised beforehand, entails criminal responsibility only in the commission of particularly serious or serious crimes in cases as provided for by criminal law.

2) Concealment by the spouse and also by close relatives of a person who has committed a crime, not promised beforehand, does not entail criminal responsibility.

#### Article 19. Failure To Report a Crime

1) Failure to report a crime that, according to reliable information, is likely to be in preparation or has been committed entails criminal responsibility only in the commission of particularly serious crimes as laid down by criminal law.

Failure by the spouse or the close relatives of the person who has committed a crime to report that crime does not entail criminal responsibility.

Note: Close relatives as indicated in Articles 18 and 19 of these Basic Principles are parents, children, adopted children, brothers and sisters, grandfathers, grandmothers and grandchildren.

#### Article 20. Repetition of Crimes

1) Repetition of crimes is the commission of two or more crimes covered by the same article of criminal law. In cases as determined by the legislation of the USSR and the union republics, repetition may be the commission of two or more crimes covered by different articles of criminal law.

2) A crime is not considered a repeat crime if the person who committed a crime previously was exonerated of punishment for criminal responsibility either by a decision of the court or when sentence for those crimes was quashed or remitted under established legal procedure.

3) Durational or continuing crimes do not constitute repetition.

#### Article 21. Plurality of Crimes

Plurality of crimes is the commission of two or more crimes covered by different articles of criminal law for none of which a person has been previously convicted. Here, crimes for which a person has been exonerated of criminal responsibility in accordance with the principles established at law are not taken into account.

#### Article 22. Recidivism of Crimes

1) Recidivism of crimes is the commission of a new intentional crime by a person previously convicted of an intentional crime if the sentence for that crime has not been quashed or remitted under established legal procedure.

2) A person convicted to deprivation of liberty for a term of at least 5 years may be considered a particularly dangerous recidivist if the court so decides, when the sentence was passed as follows:

a) for a particularly serious crime if the person has been previously convicted for a particularly serious crime or convicted twice for serious crimes and was sentenced to deprivation of liberty for a term of at least 5 years for each crime;

b) for a serious crime if the person has been previously convicted twice for serious crimes or for a particularly serious crime and a serious crime when the sentence for each of them was deprivation of liberty for a term of at least 5 years.

3) The court examining the question of recognizing a person as a particularly dangerous recidivist gives due consideration to the personality of the accused, the degree of social danger caused by the crimes committed, the motives for the crimes, the degree to which criminal intentions were carried out, the degree and nature of participation in the commission of crimes and other circumstances of the case. The decision of the court shall be explained when sentence is passed.

4) When deciding the question of recognizing a person as a particularly dangerous recidivist no consideration should be given to any conviction for a crime committed by that person if he is aged under 18 years.

5) Recognition of a person as a particularly dangerous recidivist has no force when the sentence is quashed or remitted.

6) The articles of the criminal laws of the USSR and the union republics providing for responsibility for the commission of a crime by a particularly dangerous recidivist are applied in cases where a person has been recognized as a particularly dangerous recidivist under established legal procedure before the commission of that particular crime.

### SECTION III

#### Circumstances Excluding the Criminality of an Act

##### Article 23. Necessary Defense

1) Though an act falls within the legal definition of a crime it is not considered as such if it is committed in a state of necessary defense, that is, in order to protect the interests of the Soviet state, public interests, the person, or the rights of the person defending himself or other persons against socially dangerous attempts to cause harm if when this occurs the limits of necessary defense are not exceeded.

2) A person has the right to necessary defense regardless of opportunities for avoiding the attempt at harm or appealing for help to other persons or the authorities.

3) Exceeding the limits of necessary defense is deemed an obvious incongruity between the defense and the nature of the danger of the attempt to harm if as a result the person attempting the harm suffers harm not resulting from the

need to avert or cut short the attempt to harm. Harm caused through negligence to the person attempting the harm does not entail criminal responsibility.

##### Article 24. Extreme Necessity

Though an act falls within the legal definition of a crime it is not considered as such if it is committed in a state of extreme necessity, that is, in order to remove a danger threatening the interests of the Soviet state, the public interests, the person or the rights of that person or of other persons if in the given circumstances this danger could not have been removed by other means and if the harm caused is less significant than averting [the danger].

##### Article 25. Arrest of a Person Who Has Committed a Crime

Though an act falls within the legal definition of a crime it is not considered as such if it is directed toward arresting a person in connection with a crime that he has committed if when this occurs there is no obvious incongruity between the harm caused by the arrested person and the nature of the resistance offered by him to the arrest.

##### Article 26. Professional and Economic Risk

1) Though an act falls within the legal definition of a crime it is not considered as such but is a justified professional or economic risk in order to achieve a socially useful goal.

2) Risk is justified if the act committed corresponds to present-day scientific and technical knowledge and experience and the goal set could not have been achieved without the risk of the action and the person taking the risk took all possible steps to avert harm to the interests of law of order.

##### Article 27. Compliance with an Order or Instruction

Although it falls within the legal definition of a crime it is not considered as such if in the execution of an order or instruction a person was not aware of the criminal nature of that order or instruction. Here, responsibility for the act committed in compliance with a criminal order or instruction lies with the person giving that order or instruction.

### SECTION V

#### Penalties

##### Article 28. Punishment and Its Purpose

1) Punishment is the measure of compulsion applied on behalf of the state in accordance with the sentence of the court on a person found guilty of committing a crime, and consisting of deprivation or curtailment of the rights and interests of the convicted person.

2) Punishment is applied for the purpose of reforming and re-educating convicted persons in the spirit of strict observance of the law, an honest attitude toward labor, and respect for the rules of socialist communal living, and also [for the purpose of] preventing the commission of other crimes both by the convicted person and by others.

3) Punishment does not have as its purpose the infliction of physical suffering or the humiliation of human dignity.

#### Article 29. Kinds of Punishment

1) The following main kinds of punishment may be applied to persons who have committed crimes:

a) reprimand; b) fine c) disqualification to hold specific posts or to perform specific functions; d) corrective labor e) restriction of liberty; f) holding in custody; g) deprivation of liberty.

2) Punishment in the form of restrictions on service and being sent to a penal battalion may also be applied to servicemen.

3) In addition to the main kinds of punishment the following additional punishments may be applied to convicted persons:

a) deprivation of military or special rank; b) confiscation of property.

4) A fine or disqualification to hold specific posts or to perform specific functions may be applied not only as main punishments but also as additional punishments.

5) The legislation of the union republics may also establish punishments other than those in this article in accordance with the principles and general provisions of these Basic Principles.

#### Article 30. Reprimand

Reprimand is the public expression by the court of the negative assessment of the action of a person found guilty of committing a crime, with the publication of this information in the press or by other means.

#### Article 31. Fine

1) A fine is a sum of money to be paid as determined by the court in the cases, and within the limits laid down by law.

2) The amount of the fine shall be determined according to the gravity of the crime within the range of R200 to R1,000, while for crimes committed for mercenary motives the size of the fine shall be within the range R300 to R5,000. In exceptional cases as provided for by

legislative enactments of the USSR and the union republics, higher fines may be imposed for particular crimes. When imposing a fine the court takes into consideration the financial position of the offender.

3) A fine may not be commuted into deprivation of liberty, nor deprivation of liberty into a fine.

#### Article 32. Disqualification To Hold Specific Posts or To Perform Specific Functions

1) Disqualification to hold specific posts or to perform specific functions may be imposed by the court for a period of from 1 year to 5 years as a main punishment or for a period of from 1 year to 3 years as an additional punishment.

2) Disqualification to hold specific posts or to perform specific functions as an additional punishment may be imposed by the court in cases even where, although not provided for by the criminal law establishing responsibility for the crime committed, but having regard to the character of the crime committed by a person the court concludes that he cannot retain the right to continue to carry out the functions connected with a specific post, profession or other activity.

3) When this form of punishment is imposed as a punishment additional to corrective labor, the term is reckoned from the start of the main punishment. When this punishment is imposed as a punishment additional to deprivation of liberty, being held in custody or restriction of liberty, it lasts for the entire time of the completion of the sentence and in addition for the period determined by the sentence.

#### Article 33. Corrective Labor

1) Corrective labor is imposed for a period of from 2 months to 2 years and is served on the basis of the sentence of the court at the offender's work place or at other places in the rayon where he lives. A proportion of the wages of a person sentenced to corrective labor will be deducted for the benefit of the state at a rate determined by the sentence of the court in an amount from 10 percent to 20 percent. The court may make the labor collective at the work place of the offender responsible for conducting educational work with the offender.

2) Corrective labor is not applied to servicemen.

3) The time served at corrective labor is not included in overall work seniority. On condition that labor is honest and conduct exemplary during the period served at corrective labor, following completion of the sentence by



the offender the court may upon application from a public organization or the labor collective include the time served at corrective labor as part of overall work seniority.

4) In the event of a person's persistent evasion of corrective labor the court may commute the remaining period of corrective labor to punishment in the form of restriction of liberty for that period.

#### Article 34. Restriction of Liberty

1) Restriction of liberty is sending a person to places as determined by the organs charged with carrying out the sentence, for the purpose of compulsory recruitment for work under supervised conditions.

2) Restriction of liberty is imposed for periods from 6 months to 5 years.

3) Restriction of liberty is not applied in the following cases: against pregnant women and women with children aged under 8 years, against disabled persons, against men who have attained the age of 60 years, against women who have attained the age of 55 years, against servicemen who are inducted personnel, and against persons who in addition to punishment for the commission of crime are also made to undergo compulsory medical treatment for alcoholism, drug addiction or toxicomania, and also persons who have not yet completed a full course of treatment for venereal disease, and foreign citizens and stateless persons.

4) In the case of persistent evasion of a person from serving a sentence in the form of restriction of liberty the court may commute the period of the sentence not served to deprivation of liberty for that period.

#### Article 35. Holding in Custody

1) Holding in custody is the holding of a person in conditions of strict isolation.

2) Holding in custody is imposed for a period of from 1 month to 3 months.

3) Holding in custody is not applied to pregnant women and women with children aged under 8 years.

4) Servicemen shall be held in custody is served in a guardhouse.

#### Article 36. Deprivation of Liberty

1) Deprivation of liberty is imposed for a period of from 6 months to 10 years. Deprivation of liberty for a period of more than 10 years but less than 15 years is imposed for crimes for which in accordance with Article 41 Paragraph 1 of these Basic Principles the death penalty may be awarded, and for banditry, particularly large thefts of state or public property, the acceptance of

particularly large bribes, hijacking or seizure of an aircraft or seagoing or river vessel involving the death of one or more persons, and also for military crimes and genocide.

2) When deprivation of liberty is imposed in the event of pardon of the death sentence it may also be imposed for a period of more than 15 years but not more than 20 years.

3) Punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty imposed by the court on persons who have attained the age of 18 years is served in corrective labor colonies or settlements, general, strict or special regime colonies, or in prison. The periods of deprivation of liberty for minors and the kinds of corrective labor institutions in which they serve out their punishment are set forth in Article 68 of these Basic Principles.

4) Men who are sentenced to deprivation of liberty shall serve their sentences as follows:

a) those sentenced to deprivation of liberty for crimes committed through negligence, in colonies or settlements for persons who have committed crimes through negligence;

b) those sentenced for the first time to deprivation of liberty for intentional crimes that are not serious crimes, a list of which is drawn up by the legislation of the union republics, in colonies or settlements for persons who have committed intentional crimes;

c) those sentenced for the first time to deprivation of liberty for intentional crimes that are not serious crimes, except for those indicated in Paragraph 4 Subparagraph "b" of this Article and sentenced to deprivation of liberty for the first time for particularly serious or serious crimes, in general regime colonies;

d) those sentenced for crimes against the state or who have previously served terms of punishment for intentional crime in the form of deprivation of liberty, and those who have a criminal record and are again sentenced to deprivation of liberty for an intentional crime, in strict regime colonies;

e) particularly dangerous recidivists, in special regime colonies.

5) Women who are sentenced to deprivation of liberty shall serve their sentences as follows:

a) those sentenced to deprivation of liberty for crimes committed through negligence, in colonies or settlements for persons who have committed crimes through negligence;

b) those sentenced for the first time for intentional crimes as indicated in Paragraph 4 Subparagraph "b" of this Article, in colonies or settlements for persons who have committed intentional crimes;

c) those sentenced for crimes against the state, and also particularly dangerous recidivists, in strict regime colonies;

d) other women sentenced to deprivation of liberty, in special regime colonies.

6) Depending on the nature and degree of social danger of the crime committed, the character of the offender and other circumstances of the case, the court may, with an explanation of the motives prompting the decision, designate the place where the sentence of deprivation of liberty will be served: those sentenced for the first time for crimes committed through negligence, and also for the intentional crimes as indicated in Paragraph 4 Subparagraph "b" of this Article, in general regime corrective labor colonies; other offenders sentenced to deprivation of liberty but not considered socially dangerous recidivists shall serve their sentence in any kind of corrective labor colony except special regime colonies and settlements.

7) Deprivation of liberty in the form of imprisonment may be designated for part of the term of punishment, but not more than 5 years, as follows:

a) for particularly dangerous recidivists;

b) for persons aged older than 18 years who have committed particularly serious or serious crimes and sentenced to deprivation of liberty for periods of more than 5 years.

8) Any change in the kind of corrective labor institution designated for the offender is made by the court on the grounds and under the procedure established by the legislation of the USSR and the union republics, and in the event of change in the kind of corrective labor institution to a less strict institution in accordance with a joint decision of the administration of the corrective labor institution and a supervising commission set up under the executive committee of the local soviet of people's deputies.

#### Article 37. Restriction on Service

1) Restriction on service is applied for sentenced servicemen of officer rank, warrant officers and naval warrant officers, and extended service military personnel for a period of 6 months to 3 years in cases as laid down by law, and also in cases where, giving due consideration to the circumstances of the case and the character of the

offender, the court finds it advisable instead of deprivation of liberty or restriction of liberty for periods up to 3 years to commute the punishment to restriction on service for the same period.

2) During the term of punishment in the form of restriction on service the offender cannot be assigned to a higher post or be promoted, and the term of punishment is not counted as time seniority for promotion to the next military rank, the period of leave is halved, and a proportion of monetary income will be deducted for the benefit of the state at a rate determined by sentence of the court, from 10 percent to 20 percent.

3) Monitoring of the conduct of the offender is done by the appropriate commanders of military units and chiefs of institutions and military training establishments.

#### Article 38. Assignment to a Penal Battalion

Assignment to a penal battalion is applied to servicemen serving a compulsory term of service for periods of from 3 months to 3 years in cases as laid down by law, and also in cases where the court, giving due due consideration to the circumstances of the case and the character of the offender, deems it advisable instead of deprivation of liberty for terms up to 3 years to assign the offender to a penal battalion for that same period.

#### Article 39. Deprivation of Military or Special Rank

1) When sentence is passed for a serious or particularly serious crime, a person holding military or special rank may on the sentence of the court be deprived of that rank.

2) When sentence is passed for a serious or particularly serious crime on a person holding military or special rank conferred by the USSR Supreme Soviet or USSR Council of Ministers, when passing sentence the court will decide whether or not to recommend to the body that conferred that rank to deprive the offender of the military or special rank.

#### Article 40. Confiscation of Property

1) Confiscation of property is the compulsory transfer to the state without indemnity of all or part of the assets that are the personal property of the offender.

2) Confiscation of property is determined by legislative enactments of the USSR, and for crimes committed for mercenary motives also by legislative enactments of the union republics.

3) Confiscation of property may be imposed by the court only in cases as laid down by law.

4) The list of property exempt from confiscation by dint of its necessity for the offender himself or for his dependents is laid down by the legislation of the union republics.

**Article 41. The Exceptional Punitive Measure of the Death Penalty**

1) As an exceptional punitive measure, until its complete abolition, the death penalty, by shooting, may be awarded for high treason, espionage, acts of terrorism, sabotage, murder under aggravating circumstances, and rape of minors. In cases for which special provision is made in the legislative enactments of the USSR, the death penalty may also be awarded for other crimes committed in wartime or in a warlike situation.

2) The death penalty cannot be awarded to persons who were not yet aged 18 years when they committed the crime, or to women, or to men who have attained the age of 60 years at the time of sentencing.

**SECTION V**

**Condemnation**

**Article 42. General Principles for Determination of Punishment**

1) The court imposes punishment within the limits established by the provisions of the law that determine responsibility for the crime committed. The punishment imposed by the court shall be just and in accordance with the provisions of these Basic Principles and the Criminal Code of the union republic. When passing sentence the court shall be guided by its socialist sense of justice and consider the nature and degree of social danger in the crime committed, the motives for what was done, the character of the offender, the nature and scope of harm inflicted, and circumstances extenuating or aggravating responsibility.

2) The punishment imposed on a person who has committed a crime shall be necessary and adequate for his reform and re-education and to prevent new crimes. Punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty may be imposed only if the purpose of that punishment cannot be achieved by other, lighter punishment.

**Article 43. Circumstances Extenuating Responsibility**

1) The following circumstances are deemed to extenuate responsibility:

- a) prevention by the offender of harmful consequences from the crime committed;
- b) sincere remorse, self-denunciation, active assistance in exposing the crime;
- c) voluntarily making compensation for loss inflicted or harm caused;
- d) commission of the crime as the result of the concurrent effect of difficult personal, family or other circumstances;

e) commission of the crime under the influence of threats or compulsion or because of material, service or other dependency;

f) commission of the crime under the influence of a strong emotion provoked by violence, serious insult or other unlawful actions by the victim;

g) commission of the crime under the influence of the amoral or imprudent behavior of the victim;

h) commission of the crime while in violation of the conditions for necessary defense, extreme necessity or restraining a person who has committed a crime, or professional or economic risk;

i) commission of the crime by a minor;

j) commission of the crime by a pregnant woman.

2) Provision may be made for other extenuating circumstances in the criminal codes of the union republics.

3) When passing sentence the court may also take into account other extenuating circumstances not provided for by the law.

4) Extenuating circumstances as provided by law as an element of a crime cannot be considered again when sentence is passed.

**Article 44. Circumstances Aggravating Responsibility**

1) The following circumstances are deemed to aggravate responsibility:

a) commission of the crime by a person who has previously committed some crime, except for cases provided for in Article 20, Paragraph 2 of these Basic Principles. Depending on the nature of the crimes, the court has the right not to recognize this circumstance as an aggravating circumstance.

b) commission of the crime with collusion beforehand or by an organized group of people;

c) commission of the crime for mercenary or other base motives;

d) serious consequences arising from the crime;

e) commission of a crime against a minor or aged or helpless person;

f) commission of a crime involving a person known by the offender to be suffering from a mental illness or weak-minded;

g) commission of a crime involving particular cruelty or humiliation;

h) commission of a crime that involves abuse of a general distress;

i) commission of crime in a manner constituting a public danger;

j) commission of crime by a person in a state of alcoholic intoxication. Depending on the nature of the crime the court has the right not to recognize this circumstance as an aggravating circumstance.

k) commission of a crime against a person who is materially, professionally or otherwise dependent on the offender;

l) commission of a crime against a woman known by the offender to be pregnant.

2) Provision may be made for other aggravating circumstances in the criminal codes of the union republics.

3) When passing sentence the court may also take into account other aggravating circumstances not provided for by the law.

4) Aggravating circumstances as provided by law as an element of a crime cannot be considered again when sentence is passed.

**Article 45. Imposition of a Punishment Less Heavy than Is Provided for by Law**

1) Giving due consideration to the exceptional circumstances of a case and the significantly lower degree of social danger of an act, and also recognizing the need to impose more lenient punishment than that provided for by law for a particular crime or to mitigate the kind of punishment, the court may permit such mitigation but must state its reasons for so doing.

2) On the same basis the court may release a person from additional punishment which under the law is mandated as responsibility for the crime committed.

**Article 46. Imposition of Punishment for Plurality of Crimes**

1) In a plurality of crimes, after imposing the punishment for each of the crimes, the court ultimately imposes punishment by allowing the less severe penalty to be absorbed by the more severe penalty or by complete or partial cumulation of the punishments within the limits set by the provisions of the law establishing the more severe penalty.

2) Any additional punishment laid down by the law for the crimes of which the person [in question] is found guilty of committing may be added to the main punishment.

3) The same rules are applied with regard to the punishment if, after sentence has been pronounced, the offender is found guilty of another crime committed before the passing of the sentence in the first case. In this event the punishment undergone wholly or partly in serving the first sentence will be taken into consideration in establishing the length of the sentence.

**Article 47. Imposition of Punishment for Plurality of Sentences**

1) Where a sentence has been passed on him but before he has fully served it, the offender commits a new crime, the court will add the whole of the remainder of the foregoing sentence or part of it to the punishment imposed by the new sentence.

2) The ultimate punishment in a plurality of sentences will be greater than both the punishment imposed for the new crime and the part of the punishment of the previous sentence not yet served.

3) When the punishments in a plurality of sentences cumulate, the total length of the sentence may not exceed the maximum term provided for a given kind of punishment. When punishments cumulate in the form of deprivation of liberty, the total length of the term of punishment may not exceed 10 years, while for crimes for which deprivation of liberty is provided for terms exceeding 10 years, the total length of the term may not exceed 15 years.

**Article 48. Deduction of Period Spent in Custody while Awaiting Trial**

Deduction of period spent in custody while awaiting trial is in accordance with the rules as laid down in Article 49 of these Basic Principles.

**Article 49. Rules for Deduction of Period Spent in Custody while Awaiting Trial**

1) In a cumulation of punishments in a plurality of crimes and a plurality of sentences one day of deprivation of liberty will be deducted [from the punishment] at the following rates:

a) for each one day held in custody or in a penal battalion;

b) for each two days of deprivation of liberty;

c) for each three days of corrective labor or restriction of service.

2) Punishment in the form of a fine or disqualification to hold specific posts or perform specific functions is done with cumulation of those disqualifications with deprivation of liberty, being held in a penal battalion, restriction of liberty, being held in custody, corrective labor or restriction on service.

3) The rules in Paragraph 1 of this Article shall be applied in cases where the period spent in custody while awaiting trial is counted as time served for part of the punishment.

4) When a punishment is imposed that is not covered in the above-mentioned Paragraph 1 of this Article the court, giving due consideration to the period spent in custody awaiting trial and that part of punishment served, or the time spent in conducting measures of a medical nature, may correspondingly mitigate the punishment or release the offender from serving his punishment.

#### Article 50. Calculation of Terms of Punishment

Terms of punishment are calculated in months and years. In commutation or plurality of sentences, and also in the case of time spent in custody awaiting trial, terms of punishment may also be calculated in days.

#### Article 51. Determination of Punishment for Making Preparations for a Crime, Attempting a Crime, and for Crimes Commissioned with Accomplices

1) When determining punishment for making preparations for a crime and for attempting to commission a crime the court shall take into consideration the nature and degree of social danger stemming from the actions committed by the offender, the degree of criminal intent, and the reasons why the commissioning of the crime was not completed.

2) When determining punishment for the accomplices in a crime the court shall take into consideration the nature and degree of participation by each accomplice in the commissioning of the crime. Extenuating and aggravating circumstances relating to the person of the individual accomplice are considered by the court only when punishment is imposed on that particular accomplice.

### SECTION VI

#### Conditional Sentence and Deferment of Execution of Sentence

##### Article 52. Conditional Sentence

1) If when imposing punishment on a person who has committed a crime, in the form of deprivation of liberty, restriction of liberty or corrective labor, or in the form of assignment to a penal battalion, and taking into consideration the circumstances of the case and the personality of the offender, the court concludes that no useful purpose would be served by letting the offender serve the punishment imposed, it may decide conditionally not to impose the punishment upon him. In such a case the court rules that the sentence shall not be enforced unless during a defined period of probation established by the

court the offender commits a new crime. Additional penalties except for confiscation of property may be added to a conditional sentence.

2) The period of probation is set for a period of from 1 year to 3 years.

3) Monitoring of the behavior of offenders sentenced conditionally is carried out by internal affairs organs, and, with respect to minors, also by commissions for minors, and, with respect to servicemen, by commanders of military units and the chiefs of institutions and military training establishments.

4) Taking into account the circumstances of the case and the personality of the offender, and also applications from public organizations or the labor collective where the offender works concerning the conditional sentence, the court may send the offender to those organizations or to the collective for re-education and reform. If no application is received the court may with the agreement of a particular labor collective or person make that collective or person responsible for observing the offender conditionally sentenced and for conducting educational work with him.

5) In the event a person serving a conditional sentence commits a new crime during the period of probation he is punished in accordance with the rules set forth in Article 47 of these Basic Principles.

##### Article 53. Deferment of Execution of Sentence

1) When sentencing a first-time offender to deprivation of liberty for a period of up to 5 years, giving due consideration to the personality of the offender and to other circumstances indicating that the offender can be reformed and re-educated without being isolated from society but while under conditions of strict monitoring of his behavior, the court may defer execution of sentence in the form of deprivation of liberty for a period of from 1 year to 3 years. In such cases the court may also defer additional punishments.

2) Deferment of execution of sentence shall not be used with respect to persons guilty of particularly serious crimes.

3) In deferring execution of sentence the court may bind the offender to make good within a certain time damage caused, start work or studies, not to move his place of residence without the agreement of the internal affairs organs or to change jobs or study without informing those organs, and to appear periodically to report to an internal affairs organ, or undergo a course of treatment for alcoholism, drug addiction or toxicomania, or venereal disease; and it may lay on him other obligations provided for by the legislation of the union republics whose execution can help in the reform and re-education of the offender.

4) The court may with the agreement of a particular labor collective or person make that collective or person responsible for observing the offender and conducting educational work with him.

5) Monitoring of the behavior of offenders with deferred execution of sentence is carried out by internal affairs organs, and, with respect to minors, by commissions for minors, and, with respect to servicemen, by commanders of military units and chiefs of institutions and military training establishments.

6) If an offender with deferred execution of sentence fails to carry out the obligations imposed on him by the court or permits a violation of public order or labor discipline resulting in administrative measures or disciplinary or public censure, then at the representation of the organ monitoring the behavior of the offender, the court may repeal the deferment of execution of sentence and direct the offender to serve the time determined by the sentence.

7) When the period of deferment of execution of sentence has expired, at the representation of the organ monitoring the conduct of the offender and depending on the offender's attitude toward labor or studies and his conduct during the period of deferment of execution of sentence, the court may either release the offender from the punishment or direct him to serve the period of deprivation of liberty determined by the sentence.

8) In the event that the offender commits a new crime during the period of deferment of execution of sentence the court shall combine the new punishment with the earlier one as provided for in Article 47 of these Basic Principles.

## SECTION VII

### Relief from Criminal Responsibility and Punishment

#### Article 54. Relief from Criminal Responsibility and Punishment

A person who has committed a crime may in cases as provided for by criminal law be relieved of criminal responsibility or punishment or released early from serving a punishment imposed by the court.

#### Article 55. Relief from Criminal Responsibility as a Consequence of Lapse of Time

1) A person is relieved of criminal responsibility if the following periods have elapsed since the day on which the crime was committed:

- a) 2 years in the commission of a crime that was not socially dangerous;
- b) 4 years in the commission of a less serious crime;
- c) 7 years in the commission of serious crime;

d) 10 years in the commission of a serious crime except in a case as provided for by Paragraph 6 of this Article.

2) Lesser periods of limitation may be established for particular kinds of crime by the legislation of the union republics.

3) The period of limitation shall be calculated from the day of the commission of a crime and up to the moment of sentencing, and shall not be interrupted by institution of the criminal case.

4) The period of limitation is interrupted if before the expiration of the period determined by law a person who has committed a serious or particularly serious crime commits a new intentional crime. When this occurs calculation of the period of limitation starts from the moment of the commission of the new crime. In particular cases, if before expiration of the period of limitation a person commits a new crime the lapse of time for each crime runs separately.

5) The period of limitation is halted if a person who has committed a crime is a fugitive from justice. In such cases the period of limitation starts again from the moment that the person is arrested or gives himself up. When this occurs the periods of limitation as determined by Paragraph of this Article are doubled, but may not exceed 15 years.

6) The question of the applicability of period of limitation with regard to a person who has committed a crime for which the death penalty is awarded is decided by the court. If the court finds it impossible to apply period of limitation to that person the death penalty cannot be awarded and is commuted to deprivation of liberty.

7) In cases as provided for by legislative enactments of the USSR, period of limitation is not applied.

#### Article 56. Relief from Punishment as a Consequence of Expiration of Period of Limitation for Execution of Sentence

1) A person is relieved from punishment if the sentence has not been carried out within the following periods, counting from the day on which it entered into legislative force:

- a) 2 years for a sentence of deprivation of liberty for a period not greater than 2 years or for punishment not connected with deprivation of liberty;
- b) 4 years for a sentence of deprivation of liberty for a period not greater than 5 years;
- c) 7 years for a sentence of punishment more severe than deprivation of liberty for a period of 10 years.

d) Lesser periods of limitation may be established for particular kinds of crime by legislation of the union republics.

3) The period of limitation is interrupted if the offender evades serving the sentence. In this case the period of limitation starts again from the moment that the person gives himself up to serve the sentence or from the moment of his arrest. When this occurs the periods of limitation as determined by Paragraph 1 of this Article are doubled, but may not exceed 15 years.

4) The question of applicability of period of limitation with regard to a person awarded the death penalty is decided by the court. If the court finds it impossible to apply period of limitation the death sentence is commuted to deprivation of liberty.

5) In cases as provided for by legislative enactments of the USSR, the period of limitation is not applied.

**Article 57. Relief from Criminal Responsibility with Application of Measures of Public Reprimand**

1) A person who has committed a crime that does not represent a great social danger may be relieved of criminal responsibility if the aims of reforming and re-educating him can be achieved by means of application of measures of public reprimand. The labor collectives and public organizations are enlisted to reform and re-educate such a person.

2) If the grounds indicated in Paragraph 1 of this Article are present the prosecutor, the investigator or investigating body with the agreement of the prosecutor, and also the court, may relieve a person from criminal responsibility as follows:

a) by transferring the materials in the case for consideration by a comrades' court;

b) by transferring the person to the charge of a labor collective or public organization.

**Article 58. Relief from Criminal Responsibility and Punishment by Virtue of a Person No Longer Being Socially Dangerous or Because of His Prevention of Harmful Consequences**

1) A person who has committed a crime may be relieved of criminal responsibility if it is recognized that before the investigation or examination of the case in a court that person ceased to be socially dangerous as a consequence of altered circumstances.

2) A person who has committed a crime may be relieved of criminal responsibility by the prosecutor or by the investigator or investigating body with the agreement of

the prosecutor, and also by the court, if after the commission of the crime the person has shown sincere remorse, admitted his guilt and taken steps to prevent harmful consequences.

3) A person who has committed a crime may at the direction of the court be relieved of punishment if it is recognized that as a consequence of his exemplary conduct and honest attitude toward labor after the commission of the crime that person is no longer socially dangerous.

**Article 59. Conditional Remission of the Remainder of Punishment**

Persons who are serving punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty, restriction of liberty or corrective labor, and also by assignment to a penal battalion or restriction on service, may be conditionally remitted of the remainder of punishment. When this is done a person may also be relieved of additional punishment.

2) Conditional remission of remainder of punishment can be applied to an offender only in a case where by exemplary conduct and an honest attitude toward labor he has shown that he has reformed.

3) Conditional remission of remainder of punishment can be applied after an offender has actually served part of his sentence, as follows:

a) at least half of the term imposed by the court for a crime that does not entail great social danger, or for a less serious crime;

b) at least two-thirds of the term imposed by the court for a serious crime, and also in repeat crimes if the person was previously sentenced to deprivation of liberty for an intentional crime;

c) at least three-fourths of the sentence imposed by the court for a particularly serious crime, and also of punishment imposed on a person previously released from punishment who committed a new crime during the period of the part of the sentence not served.

4) When applying conditional remission by discharge from punishment the court may if a particular labor collective has made application, or with its agreement, make that labor collective responsible for observing the conditional discharge of the offender and carrying out educational work with him during the period covering the part of the sentence not served.

5) Conditional release is not applied in the following cases:

a) for a person for whom punishment in the form of the death penalty has been mitigated by pardon or amnesty to deprivation of liberty;

b) for particularly dangerous recidivists.

6) In the event of the commission of a new crime by a person given a conditional discharge during the period covering the part of a sentence not served, the court shall impose punishment in accordance with the rules set forth in Article 47 of these Basic Principles.

#### **Article 60. Remission of Punishment**

1) Persons sentenced to deprivation of liberty, restriction of liberty or corrective labor, and also assigned to a penal battalion, may be granted remission of sentence and allowed to serve the part of sentence yet to serve in a more lenient form.

2) Commutation of the part of a sentence not yet served to more lenient punishment may be applied in the case of an offender who has set out along the path of reform after serving part of a sentence, as follows:

a) at least one-third of the term of the sentence imposed by the court for a crime that was not socially dangerous, or for a less serious crime;

b) at least half of the term of the sentence imposed by the court for a serious crime, and also for a repeat crime if the person was previously sentenced to deprivation of liberty for an intentional crime;

c) at least two-thirds of the term of the sentence imposed by the court for a particularly serious crime, and also of punishment imposed on a person previously granted a conditional discharge who committed a new crime during the period covered by the part of the sentence not served.

3) When the part of deprivation of liberty, restriction of liberty or corrective labor, and also assignment to a penal battalion, not yet served is commuted, this is done within the time limits established by law for those kinds of punishment, and should not exceed the period of deprivation of liberty not served.

4) Commutation of the part of a punishment not yet served to a more lenient punishment is not applied in the case of persons listed in Article 59 Paragraph 5 of these Basic Principles.

5) When punishment is commuted to a more lenient punishment the offender may be relieved of additional punishments. The offender shall be relieved of additional punishment if it is more severe than the new main punishment.

6) For persons whose punishment has been commuted to a more lenient punishment, conditional release shall be applied in accordance with the rules set forth in Article 59 of these basic Principles.

#### **Article 61. Release from Punishment for Reasons of Health**

1) A person who has committed a crime shall not serve a sentence if before sentence is passed by the court he falls ill with a mental disease that deprives him of his ability to account for his own actions or to control his actions.

2) A person who falls ill after sentence has been passed with a mental disease that deprives him of his ability to account for his own actions or to control them shall be relieved of punishment or of further time served as punishment.

3) The court may direct that persons as listed in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article undergo compulsory measures of a medical nature as provided for in Article 75 of these Basic Principles. In the event of recovery the person may be liable to punishment.

4) A person who falls ill after passing of sentence with some other serious disease that prevents him from serving his sentence may be released from punishment or from further serving a sentence. When deciding this question the court shall take into consideration the severity of the crime committed, the personality of the offender and other circumstances.

#### **Article 62. Relief from Criminal Responsibility and Punishment on the Basis of an Act of Amnesty or Pardon**

1) A person who has committed a crime may be relieved of criminal responsibility and a person sentenced for a crime may be wholly or partly relieved both of the main punishment and additional punishment or conditionally released from punishment, or that part of a sentence still not served may be commuted to a more lenient punishment on the basis of an act of amnesty or pardon.

2) If a person conditionally released from punishment on the basis of an act of amnesty or pardon commits a new crime during the period of probation the court shall impose punishment on that person in accordance with the rules as set forth in Article 47 of these Basic Principles.

#### **Article 63. Criminal Record**

1) Criminal record is of legal significance when a new crime is committed, and also in other cases as provided for by legislative enactments of the USSR.

2) A person is considered to have a criminal record from the day that the sentence of the court comes into force. Persons relieved of punishment at the direction of the court are not considered to have a criminal record.

3) A criminal record is expunged as follows:

a) with regard to those conditionally released if during the period of probation they do not commit a new crime;



b) with regard to persons whose punishment is deferred if during the period of the punishment they have not committed a new crime and the sentence was not executed in accordance with established procedure;

c) with regard to persons sentenced to reprimand, after that punishment has been served, and also with regard to persons who have served a sentence in the form of disqualification to hold specific posts or perform certain functions, and also restriction on service or assignment to a penal battalion;

d) at the expiry of 1 year following punishment in the form of a fine, and also after serving punishment in the form of corrective labor or being held in custody;

e) at the expiry of 2 years after serving punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty or restriction of liberty for periods not exceeding 5 years;

f) at the expiry of 3 years after serving a sentence in the form of deprivation of liberty for a period of more than 5 years but not more than 10 years;

g) at the expiry of 5 years after serving a sentence in the form of deprivation of liberty for a period of more than 10 years;

h) at the expiry of 10 years after serving a sentence in the form of deprivation of liberty by a person considered to be a particularly dangerous recidivist.

4) The period for the expunging of a criminal record is calculated from the day of completion of the main and additional punishment.

5) The time during which a sentence is deferred is included in the period for expunging a criminal record, and when this is done the lapse of time is uninterrupted.

6) If under established legal procedure a person has been conditionally released early from punishment or the punishment has been commuted to a more lenient punishment, the period for expunging the criminal record is calculated from the actual completion of the sentence.

7) If after sentence has been served a person proves that he is reformed and has a honest attitude toward labor, then upon application by a labor collective or public organization the court may expunge the criminal record in accordance with the periods indicated in Paragraph 3 of this Article.

8) A criminal record may be expunged on the basis of an act of amnesty or pardon.

9) If a person who has served a sentence commits a new crime before the period set for expunging of the criminal record is complete, that period is interrupted. In such a

case the period for expunging the criminal record for both crimes is calculated after the main and additional punishments have been served for the new crime.

10) Expiry or expunging of criminal record nullifies the legal consequences of the crime committed.

## SECTION VIII

### Features of Criminal Responsibility of Minors

#### Article 64. General Provisions

Criminal responsibility of persons who have committed a crime when aged under 18 years is in accordance with the provisions of these Basic Principles, with due consideration of the rules as set forth in this Article.

#### Article 65. Kinds of Punishment Applied to Minors

1) The following kinds of punishment may be applied to minors:

a) reprimand; b) fine; c) corrective labor; d) holding in custody; e) deprivation of liberty.

2) Other forms of punishment in accordance with the general provisions of these Basic Principles may be established by the legislation of the union republics.

#### Article 66. Fine

A fine is applied only to minors having an independent income and may be from R50 to R200, and for crimes with mercenary motives, up to R500.

#### Article 67. Holding in Custody

Minors who have attained the age of 16 years at the time of sentencing may be held in custody for a period of from 20 days to 45 days.

#### Article 68. Deprivation of Liberty

1) A person who has not attained the age of 18 years and who has committed a crime that is not very socially dangerous may not be sentenced to punishment in the form of deprivation of liberty.

2) For a person who has not attained the age of 18 years and has committed a crime, deprivation of liberty may not exceed the following:

a) for a less serious crime, 3 years;

b) for a serious crime, 5 years;

c) for a particularly serious crime, 7 years.

3) Persons who have not attained the age of 18 years at the time of sentencing shall serve their terms of deprivation of liberty in general or reinforced regime educational-labor colonies.

4) Sentences are served in educational-labor colonies by the following:

a) male minors convicted for the first time to deprivation of liberty, and also female minors: in general regime colonies;

b) male minors who have previously served sentences in the form of deprivation of liberty and having a criminal record: in reinforced regime colonies.

5) Depending on the nature and degree of social danger in the crime committed, the personality of the offender and other circumstances of the case, deprivation of liberty may be imposed on a convicted male minor with sentence to be served in a general regime educational-labor colony instead of a reinforced regime colony; the reasons for such a decisions shall be indicated.

#### Article 69. Determination of Punishment

When determining punishment for a minor, in addition to the circumstances indicated in Articles 42, 43 and 44 of these Basic Principles, the court takes into consideration the degree of development of the minor, the conditions of his life and education, and the influence of adults.

#### Article 70. Relief from Criminal Responsibility and Punishment

1) A minor who has committed a crime for the first time when the crime does not present any serious social danger may be relieved of criminal responsibility by the prosecutor or by the investigator or investigating body with the agreement of the prosecutor, and the materials of the case passed for examination by a commission for minors, if it is established from the nature of the action committed, information about the personality and other circumstances of the case that the offender can be reformed and re-educated without the imposition of punishment.

2) The court may decide to relieve from punishment a minor who has committed a less serious crime for the first time that does not present any serious social danger, and apply compulsory measures of an educational nature if it is established from the nature of the action committed, information about the personality and other circumstances of the case that the offender can be reformed and re-educated without the imposition of punishment.

3) The kinds of compulsory measures of an educational nature and the procedure for applying them are established by the legislation of the union republics.

#### Article 71. Conditional Remission of the Remainder of Punishment

1) Persons convicted to deprivation of liberty or corrective labor for a crime committed before attaining the age of 18 years may be conditionally discharged. When this is done the person may also be discharged from additional punishment.

2) Conditional remission of punishment can be applied to an offender only in a case where he has shown by exemplary conduct and an honest attitude toward labor and training that he has reformed.

3) Conditional remission of punishment is applied after an offender has actually served part of his sentence, as follows:

a) at least one-third of the term of the sentence imposed by the court for a crime that does not present any serious social danger, and for a less serious crime;

b) at least half of the term of the sentence imposed by the court for a serious crime;

c) at least two-thirds of the term of the sentence imposed by the court for a particularly serious crime, and also in a repeat crime if the person was previously sentenced to deprivation of liberty for an intentional crime.

4) When applying conditional remission of punishment the court may with the agreement of a particular labor collective or person, make that collective or person responsible for monitoring the person conditionally discharged throughout the time covering that part of the sentence remitted as directed by the court, and for conducting educational work with the offender.

5) In the event that a person who has been conditionally discharged commits a new crime during the period of the sentence the court shall impose punishment in accordance with the rules set forth in Article 47 of these Basic Principles.

#### Article 72. Commutation of Sentence

1) Persons sentenced to deprivation of liberty or corrective labor may have the remainder of their sentence commuted to a more lenient punishment.

2) Commutation of the remainder of a sentence to a more lenient punishment may be applied in the case of a person who has set out on the path of reform after actually serving part of his sentence, as follows:

a) at least one-fourth of the term of the sentence imposed by the court for a crime that does not present any serious social danger, or for a less serious crime;

b) at least one-third of the term of the sentence imposed by the court for a particularly serious crime, and also in a repeat crime if the person was previously sentenced for an intentional crime.

3) When sentence is commuted to a more lenient punishment the offender may be relieved of additional punishment. The offender is relieved of additional punishment if it is stricter than the new main punishment.

4) For persons whose sentences are commuted to a more lenient punishment or who are conditionally discharged the rules set forth in Article 71 of these Basic Principles apply.

#### Article 73. Criminal Record

A minor convicted for a crime that does not present any serious social danger has no criminal record after sentence has been served.

### SECTION IX

#### Compulsory Measures of a Medical Nature

##### Article 74. The Purpose of Applying Compulsory Measures of a Medical Nature

Compulsory measures of a medical nature with respect to persons who have committed socially dangerous acts and are suffering from mental disorders are used for the purpose of preventing them from committing new socially dangerous acts and to protect their persons and treat them.

##### Article 75. Application of Compulsory Measures of a Medical Nature with Respect to Persons with Mental Illness

1) With respect to persons who have committed socially dangerous acts as laid down by criminal law when incapacitated, or who committed crimes but were suffering before or after sentencing from a mental illness that deprived them of the capacity of being aware of their actions or the ability to control them, the court shall apply compulsory measures of a medical nature if because of the nature of the action committed or their own diseased condition such persons represent a danger to society.

2) The court shall designate the following compulsory measures of a medical nature:

- a) treatment in a psychiatric hospital (or department) with normal observation;
- b) treatment in a psychiatric hospital (or department) with reinforced observation;
- c) treatment in a psychiatric hospital (or department) with strict observation.

3) Instead of applying compulsory measures of a medical nature the court may entrust a mental patient to the care of relatives or other persons who shall care for the patient, with compulsory observation by a physician at the place of residence.

4) The time during which a person with a mental illness after committing a crime is subject to compulsory measures of a medical nature is calculated according to the term of the corresponding sentence.

5) The conditions and procedure for the application of compulsory measures of a medical nature are established by the legislation of the union republics.

##### Article 76. Application of Compulsory Measures of a Medical Nature with Respect to Alcoholics, Drug Addicts and Toxicomaniacs

1) In the event that a crime is committed by an alcoholic, drug addict or toxicomaniac, the court may apply compulsory treatment with respect to such persons in accordance with the conclusions of a medical commission.

2) With respect to a person sentenced to deprivation of liberty, treatment for alcoholism, drug addiction or toxicomania is done at the place where sentence is being served or in a closed treatment center, while a person not sentenced to deprivation of liberty shall be treated in a medical establishment with a special treatment regime.

##### Premier Toome on Estonian Economic Accountability

18000300a Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
24 Dec 88 p 3

[Interview with Indrek Kherbertovich Toome, Chairman of the Estonian Council of Ministers by L. Levitskiy: There Is No Other Incentive"; time and place not specified]

[Text] **Indrek Kherbertovich Toome has been appointed chairman of the Estonian Council of Ministers at a session of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet.**

Toome was born in 1943 in Tallinn. He graduated from the Tallinn Polytechnical Institute and from the CPSU Central Committee Higher Party School as an external student. He was first secretary of Estonian Komsomol Central Committee and first secretary of the party gorkom in Tartu, and later deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers. His latest appointment was that of secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee.

■**Levitskiy** ■ **Indrek Kherbertovich, has your previous work in the Council of Ministers shortened the inevitable period of adjustment in your post?**

[Toome] A chairman is a chairman. Another level of responsibility. Moreover, the dynamism of perestroika has placed us all in an essentially new situation. It is the time to criticize and reject what did not please us in the past. Today is the time for constructive action. People's growing activeness is pleasing. Herein lies the guarantee for realization of the program of renewal that was prepared for the 19th Party Conference and confirmed by the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee September Plenum. Its goal is to turn the economy of the republic toward the individual and improve the quality of life for people. The path to reach this goal is cost accounting at all levels. And its apex is republic cost accounting and self-management for Estonia.

**■Levitskiy■ How far has the republic moved along this path?**

[Toome] The presidium of the Estonian Academy of Sciences recently completed an expert examination of the concept of republic cost accounting. The first, one might say official concept was developed by an ad hoc scientific collective at the Estonian Academy of Sciences Economics Institute. The second, alternative concept was developed by the public organizations and enthusiasts. The two versions coincide from the viewpoint of many questions and recommendations. But once the ideas of the competing groups and authors can be made to match then the probability of error is minimal.

The final concept will absorb the best of both versions.

**■Levitskiy■ I have also heard criticisms from scholars in the country about the Estonian model for cost accounting.**

[Toome] This is natural. We have created it for the first time and we realize that it is not ideal. Economics is always constant search. When something that today seems fine turns out to be wrong then we must look for new solutions. A discussion on the problems of regional cost accounting has taken place in the country's Council of Ministers. The ways and methods that we have proposed were not perceived by everyone in the same way. Discussion and exchange of opinion are also a search for truth. But it is quite groundless to accuse Estonia of striving for economic isolation, or that we have been seized with economic egoism. This is not so. The republic is simply unable to live and develop without a strengthening of the links with the entire national economy of the country and with all its regions. We are proposing that this be done in a more efficient way and be built on the basis of equality and mutual advantage. And it is not necessary that those links run through Moscow. The shortest and most reliable kind of line is a straight line. The country's national economy can only gain from this.

I am aware that a number of pieces published in the Estonian press give grounds for such suspicions and doubts. But the position of the government is not determined by extreme views. There is no doubt that the

main, base sectors of industry will be under union subordination. But there is also no doubt that the republic should have levers to influence enterprises of union subordination.

**■Levitskiy■ The hopes for self-management are great. But the disappointment may be even greater. There are already worrying examples.**

[Toome] Of course it would be easier and simpler to complain about lack of understanding "at the top." Now we carry all the responsibility ourselves. There will be no easy life. There is intensification everywhere, in everything. Much has already been done. Yes, and alarming factors have also emerged. Light industry was the first to operate on the principles of cost accounting and independence. Its economy has been significantly strengthened. But quantities of goods in the stores have not increased. The ultimate goal of republic cost accounting is to improve the quality of life and people's well-being. Each person must be convinced that if he works in a stepped-up way then he will be paid well and will be able to make his income for the good of his family. There is no other incentive for labor...

**Estonian Supsov Session Debates Constitution**  
*18000296 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA*  
*in Russian, 18, 19, 20 Nov 88*

[Report on debate at the Extraordinary 8th Session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation: "In Keeping With the Will of the Voters"]

**■18 Nov pp 2-3■**

[Text] It would be difficult to recall in recent decades a session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet that took place in an atmosphere of such bustle as the Extraordinary Eighth Session. Not a single report by an official on his own activity (raport-samootchet), customary in the past. The deputies proved themselves to be political figures in the full sense of the word—there was a very frank and democratic discussion of the important political issues, and the participants in the session were fully aware how much the future of Estonia and its people depended on the decisions they made. Those who spoke expressed differing opinions, they argued over variant wordings, and they made their proposals. But they had a common objective, as shown by the vote—to adopt documents that promoted to the fullest realization of the course of the 19th All-Union Party Conference toward creation of a democratic state based on law and the decisions of the 11th Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee, and to carry out the command they had received from the voters.

"It is our direct duty as representatives of the supreme body of government," said deputy R. Khagelberg (Tallin-Kivimyyeskiy Election District No 16), "to understand that improvement of the constitutional legislation is a central requirement of the major reform of the

political system. The system laid down by the Constitution must guarantee construction of a democratic state based on law and full-fledged development of a union of equal and sovereign states based on Leninist principles. The draft of amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution which is now undergoing nationwide discussion and also the legislative bill on election of people's deputies of the USSR unfortunately do not meet those requirements in all respects. Those draft proposals contain a number of deficiencies, but I will be so bold as to reduce them to two positions.

"First, the narrowing of voter democracy and the unequal representation of the union republics in decisionmaking on all-union matters.

"Second, the rights of the republics are considerably more restricted than up to now in the fields of the economy, culture, and the social sphere, which in practice makes it impossible to carry out our program for a cost-accounting (khozraschetnaya) Estonia. I am so bold as to assert this with full conviction, since by virtue of my duties, both professional and official, I have had occasion to come into rather close contact with the IMYe study and the review of it by the experts.

"So, let us turn all our thoughts to the possibilities for changing and improving the situation. I would like to call it to your attention that I am also conveying the ideas expressed in the decision of the General Assembly of the ESSR Academy of Sciences which has already been presented in detail by Comrade A. Ryutel. I see no reason, then, to expound their content once again. I will pass on only those ideas which the republic's academy of sciences has received from other scientific institutions, along with the wishes of my own constituents. They are all unanimous that we must act as is proper in a democratic state based on law. The positions of our constituents and of the work collectives we represent are at times quite radical. For example, there is this point in the decision of the General Assembly of the Academy of Sciences: acceptance of these proposals for discussion in the upcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is deemed intolerable.

"Political wisdom is always based on thorough analysis. Today, we have heard here the results of a thorough political analysis of the documents under discussion today that was conducted by Comrade Ryutel, and a rather substantial legal analysis presented by Comrades Kiris and Almann. We now have at our disposition draft versions of decisions prepared by our working commissions and approved by the basic commission. It is quite clear that along with all the criticism, a decision also needs constructive proposals, a constructive program that leads our life forward. Nor in a nationwide discussion is it possible to bypass a single argument emphasized in the decision of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee recently adopted on this matter. I would like to stress, then, that the General Assembly of

the ESSR Academy of Sciences has obligated its members, institutions, and officials to help the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet and other ESSR government institutions in every way during the drafting and polishing of the proposed versions of both the Compact on Union (soyuznyy dogovor) and also drafts of other pieces of legislation. This in fact is being done already. Proposals formulated with the help of scientists have been reflected in the relevant draft proposals presented by the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet. The more forces we bring to bear, the greater the result that always comes from effort, which is why the General Assembly of the Academy of Sciences addressed its decree to many entities, including the academies of sciences of the other republics and the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

"There has been a direct response to this already from the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences in which the most prestigious specialists acknowledged that our position on the draft amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution absolutely deserves attention. But they requested submittal of our concrete proposals and wordings so that they could be given serious consideration. The proposals have already been included in the draft versions which the deputies now have in hand. Given the short time for discussion, it is clearly impossible to present proposals on all issues. It is understandable, then, that the range of issues which we are now examining, out of a desire for them to be an item for debate of the upcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is more limited than is required for adoption of what we might call a definitive decision. Since resolution must always be in stages.

"We are now on the threshold of making very crucial decisions. I call upon all deputies to support the noble ideas of building a democratic state based on law. We will do this with equanimity, reasonably, without excessive emotions, and we will do it without going to extremes. I feel that the draft proposals which have been distributed for discussion qualify as the basis of our effort and our decisions."

"I wish to express not only my point of view as a deputy, but also the views of the Tartu Party Gorkom, the Tartu City Soviet, and those of practically the entire group of deputies of the city of Tartu, views which we have repeatedly stipulated, and do so once again today," said T. Laak (Vanemuyzeskiy Election District No 140), first secretary of the Tartu Party Gorkom. "First, I would like to express full support of the draft decree entitled 'On Proposals Pertaining to the Proposed Versions of the USSR Law on Amendments and Supplements to the USSR Constitution (Fundamental Law) and the USSR Law on Election of People's Deputies of the USSR.' In keeping with the spirit of that decree, I would like to call your attention to the need to make essential corrections in the ESSR Constitution. This necessity arises, in my view, from the following circumstances. First, so that the

ESSR Constitution and USSR Constitution are organically related to one another. Second, it arises out of the persuasive demands of our people that constitutional guarantees be presented today against any attempts to restrict the sovereignty of ESSR by political means or to unsettle democratization in our republic through centralization. By making the relevant amendments and supplements to the ESSR Constitution, we would be refuting the assertion that there exists no legal mechanism which could stand in the way of the ideology which diminishes the sovereignty of the union republic and which is contained in the supplements and amendments to the USSR Constitution.

“Those who deny the possibility of amending and supplementing the ESSR Constitution face us with an objective choice—either to agree to the method of so-called democratic vote proposed by the higher authorities, in which we on the crest of the next triumph of democracy—the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet—will again find ourselves in the minority, or to withdraw from the USSR, which certain legally astute, but politically naive figures have been attempting to propose in all seriousness. I feel that a deputy who feels a sense of responsibility will answer ‘nay’ to both extremes. ‘Nay’ both to the negativism of, for all practical purposes, sitting with hands folded, and also to an extremism that runs an excessive political hazard. What remains is to decide how to create the constitutional guarantees of political stability and sovereignty of Estonian SSR. Proceeding from precisely that logic, I and deputy N. Preyman have presented proposals for amending the ESSR Constitution so as to guarantee validity of USSR laws on ESSR territory, including the amendments to the Constitution, only after their approval by the ESSR Supreme Soviet. This idea was supported in a joint session of the Tartu Party Gorkom and Tartu City Soviet, and also, aside from the two mentioned, by 38 deputies in the ESSR Supreme Soviet from the city, the rayon, and southeastern Estonia as a whole. This idea has today been submitted by deputies in the form of a draft decree of the ESSR Supreme Soviet on the two all-union legislative proposals and the draft of the Law on Amending and Supplementing the ESSR Constitution. It is embodied in Article 5 of the bill and in the form of a separate bill, in the original form presented to us.

“Today, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet has submitted a considerably altered version. The deputies have, of course, noticed this. What can be said about this version in which, I emphasize, the idea, the entire idea, and the ideology are the same? In my view, the new version is better for many reasons. First of all, this is a proper legal document. When on 2 November I submitted in Tartu what was referred to as the bill-proposal of the Tartu deputies, I emphasized in my speech that our bill was not a proper legal document, but a very important political document. This thought was thoroughly debated in the joint session, but no one was able to propose any different solution to the problem. It was emphasized even then that if we find a different and

proper legal wording, that it would be given preference. In my opinion, this second version has now been found. In addition, I would also like to call attention to certain important and essential differences. Concerning amendment of Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution, the original version spoke only about conditions for adopting provisions of the USSR Constitution and USSR laws. The new version covers practically all legislative and other normative acts. Consequently, the effect of the new version is considerably broader. What is more, the date of adoption of amendments to the Constitution in the original version would signify the time when USSR laws to be adopted would begin to be subject to consideration of the ESSR Supreme Soviet from the standpoint of whether they would be valid in our jurisdiction or not.

“The new version as a practical matter makes amendments to the Constitution retroactive and makes it possible to stay or set limits on enforcement of USSR laws or other normative acts regardless of when they were adopted. As we know, neither the ways nor the means have so far been found in Estonian SSR to revoke in our jurisdiction legislative acts of the USSR adopted in the past.

“Should the original version be adopted, the ESSR Supreme Soviet would have to thoroughly debate every new law and any normative act of the USSR and attempt to adapt them to our conditions even when there was no such need. I imagine that there would be very many such acts, especially when we take into account that the USSR Supreme Soviet will be transformed into a legislative body in permanent session. In the new version, the ESSR Supreme Soviet would examine legislative acts of the USSR only in certain cases when the sovereignty of Estonian SSR was violated or attempts occurred to regulate matters which under the ESSR Constitution are in the jurisdiction of Estonian SSR or do not take into account the peculiarities of the republic. Such cases will probably be rare, and the ESSR Supreme Soviet will be able to direct its efforts and energy toward solving the republic’s vital political and economic problems. Obviously, the question can be debated, if not today, then in the future, of whether examination of all USSR laws might be included among the tasks of the constitutional commission of the ESSR Supreme Soviet. In short, thanks to joint efforts the bill has been put in an improved new version that broadens its content and does not alter its essence.

“After all, the new version does not say that USSR legislative enactments will automatically begin to take effect in Estonian SSR, but look closely at the wording, which reads: ‘Legislative and other normative acts of the USSR shall be subject to acceptance for enforcement on the territory of Estonian SSR.’ It is evident that we must think about the mechanism that would regulate what is referred to as acceptance for enforcement. Quite a few proposals have been made in this regard, and I believe that our editorial committee will have to take them

under consideration, for example, this version: 'Legislative and other normative acts of the USSR shall be adopted for enforcement on the territory of ESSR through the procedure established by the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, and acts of the ESSR Supreme Soviet and of its Presidium shall be subject only to the will of the majority of the people of ESSR.' Perhaps this ought to be set down right in the Constitution; perhaps we ought to adopt a separate legislative act on this today, depending on whether today's session accepts the new version of Article 74 or not. Should that version be adopted, we can weigh the question of debating a decision on requiring the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet to work out a procedure for acceptance of USSR laws for enforcement in ESSR and to submit it, say, to the next session for approval. I think that the editorial committee must furiously weigh these different versions, and the deputies must make a decision concerning them. Since I have been a direct participant in the work process in the true sense of the word, beginning with the birth of the idea of amending Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution, the result of which is before you today, I want to emphasize that this is not only a politically effective bill, but also a legally reliable and impenetrable constitutional guarantee protecting the republic's sovereignty.

"That is why I would like to emphasize once again that today we have under consideration not two differing bills to amend Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution, but a single bill in different versions in the form of a new version of a single legislative initiative that has been developing. Should there be a discussion, and we will have to take a vote, I propose that these two versions should by no means be treated as differing and competing bills. If opinions should differ, then let the question be decided by a simple vote; ultimately one of these bills with amendments needs to be put up to a vote. I would also like to emphasize that I cannot concur at all in the proposals to the effect that today there is still no need to decide the question of amendments and supplements to the ESSR Constitution. Unfortunately, such a proposal is out of touch with the situation that has come about in the republic and also reflects a lack of understanding of the situation which led to calling today's extraordinary session. Should the deputies realize that they are unable to adopt sufficiently sound and well-thought-out decisions on these matters, then we will continue the effort until full clarity is achieved. The voters will expect of us today specific steps to support the political course of the 11th Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee.

"By amending Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution today and by giving it the new wording that has been proposed in the draft, we create a realistic platform for practical realization, not just declarations, of all the important proposals which have today been put up for discussion. I would also like to call attention of the deputies to another circumstance. When the supplement to Article 74 contained in the new version is adopted in our republic, that creates a fundamental opportunity to act

in support of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet who would vote, for example, in the USSR Supreme Soviet against the bill on the 'black berets,' and even today we would be able on the basis of that version to put forth a draft decree to stay this all-union law on the territory of Estonian SSR. As a practical matter, we would have no such opportunity under the original version submitted by Tartu."

"Yesterday, rallies and worker conferences were held throughout the republic, and more than 100,000 persons took part in them," deputy V. Koltakov (Tallin-Leningradskiy Election District No 52) said in his speech. "Rallies were held in Tallinn, Narva, Kokhtla-Yarve, Sillamyaе, Paldiski, Tartu, Tapa, and Rakvere. The participants included workers from enterprises in industry and construction, from schools, hospitals, the merchant marine, the airlines, and other sectors. Aside from adoption of resolutions and instructions to deputies, which received the votes of 98,441 persons, unanimous support was also given at these rallies to the call for consolidation issued by Comrade Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian CP Central Committee, in the republic's party-economic aktiv.

"The workers expressed trust in the possibility of lessening the tension in the republic's political atmosphere. Inclusion of the point on adoption of amendments to the ESSR Constitution in the session's agenda put all of us in an extreme quandary. How can such crucial documents be adopted when not only the public at large, but even many deputies of the Estonian Supreme Soviet are not familiar with them? This approach is not permissible in a period when a democratic society based on law is being built. It undermines the confidence of party members and the entire people in the supreme bodies of government in the republic."

"A political commission was recently created in the ESSR Supreme Soviet to prepare the draft decisions of the extraordinary session," said deputy E. Savisaar (Vinniskiy Election District No 236). "The commission met twice, and in both cases all the discussion ranged around changes in Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution. What is referred to as the Laak-Preyman version, in the form in which it has been submitted to you today, was taken as the basis for discussion. Several other versions were also taken under consideration, but in both meetings those present arrived at a unanimous opinion. It should be noted that the commission of legal experts looked doubtfully on this decision, and after the political commission completed its work, the legal experts drafted a second version of the amendments to Article 74, which has also been presented to you today. Why did the political commission strive so persistently for the first version of the amendments and stick to its position to the end? Because we are not operating in a vacuum, but in a concrete political situation, and we are dealing not so much with a legal as a political decision.

"We know what the political situation is today with respect to debating the problems that exist. Yesterday, we received the results of a survey of public opinion, this was a representative sample, a well-established panel that has been repeatedly used and corresponds to the social and occupational composition of the nationalities in Estonia. There was a poll of workers, say, at the 'Krengolmskaya Manufaktura,' the Baltic Ship Repair Yard, the Tallinn Machinebuilding Plant, the 'Kommunar' PO, 'Flora,' the ShPO imeni V. Klementi, the bus association, the port of Novyy Tallin, and so on. The survey showed that the will of the people has been expressed in discussion of these questions. In the opinion of 72 percent of the population, the all-union bills do not have to be supported, while 19 percent support them. If we compare Estonians and the Russophone population, 7 percent of the Estonians are ready to support the bills, while 85 percent are against. Among other nationalities, the bills are supported by 39 percent, while 49 percent do not support them. This shows that even among non-Estonians a majority feels that the draft should be withdrawn from discussion. The preconception that the Russophone population was defending these all-union drafts has been shattered. Both on the question of priority of republic legislation over all-union legislation should there be a conflict a majority agreed—90 percent of Estonians and 53 percent of non-Estonians, and even on the question of ownership, including the proposition that industrial enterprises in the republic must be under jurisdiction of Estonian SSR. This decision was considered the right one by 95 percent of Estonians and 63 percent of residents belonging to other nationalities. So, on those issues which we are discussing today there is no great disagreement. There are disagreements on matters related to the Law on Language and Citizenship. The survey showed that the various ethnic groups have as a matter of fact been discussing them in different ways. If we see the opinion which people hold about whether the deputies have been carrying out their intentions, we note that 60 percent of Estonians believe that the deputies are acting in accordance with the aspirations of the people. The Russophone population is more pessimistically disposed—49 percent feel that the deputies are acting as they would wish.

"One of the key issues for our session is the attitude toward amendments of Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution. As you are aware, two draft versions have been presented on this question, and the political and legal commissions have taken different positions on them. Let us put it this way, the attitude of the political experts and legal experts differed. This is not the first time we have encountered this, since we and the lawyers also had differing opinions on the draft of the Law on Language. We alerted them in advance that such a draft could not be submitted, there was talk about it in the advisory council, there was a conversation with the leaders, and so on. The legal experts answered that the Law on Language is a legal document not a political document, and we would be a laughing stock to the entire world if we decided otherwise. There has been an impact, the draft

considerably intensified the anxiety of the Russophone population because it had not been thought through in political terms. We now find ourselves in the same situation, only this time, if we make the wrong decisions, there will be a considerable increase in anxiety of Estonians. That is why the responsibility for what happens today, as Comrade V. Vyalyas has said, is greater than ever before. The people need guarantees that our right to self-determination will not sink into oblivion on 29 November. It sees those guarantees in the amendments to Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution.

"The legal experts say that the first version of the amendments, the Laak-Preyman version, would have an impact that would not be legally proper. To me, such a change seems just as legitimate as everything which the Estonian Parliament wishes to do in the name of the Estonian people. The legal experts also say that the amendment would be invalid from the outset because it is unlawful. On the other hand, I think that the protest of any union official against this would be unlawful, since it contradicts Article 76 of the USSR Constitution. The question of sovereignty cannot be altered by any particular supplement to Article 76. It is still the question of whether there is sovereignty or not. Let us attempt now to look more closely at the relation between the two amendments of Article 74. To determine their strong points and weak points.

"On first examination it seems that we are only talking about a procedural change. In the first case, not a single law would take effect on our territory unless the Parliament of Estonian SSR had the right to vote on it, while in the latter, all acts would not be subject to appeal. The second version seems to me essentially weaker than the first. That is, the second version assumes that laws which regard the USSR as a unified whole, whatever kind of laws they might be, would automatically take effect in Estonian SSR. In other words, the primary legislator would not be located in the Toompea. This is a version of subordination which substantially denies sovereignty. If we speak about sovereignty in the draft of the declaration, then today we cannot adopt an act which represents a step backward from sovereignty. There is no doubt that the second version, as Comrade T. Laak has said, also affords a certain possibility of contesting and having the right to have our appeals heard. But we already have that opportunity. We do contest things, quite often in vain. In the second version, there are a number of other underwater reefs as well. V. Palm, member of the academy, has already called my attention to the fact that the second version does not preclude some other all-union act that would block the competence of the Supreme Soviet. After that, our Supreme Soviet would have no opportunity whatsoever to halt or establish anything. Such illusions need to be given up. It seems that the legal form of this amendment was also not thought through. It indicates three conditions in which a piece of legislation should be stayed. First, if sovereignty has been violated, second, on matters that lie in our jurisdiction, and third, if the particular features of the



republic should not be taken into account. The concept of sovereignty, which also encompasses the concept of the republic's jurisdiction, is considerably broader. It makes no sense, then, to single out the republic's jurisdiction. The ESSR Supreme Soviet will adopt its own laws in order to express the will of the republic's people. And we stay all-union laws because we have our own will, and it need not be consistent with the all-union will at all.

"The wording 'stay' and 'right to stay' (priostanavlivat) also seems careless to me. This wording presupposes a negative action. A stay is politically and psychologically negative and places the republic's leadership personally in an incomparably more difficult situation, because we are forced to constantly take negative steps in the name of protecting sovereignty. In this way, we make conflict situations occur more frequently. What is more, this is a matter that takes a great deal of work and is at the same time ineffective—we have no guarantee that we will be able to keep track of everything and react to everything in time. Finally, the danger arises that some 'good' all-union law might perhaps not be ratified by us in good time, that we would be late in doing this. But at the same time, this harm is considerably less than the harm done if we are caught napping by some 'bad' all-union law. In my opinion, there is a fundamental difference here.

"Finally, it is said that amending Article 74 is merely a political act that has no legal effect. It seems to me that that is largely true of our entire Constitution. We have not been functioning in a legal system, those who administer justice and other legal bodies do not refer to it, but we must bring the Constitution as a political document into conformity against the day when it becomes a legal document. We are actually not creating anything new by this amendment, but only bringing the Constitution into conformity with Article 76 of the USSR Constitution and Article 68 of the ESSR Constitution. In other words, we are expressing what is implied there. The draft of the decree states that by way of legislative initiative we are striving to make a corresponding amendment in the USSR Constitution as well. Thus, our point of departure is precisely the interests of the entire union, not local interests, although the latter are also very important to us.

"Now some thoughts related to the remarks of T. Laak.

"First of all, ratification is not a lengthy process at all. If the all-union laws are good, if they take the republic's interests into account, we will enforce them as though they were our own. But, beyond question, if they have to be picked apart, regardless in what version, the amount of work will not change by one iota.

"And a second thought. One of the basic principles in the conditions of the IMYe that is set down in both drafts is that a pile of all-union instructions cannot be heaped upon us. This is a route which we must cut off no later than the session on 5 December. To say at this point that

the flow of all-union instructions and orders will continue means that we think without saying so that we will never make the transition to republic cost accounting.

"And now right at the end I would like to say that I share T. Laak's opinion to the effect that it would not be advisable to present several draft versions at this point. I also think that when we thoroughly discuss all this among ourselves, we will simply have to vote and decide which of these versions to put up to a general vote, and the editorial commission will have its job to do, because there is no question that each of these drafts, and now there are three of them, has its strong points."

"The drafts of the USSR laws on amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution and on election of people's deputies of the USSR, which have been put up for nationwide discussion by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, display a desire to lay the legislative basis for eliminating the sovereignty of the union republics," V. Laul (Tallin-Yarve Election District No 11) began his speech. "Whereas up to now sovereignty could be spoken of in the formal legal sense, should the drafts now under discussion be adopted the sovereignty of the union republic would be entirely eliminated. The drafts which have been put up for discussion fundamentally contradict the decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference on further democratization of Soviet society, on strengthening the sovereignty of the union republics, and on broadening their rights.

"The procedure for preparation of these drafts and for their presentation for nationwide discussion have to be condemned. The union republics did not take part in drafting them. The extremely short period set aside for discussion is not in line with their importance.

"I must note that because the drafts prepared by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet do not conform to the principles of Leninist nationality policy and socialist federalism many work collectives, expressing a fear that it will be difficult for editorial corrections to alter the orientation of these drafts toward setting up a unitarian state, have issued their deputies orders to strive for the withdrawal of these drafts from the agenda of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 29 November.

"But it should be noted that the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet has been able to prepare for today's session a decree that offers a hope of achieving more for the union republic than could realistically be expected if a position of utter denial is taken. That is why today I support the draft of the decree prepared by the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet and submitted to us. Confidence is instilled, for example, by its provision that adoption, amendment, and supplementation of the USSR Constitution and other constitutional laws would take place after their approval by all the union republics.

"Relying on the orders issued by voters in the Leninskiy Rayon of Tallinn, the workers of the 'Ars' Combine, and the general assembly of workers and students of the conservatory, I make a proposal to the ESSR Supreme Soviet. First, to present an initiative to the USSR Supreme Soviet that it set up a state constitutional commission based on equal representation of all the union republics. The foremost task of the constitutional commission would be to prepare a draft of the Compact on Union and a democratic law on elections in the spirit of restructuring.

"Second, on the basis of the vital need to protect the republic's sovereignty, that it adopt in the present session the proposals for amendments and supplements to the ESSR Constitution, which have been published in the republic press and have won broad support during the popular discussion. Relying specifically on the orders of my constituents, I support the wording of Article 74 which was adopted on 14 November in an assembly of the voters of Leninskiy Rayon: 'To amend Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution. To word it as follows: "USSR laws would take effect on the territory of Estonian SSR upon their approval by the ESSR Supreme Soviet. Amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution would take effect on the territory of Estonian SSR upon their approval by the ESSR Supreme Soviet and upon incorporation of corresponding amendments and supplements in the ESSR Constitution."'

"I also support adoption of the other provisions of the draft on amendments and supplements to the ESSR Constitution which have been presented to us today for approval.

"Esteemed deputies! The bills under discussion today place immense responsibility on us, but we do have something to rely on. Essentially, what is taking place in the republic is a referendum—that is how massively the people and work collectives have expressed their opinion. Let us heed the voice of the people! As president of the Estonian Music and Choral Societies I join in the decision of the collegium of public organizations of Estonia dated 10 November 1988, which expresses full approval of the activity of the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet to discuss the bills which have been put up to the judgment of the entire nation."

"We have gathered today for an extraordinary session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet," said deputy S. Kont (Keylaskiy-Kingiseppskiy Election District No 175), "in order to state with authority what we have to say about resolving the contradictions that have occurred during discussion of the drafts of the USSR Law on Amendments and Supplements to the USSR Constitution and the USSR Law on Election of People's Deputies of the USSR, which the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has put up for nationwide discussion. The publication of these documents in the press aroused unprecedented activity both in our own rayon and also in the republic's entire population. These documents have

been discussed in assemblies held in work collectives, assemblies by place of residence, in support groups of the Popular Front, and in other public structures, in primary party organizations, trade unions, extraordinary sessions of local soviets, and plenums of party raykoms. At all these meetings, the participants arrived for all practical purposes at a unanimous opinion that the documents put up for nationwide discussion contradict the resolutions of the 19th party conference on development of democracy; they envisage a substantial restriction of the sovereignty of the union republics and essentially deny the inalienable right of the people to self-determination. People have been expressing their concern about the further process of democracy, seeing in the planned changes a threat of greater centralization of power in the hands of all-union authorities. History offers quite a few examples of where that will end. In my opinion, we must not repeat old mistakes. We have to decide today to go further along the road of renewal or take a step backward on the path of stagnation.

"One of the main objectives of the popular assemblies was to halt discussion of the bills on amendment of the USSR Constitution and election of people's deputies, since they are undemocratic and contradict the directions taken by the 19th party conference. Which accounts for the demand to convene the extraordinary session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet in which we are taking part today. The fact that representatives from none of the union republics were involved in preparing the drafts of the constitutional amendments and the law on elections have been seen as improper. We deem it necessary that the USSR Supreme Soviet create a commission consisting of representatives of the union republics on parity principles to discuss the main issues and work out solutions, as well as draft the Compact on Union, in which the public at large would be involved. Proposals have been submitted by the Estonian CP Central Committee to form a working group or commission in the ESSR Supreme Soviet to summarize future proposals and work out measures to protect the republic's sovereignty. All of these issues were placed on the agenda of the extraordinary session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet. As of today, the political situation has changed. In view of the present situation, deputies elected to the republic's Supreme Soviet from Kharyuskiy Rayon have met and come to an almost unanimous opinion of supporting the draft of the decree which was prepared by the commission and group of experts of the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet and which was approved by the Estonian CP Central Committee and Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet. These are the proposals concerning the drafts of the USSR on amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution and on election of people's deputies as well as on amendments and supplements to the ESSR Constitution.

"In principle, we agree with these documents as a whole. As Comrade Laak has noted today, Article 74 is the 'highlight' of the amendments to the ESSR Constitution.

In discussing this question, we also came to the conclusion that the bill proposed by Laak and Preyman is quite effective and necessary. But we agree with Comrade Laak, who has made the proposal that both drafts not be taken as the basis and put up for discussion. We would also like to support Comrade Savisaar, who has made the proposal that if these questions are discussed, the result should be a single draft which the editorial commission would take under serious consideration in preparing the decision.

"There is no question that we might talk today about economic problems as well, but I think that this is neither the time nor the place. It is a fact that cost-accounting Estonia cannot exist unless these two main issues are resolved. A meeting of the republic's party aktiv with Comrade Chebrikov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took place 2 days ago in the headquarters of the Estonian CP Central Committee, and the idea of consolidation, which is very important to us at the present moment, was brought up. This is also very important in today's session. Let us show goodwill in the name of protecting the interests of our republic and thereby carry out the will of our constituents and demonstrate that the supreme body of government power in the republic stands firmly on the road of restructuring."

"Yesterday, a republic scientific conference took place in the Institute for Improvement of Qualification in which half of the managers of the economy from all rayons took part," said deputy A. Melder (Tartu Rural Election District No 250).

"For centuries, agriculture has been the leading sphere of activity and it will remain such in the future as well. The economic level of agricultural enterprises to a considerable degree determines the development of rural regions and people's prosperity. In view of the situation that has come about, the 11th Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee has deemed it advisable that agriculture receive priority development until equilibrium is achieved. We hope that the losses inflicted on agriculture will be made up and that in addition to the development of production the sociopolitical system will also give greater consideration to people. After discussing the tasks for the next farming year in the commission of the agroindustrial complex, the field cropper saw no possibility of expanding the initiative. In view of the upcoming plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on questions of agriculture and the tasks of the republic in producing agricultural products and above all meat, the plan for next year should be adjusted even before its adoption in the next session.

"In view of the extremely important and urgent problems, the conference was unanimous in considering it necessary to address the extraordinary session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet in writing. I was commissioned to

present this petition. Since discussions occur rarely in this body, I apologize in advance for the fact that the petition also contains painful problems for field croppers that are less urgent."

Petition of the republic conference on the topic "Success in Management and Economics and a Development Program Aimed at Success" to the extraordinary session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet:

The conference discussed ways of developing the republic's farms that have been developing effectively, the conditions necessary for successful performance, and future lines of development of agriculture and rural social development. Relying on the main directions of the farm policy of the IMYe and taking the urgent problems of the moment as their point of departure, the participants in the conference address the deputies as follows.

1. We support the proposals of the 11th Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee and adoption of amendments to the ESSR Constitution in order to guarantee the republic's sovereignty.
2. We support adoption of the ESSR Law on Language in the upcoming extraordinary session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet.
3. We call upon the Supreme Soviet in its subsequent work to guarantee the transition from words to deeds in developing the priority for rural life so as to achieve social equality between city and country.
4. Having proclaimed the land, minerals, and inland and territorial waters to be the property of the republic, the right of their use and disposition should be transferred to the jurisdiction of local soviets.
5. Equivalent exchange should be guaranteed between agriculture and other sectors of the economy.
6. The functions of ESSR Gosagroprom should be spelled out, and it should be looked upon as a body financed from the state budget.
7. Equal conditions for the conduct of economic activity should be guaranteed to all forms of agricultural enterprise.

"The union drafts on amendments and supplements to the Constitution and the draft of the Law on Election of People's Deputies have been discussed in our city, just as they have throughout the republic and throughout the entire country," deputy Yu. Tolmachev (Sillamyaeskiy-Kirovskiy Election District No 134) said to those assembled. "And I consider it my duty to my constituents and my duty as a deputy to report to you that the discussion that has taken place in work collectives and election districts ended yesterday in a session of the city soviet, which adopted a decision based on the results of that

discussion. I would like to familiarize you with the main points of its substantive section, without dwelling on the preamble and general assessments. I think that they ought to be taken into account in consideration of the questions that have been put on the agenda.

"The city soviet of people's deputies decided to approve the drafts of the Law on Amendments and Supplements to the USSR Constitution and the Law on Election of People's Deputies and their adoption for consideration in a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the date indicated—29 November. It was also decided to propose to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet that it immediately include in the membership of the Presidium's commission representatives of the union republic of their own choice. The Sillamyae City Soviet of People's Deputies proposes that only the new bodies of government elected and formed on the democratic basis, as set forth in the resolution of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, are capable of quickly and decisively carrying out the reform of the political system. It finds it impermissible to adopt amendments to the ESSR Constitution in the extraordinary session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet in order to block union legislation. The city soviet of people's deputies, expressing the will of the voters, resolutely condemns all attempts aimed at setting up the republic in opposition to the USSR and demands for Estonia's withdrawal from the USSR, from whom-ever they originate.

"And finally. To forward the proposals of the city's workers concerning the drafts of the laws to the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet and to call upon the deputies of the Supreme Soviet elected from the city to make this decision and the proposals of the workers known to the session of the Supreme Soviet, which I have now done.

"In spite of the extremely short time given to study the drafts which have been placed on the agenda today, I would like to say that with certain refinements one could concur in the draft of the decree of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, with the main principles set forth there, and with the proposals of Estonian SSR concerning the drafts of the USSR Law on Amendments and Supplements to the Fundamental Law and the Law on Election of People's Deputies of the USSR, and I appeal to you to vote for that document, for its adoption. As for the other drafts placed on the agenda, you understand that the opinion of the voters, the will of the voters, are binding for a deputy, and his position is determined thereby.

"In addition, I would like to say that there is no dispute that constitutional amendments are necessary to make it possible to strengthen the question of the republic's sovereignty, and so on. But it would probably be worthwhile to time this to the reform of the election system and the constitutional system of the USSR. Today, at this fast pace, without knowing what consequences might come from the constitutional amendments, specifically the amendment of Article 3, where it talks about

private property, and so on, and so forth. It is very difficult to determine whether the interests of my voters will be protected here or not. It seems to me, then, that this work is necessary, that it needs to continue. But I do not consider it possible to adopt the bill today in its final form during the session."

"In none of the previous sessions of the Supreme Soviet has the activity of the voters been so great as today," said deputy Kh.-Yu. Aun (Tormaskiy Election District No 189). "Never before have people taken events so much to heart as now. This is also felt in meetings with constituents.

"The drafts of the USSR laws on elections and on amendments to the Constitution, which have been put up for nationwide discussion, have aroused particular activity in the voters. Even before publication of responses in the newspapers the residents of my region expressed doubt about the suitability of such laws for Estonia. And now they are unanimously demanding that those drafts be withdrawn. The drafts are unacceptable to the people.

"The amendments to the USSR Constitution have aroused particularly serious objection, since their adoption would actually eliminate Estonian SSR as a sovereign national republic and would give the central authorities and union departments unlimited powers in solving the problems of life here and in deciding people's destinies. Since the phosphate rock war is still fresh in the minds of our people, it is clear to everyone what lies in wait for our land should these constitutional amendments be adopted. After all, the draft clearly speaks about the transfer of the mining of the most important minerals to union jurisdiction. The amendments to the Constitution which have been presented do not afford a possibility of creating a cost-accounting Estonia. Indeed, even the fundamental issue of the IMYe—the question of ownership and prices—has been turned over to the Union in the draft.

"There is not even the slightest hope that these matters will be resolved at the union level in a manner that would square with our outlook. At the same time, the concept of the IMYe is so deeply rooted in the hearts of the people that to renounce it would mean to suffer a collapse. Every belief in a better life would dissolve, we would be deprived of the thirst for activity and the desire to work. This cannot be permitted. The attitude toward the draft of the Law on Elections is also negative, although it aroused fewer passions than the draft of the constitutional amendments. People do not understand why in a period of democratization the voters can have a differing number of votes, how in a period of expanding rights of the union republics their representation in all-union bodies of government would even be reduced. Are we actually traveling the road of democratization, or are we doing this merely in words? My constituents feel that every union republic must itself adopt an election law that suits it and then they would together decide

what the procedure should be for forming the government bodies of the USSR. Finally, it needs to be understood that formation of all-union bodies of government is above all the business of the union republics, not the personal concern of the present apparat. I call upon all deputies to look adversely on the drafts of the union laws. Their shortcomings have fundamental importance, and we are not talking here about editorial inaccuracies at all, as Comrade Chebrikov said in his interview over Estonian television. But since these bills might still be adopted on 29 November, I consider it extremely necessary to adopt appropriate amendments to the ESSR Constitution this very day so that we would be able to defend ourselves against undemocratic enactments at the union level."

"Without sovereignty and further development of the legal status of the union republics, republic cost accounting is unthinkable," deputy R. Kirs (Kilingi-Nymmeskiy Election District No 224) emphasized. "The opposite follows from the draft of the amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution—the republics would be sovereign insofar as the central authority grants them independence. Sovereignty cannot be granted from outside, an entity either possesses sovereignty or it does not. Intermediate variants are impracticable both in theory and practice.

"Before the extraordinary session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, we held a session of the rayon soviet and a plenum of the party raykom with discussion of these drafts on the agenda. The session noted that the drafts essentially contradict the processes of democratization of Soviet society and expansion of the rights of the union republics.

"Expressing here the will of my constituents, of the Popular Front of Pyarnuskiy Rayon, and of the rayon's entire population, I take an adverse view of the drafts on amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution and on election of people's deputies of the USSR. The session of the rayon soviet empowered me to report to the session of the republic's Supreme Soviet on the amendments and supplements that need to be made to the ESSR Constitution. It is important to adopt in legislation a provision whereby USSR laws would take effect on the territory of Estonian SSR only with approval of the ESSR Supreme Soviet. In our session today, we have not yet discussed the Law on Language, since it is still being discussed by the people, and the law on that subject matter will be adopted in the next session. In the meeting with my constituents held a week ago in the Kilingi-Nymmeskiy Election District, I was given instructions that coincided with the decision of the last session of the rayon soviet—to propose to the ESSR Supreme Soviet that it bring up in the extraordinary session an amendment to the ESSR Constitution to proclaim the Estonian language an official language.

"Much attention was paid at the 19th All-Union Party Conference to the question of eliminating duplication in the work of party and soviet authorities, to increasing the

role of the soviets in handling public affairs. So far, systemwide factors have mainly been the brake on the activity of soviets of people's deputies: distortions in implementing the principle of democratic centralism, commingling of the functions of party and soviet authorities, shortcomings in the performance of soviet and party leadership, and so on. Their elimination creates prerequisites for the growth and the involvement of the internal potential of the soviets. Increased effectiveness of the effort of the soviets is bound up with strengthening the role of the deputy. Shortcomings in the work of soviets of people's deputies are explained above all in terms of the low level of deputy activity. If all deputies are to be able to understand the essence of a problem, to know what they are voting for in a session, the material of the session must be efficiently sent out in advance to the deputies or published in the press. The deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet were really well-prepared for today's extraordinary session, in practical terms they are abreast of all the problems. One would like to hope that the material that will be discussed in the next regular session on 5 February will be sent out to the deputies in advance.

"The resolution of the 19th All-Union Party Conference on democratization of Soviet society and reform of the political system noted that local government authorities, except for village and settlement soviets, must elect standing presidiums, and all soviets without exception must elect their chairman by secret ballot. It would enhance the role of representative bodies if a recommendation were made to elect first secretaries of city and rayon party committees to the post of soviet chairman as a rule. I consider it more correct for the chairman of the soviet, who is at the same time the chairman of the presidium, to be elected from among several candidates directly by all the citizens who have the right to vote.

"The proposed joining of the positions of first secretary of the party raykom or gorkom with the position of chairman of the respective soviet of people's deputies seems incompatible. It cannot be considered correct to elect the chairman of the people's control authority deputy chairman of the presidium, since in this case, in making decisions himself, he will not be able to follow up on their execution. The right thing might be for the chairman of the people's control authority to be a member of the presidium.

"The republic's transition to full cost accounting signifies using the principles of regional cost accounting in its regional subdivisions, above all in cities under republic jurisdiction and in rayons, but within certain limits in cities under regional jurisdiction and settlements and village soviets as well.

"As a rule, the problems of economic and social development are dealt with by local soviets, and at the same time all expenditures are covered from their own revenues. The all-union normative acts now in effect do not allow the republic to independently change the structure,

rights, and duties of local soviets. These normative acts should be annulled, the USSR Constitution should be amended, and the republic's Supreme Soviet should be granted the right to decide these matters.

"Regional cost accounting at the level of local soviets requires first of all the establishment of rates governing deductions to local budgets. In the context of cost accounting, the local soviet must dispose of its money entirely on its own. The lowest level of soviet power, deprived of money, has for all practical purposes been eliminated from deciding questions of the economic and social development of its region; these functions are performed by rayon soviets and local farms and enterprises.

"In the context of cost accounting, the large number of construction organizations is guaranteed by the self-developing system. Rayispolkoms draw up regional capital construction plans in which construction of republic and union projects are included in plans only with consent of the local soviet, which issues the building permit. The local soviet determines the level of need for construction of a project belonging to the social infrastructure, its location, and its priority.

"The transition to cost accounting would require establishing economic and legal guarantees at the republic level. Legislation has to fix the range of problems that are in the exclusive competence of the local soviet. Spelling out the exclusive jurisdiction of the local soviet in republic laws is a guarantee that no higher-level soviet will be able to change them.

"Eight deputies of the ESSR Supreme Soviet from Parnuskiy Rayon find the draft versions of the decisions presented to the session acceptable for adoption."

"All of us making up the republic's supreme body of government, the Supreme Soviet, have one ultimate goal, I emphasize—one: guaranteeing the stable political and economic development of Soviet Estonia," is how deputy V. Andreyev (Narvskiy-Energeticheskoy Election District No 115) began his speech.

"The draft of amendments to the USSR Constitution unconditionally requires further editing in the direction of the rights and sovereignty of the union republics and clear and unambiguous delimitation of union and republic jurisdiction. This work is being done, and we see this in the mass media. I feel that our general attention must be turned toward guaranteeing the development of democracy. Elections of people's deputies of the USSR are being held in the spring. They need to be elected on the basis of the new law. And we must concentrate our efforts on solving this problem.

"In addition, I feel that the provisions of the draft of the decree on proposals related to the drafts of amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution and on

election of people's deputies of the USSR, presented today for consideration, mainly correspond to the decision of the recent session of the Narva City Soviet of People's Deputies."

"Now about amendments to the ESSR Constitution. I do not understand at all why there should be such a rush. We talk a great deal about democracy, about democratic spirit, about a state based on law, and about the role of Estonia in that process. But I will express my opinion, the opinion of my constituents, and the opinion of the overwhelming majority of inhabitants of the city of Narva when I say that posing the problem of amendments to the republic Constitution in this way has aroused in us a certain quandary as to the development of the process of democratization. As a matter of fact, how can I make a decision on amendments to the Constitution, in which even the placement of a comma can be important, when I learned about the proposed changes only yesterday, and I saw the actual text only this morning? With whom can I discuss the questions that have arisen calmly and judiciously? For example, what is the difference between private and personal property? And how does the state create the conditions for augmentation of private property? What is a social movement? Moreover, if I adopted these amendments, I would not be able to reply anything sensible to my constituents and my comrades at work in response to their natural questions of what this is that has been adopted behind our backs—after all, I do not even have time to inform them about the amendments to the Constitution which have been prepared. And now it turns out that one must close his eyes and place his trust in the specialists who are the members of the preparatory commission. Our practical experience tells us that this is dangerous, since we all know what happened after publication of the draft of the Law on Language. After all, there were also specialists working there....

"Now about my attitude toward those thousands of signatures, resolutions, and decisions addressed to the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet and to our session. I consider them a popular expression of the most acute dissatisfaction with the economic, political, and ethnic situation that has come about in Estonia. But there is only one right way to determine the actual will of the voters, of the people—a referendum. That is why I feel that any change in the Constitution must unfailingly be preceded by broad preliminary discussion, and, if necessary, a referendum. I support the proposal that was made during discussion of the agenda.

"I feel that we must decide the question of the referendum and also draft and adopt the Law on Election of People's Deputies of Estonian SSR. If we are able to solve these problems, we will be giving the new deputies a good start.

"I would say in conclusion that I have been authorized by my constituents and the work collectives who made me a deputy to make the following statement. There is a

decision by a session of the Narva City Soviet of People's Deputies to raise the question at this point of removing the question of language from the agenda of the upcoming session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet. On behalf of consolidation, this question, in our opinion, requires additional work and subsequent discussion."

The main documents adopted by the Extraordinary Eighth Session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet will be published in the next issue.

■19 Nov pp 1, 3■

[Text] "As soon as I was elected a delegate, I can only be gratified that my activity as a delegate starts today," said deputy E. Pyldroos (Tallin-Molodezhnyy Election District No 85), "because history is being made in this room today. We are determining here the future, the Estonia of the future, and we must do it with particular responsibility, thinking not of ourselves, not of our own future, which may depend on the present, but thinking about what the people expect of us, what our grandchildren will say and think of us.

"I would first like to say a few words about a document that has not been spoken about today. That is the declaration. I would like to express regret that the text passed out to us today is missing a sentence which was still in it last evening, just a moment before the session of the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet began. This was the last sentence in the next to the last paragraph of the second page, and it went like this: 'Amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution take effect on the territory of Estonian SSR upon their approval by the ESSR Supreme Soviet and when corresponding amendments and supplements are made to the ESSR Constitution.' This is a rather important position. I feel that it was one of the reasons why the declaration was written in the first place. And I now make an appeal to the deputies that we restore this sentence in its previous place in the text.

"Now some more about the two versions which we have of Article 74. Here, the matter is probably somewhat more complicated. I have to admit that for a long time I was a fervent advocate of the Laak-Preyman version. I came to its defense in many conferences, I voted for them in many places, while at the same time I acutely felt its shortcomings, but I was unable to find a better version. And seeing at the same time that people also were experiencing a great lack of assurance because they were not fully convinced about the amount of effective legal protection this amendment guaranteed them.

"They were all well aware of the relevant articles of the Constitution of the Soviet Union on whose basis it is quite simple to revoke the republic articles that contradict them. To be sure, we are talking about the sovereignty of our Supreme Soviet, that is our dream. A dream is exactly what it is. In actuality, we know that there is not very much of that sovereignty. We are merely on the

road to acquiring it. That is exactly what we are doing here now. As to people's fears that this amendment is legally weak and can easily be torpedoed, I have said: legally—yes, but it is also a political question, and it is not a simple matter at all to torpedo it politically, because the attack on it is a political attack, and revoking it is a political act. At the same time, I am aware myself that this umbrella over our head is not what it might be. I have noticed among other things that perhaps it is because people did not see in that sentence a reliable guarantee whose protection they could confidently count on that the desire arose to seek that guarantee in extreme alternatives, to seek it in the existing constitutional provisions which legally permit withdrawal from the USSR. And many have turned precisely to that. We know this, it is reality.

"As for the new version, I would like to make a small revision. The political commission did not give preference to the original Laak-Preyman version. The commission which dealt with this did not even see this version, since the new version was worked out the night before last following the end of the session of the political commission in which we expressed unanimous support for the Laak-Preyman version.

"The new version is entirely fresh, and it has arrived here fresh. We have not yet discussed it, and I do not know what decision would be made if we did discuss it.

"It obviously has its pluses and minuses. Its pluses are that it actually is more legally reliable, that it is less vulnerable. We do not have a union law which would make it possible to revoke it directly. Of course, no legal enactment offers a 100-percent guarantee, perhaps, especially in our country, but, it seems to me, aside from the political guarantees, it also contains at least some legal guarantees. And that already counts for a great deal.

"Second, what I really like about this version is its retroactive force, which is lacking in the original version. It is interesting that just as T. Laak spoke here today about the 'black berets,' so my first thought in reading the new version was that it might make it possible for us to stay the effect of the ukase about the 'black berets' in our republic, which we probably could not do using the first version. So that is a clear plus. There is obviously another plus in the fact that it embraces a large range of legislative and normative acts, not just constitutional acts.

"What are its shortcomings? It is probably a deficiency that it does not express so declaratively and proudly the idea of the precedence of our republic's laws, as was done in that original version. And this is understandably very close to our hearts. Even when it has been expressed with weak guarantees. This also has to be taken into account.

"And still, when I compare them, I have to admit that my sympathies are beginning to slowly incline toward the new version, although I must also admit that I have not altogether freed myself of doubt.

"There is also a very serious ethical problem in this entire affair. First of all, the Laak-Preyman version has been discussed throughout Estonia. Many of us have been bound to vote for it by our constituents. The constituents have not seen the new version. I do not know what they would say about it. It would, of course, be simpler for us to say that we are doing what we were told: our conscience will be clear. But possibly it is we who must take responsibility and make the decision, squaring it with our own conscience."

"Yesterday, an assembly of the aktiv of the women's council took place in Pyarnu, and in the light of the situation today the assembly adopted an appeal to all the women deputies of the ESSR Supreme Soviet. Allow me to read this appeal verbatim—in the Estonian language," deputy M. Praporshchikova (Pyarnuskiy-Promyshlenny Election District No 125) began her speech:

Anxious about the fate of the children of Estonia and about the fate of the republic, we want to wish for the deputies of the Estonian Supreme Soviet the wisdom, equanimity, and acuity to recognize and implement the signs of the future. The people has empowered you to conduct our general affairs in such a manner that you will be above emotions, movements, fronts, societies, and groupings. We expect of you wise decisions in the name of those whose needs are more important to us than anything else: in the name of our children and grandchildren. We expect of the deputies of the Supreme Soviet decisions and steps that would guarantee Estonian SSR the right to economic, political, and cultural self-determination and that would instill in all people living in Estonia a sense of security in their aspirations and affairs. We appeal to representatives of all nationalities in the Supreme Soviet of our republic to understand that what is necessary and good for Estonians on the soil of Estonia is also necessary and good for the other ethnic groups, that all the undemocratic legal provisions which threaten the Estonian on his native soil also threaten every other nationality in every other corner of the Soviet Union.

We appeal to you, women representatives of the people, to let your hand and heart be guided by the idea of all the homes in Estonia which need clean air, clean water in wells, protection against departmental tyranny and central bureaucracy. We are deeply embittered and saddened that in an hour so crucial to us there should be people who insult one of the most sacred sentiments and evidence of the dignity of a nationality, the respect for labor. On the plot of ground that is called Estonia, not a single crust of bread should be given out without real work.

We are against playing politics by means of strikes. We appeal to the deputies to proclaim work to be sacred, to come to the defense of work and of everything that gives work meaning, that inspires it, that revives the honor and pride of the workingman.

We address to Viktor Chebrikov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, our expression of gratitude for the delicacy with which he has performed his interethnic mission in our republic. We assure him that the Estonian woman also values and displays patience, human understanding, and tolerance. She knows quite well from bitter experience the price of ethnic intolerance and knows that its results are fatal first of all to small nationalities.

We women will do everything to avoid interethnic tension. At the same time, we would like to see understanding, respect for nationalities and their ethnic identity recognized as the basis of internationalism at every level of the state, so that they would be reckoned with. We listened closely to Viktor Chebrikov's appeal to the people. His mention of the Estland Labor Commune was deeply symbolic. As a matter of fact, it was the revolutionary inspiration and desire to arrange the destiny of their nationality in the best way they could that led a sizable portion of the Estonian people to support the ideas of the commune. Had the leaders of the commune followed Lenin's prophetic advice and in their aloofness and implacability had not deceived the yearnings of the people, we might this year have been celebrating the 70th anniversary of Estonian SSR.

As a segment of our people, we know quite well the enthusiasm and trust with which a majority of Estonians perceived the program for restructuring advanced by the CPSU Central Committee, seeing the possibility for implementing it only together with the other peoples of the Soviet Union. Comrade Chebrikov's appeal to the historic experience of the Estland Labor Commune instills the hope that the statements will display profound wisdom in this present revolutionary period, that the aspirations of the small Estonian people and guarantees of their realization will also find expression both in the Constitution and in other laws.

[Signed] Participants in the conference of the women's aktiv of the city of Pyarnu

"Today, more than ever before," said deputy P. Tarre (Elvaskiy Election District No 254), "we are aware that it is not a simple matter for the deputies of the ESSR Supreme Soviet and the deputies of city and rayon soviets in today's very important and very complicated situation to perform their duties as deputies properly. It is understandable, then, that the drafts which have been published of the Law on Amendments and Supplements to the USSR Constitution and the Law on Election of People's Deputies of the USSR have become the basis for serious and very responsible work by deputies at all levels. It is now even more essential that all deputies have the closest ties to their constituents. The bills which



have been put up for nationwide discussion by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet have rightly been criticized to the effect that many of its articles do not conform to the goals of democratization of the political system of Soviet society, to the goals of expanding the sovereignty of the Soviet socialist union republics and creation of a socialist state based on law.

"The negative attitude of a sizable portion of the electorate toward the drafts as a whole that have been put up for discussion is understandable. We had all hoped to see in them the provisions approved by the 19th All-Union Party Conference, which were aimed at granting more independence to the union republics, at putting a stop to the dictate of union departments, at solving the problems of the socioeconomic development of every union republic.

"It is incomprehensible that representatives of the union republics should not have been involved in preparing the drafts. I deem it indispensable that the USSR Supreme Soviet create a constitutional commission on the basis of equal representation of all the union republics to prepare amendments and supplements to the Fundamental Law, since development of democracy also requires a fundamental law that is appropriate to a state based on law.

"The Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, with the vigorous participation of our legal experts and social scientists, must prepare a draft of the Compact on Union, since only sovereignty guaranteed by a compact on union can guarantee that Estonia belongs to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a sovereign union republic. But delegates elected to the ESSR Supreme Soviet from Tartuskiy Rayon support the draft of the decree on proposals for amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution and on election of people's deputies of the USSR which has been submitted.

"Today, we need to adopt the Law on Amendments and Supplements to the ESSR Constitution. In meetings with the voters and also in a session of the Tartuskiy Rayon Soviet, proposals were made which might be taken into account in amending or supplementing the present ESSR Constitution. That is why we express agreement with the draft of the law now being proposed, which envisages all those amendments to articles contained in the draft decree. I would particularly like to emphasize that in no case should we give in, but rather we should reword Part 2 of Article 11 of the ESSR Constitution as follows: 'The land, minerals, air, inland and territorial waters, continental shelf, forests, and other natural resources are the exclusive property of Estonian SSR. The basic means of production in industry, construction, and agriculture, transportation and communications equipment, the state banks, the property of trade, municipal service, and other enterprises organized by the state, the basic urban housing stock, and also other property necessary to perform the tasks of Estonian SSR are also the property of Estonian SSR.'

"It should not be wrongly taken that now the right of enterprises and institutions in various departments to ownership will disappear. That is what particularly alarmed union enterprises. They say that now their workers will no longer be able to work at those enterprises. It is unfortunate that some people have in fact expressed opinions along those lines. I believe that in actuality matters stand differently.

"And finally. We fully support Article 5 of the draft decree which speaks about Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution. We deputies of the Supreme Soviet elected from Tartuskiy Rayon express our full concurrence with that draft presented by deputies Preyman and Laak. At first, we were unable to propose another version. Today, we support it in the wording in which it has now been set forth in Article 5 of the draft law.

"The drafts that have been presented of the resolution and the declaration have also been discussed by the group of deputies from Tartuskiy Rayon, and we support their adoption."

"It has not exactly been common practice for deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet to speak in a session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet," said deputy V. Beekman. "But today this is a session and this is a case in which this has to be justified.

"Today's session is special not only because it is referred to as an extraordinary session and was convened outside of the regular schedule, but because it is called upon to decide sociopolitical issues of particular importance. It can even be said that the extraordinary session of our republic's Supreme Soviet is the first in the Soviet Union since the moment that restructuring began to be conducted with such an agenda. For that reason, our responsibility extends beyond the boundaries of the republic. I would like to mention that tomorrow the extraordinary session of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet will begin. The Lithuanian comrades will certainly be calling up tonight and will want to know what happened, how it went, and what was decided in Estonia. I think that this is important even to them. We are discussing today our attitude toward the draft put up for nationwide discussion by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. We are doing this not out of an idle desire to split hairs and unfailingly present our decisions, but because the discussion of these drafts in the republic has become so special in nature, dictated by a desire to get to the essence, by a more critical attitude than that in many other places, judging by the responses in the central press. Along with the assemblies and extraordinary sessions of soviets taking place in our election districts, this imposes a particular responsibility on us as deputies. I must say that I am fully aware of the desires and opinions of the voters in my election district in Pyarnuskiy Rayon. Both from the newspaper PYARNU POSTIMEES and from other sources. I have formed my view of the drafts which have been presented and which I intend to express at the upcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. But I

must say that, of course, the decisions made today by the republic's Supreme Soviet have an importance that is by no means small, since in the Council of Nationalities we represent not only our own election district, but the republic as well. That is why for us your decisions are an important guide to action. We hold to more or less the same opinion, that the drafts which have been presented, although both of them have evoked criticism, are not equivalent, they cannot be viewed identically, if we want to continue our work constructively and achieve results in the USSR Supreme Soviet as well. The opinion I have formed coincides in part with certain opinions that have already been expressed here. I would like to say briefly that we will be able to support the proposed Law on Elections provided a maximum number of corrections are made in it to make it more democratic. In the form proposed, there is utterly too little of that democratic spirit for me. And then we will have to present a far more constructive draft of amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution to the new body of government. Since this is the 5th year that I have worked in the USSR Supreme Soviet of the present convocation, I have in that time formed a rather firm opinion about its power, or, more accurately, its lack of it. This convocation was elected in early 1984, and mainly it is a nomenclature membership, routine and conservative. That is why I feel that the only possible thing both for us and for development of our restructuring, if we are to change our Constitution and adopt a new one, is that the new makeup of representatives of the people, elected according to the new principle, take office. The pace of life in our time is so fast that a great many things are decided here not just in 4 years, but even in 4 months. And that is why I would not want to take on myself the duty of actually beginning to vote on amendments to the Constitution with the present membership. I know in advance that the traditional voting machine will go into operation. This goes against my conscience. Incidentally, I would like to dwell on one specific matter which has aroused contradictory opinions here, and that is amending the republic's Constitution, specifically Article 74.

"We have been discussing them for at least 2 weeks. The Laak-Preyman amendment made the round of many assemblies, and it was also covered in the press. It has been discussed in many homes. It is, of course, distressing when today a number of deputies declare that this is something completely new to them. They are seeing it and hearing about it for the first time, and that is why they cannot formulate their attitude, since they have not consulted with their constituents. I cannot fail once again to place the blame on a portion of the republic press—the Russophone press, in which a strange braking mechanism operates: all new and unaccustomed ideas are first passed over in silence, 'held up,' and only after a great delay do they begin to be spoken about quietly. The result of this is that the Russophone population has not been fully informed. Which accounts for the slow reaction. That is one of the reasons. Unfortunately, though, it is not the only one. I must say in this connection that a large segment of the Russophone

population of certain regions is in one way or another closely bound up with large union departments. People work at enterprises under union jurisdiction, and they have become accustomed to a certain pattern, which is that all the good and right laws originate from above, from Moscow. All the rest is less important and not very competent. That has not always been the case, but unfortunately it is the present situation. And that is why they are afraid that delegating any sovereign decision to the republic or transfer of the right to make it to the person whom it essentially affects could be harmful to the interests of the union as a whole.

"The union departments have always used this successfully to pursue their own interests: for example, the Ministry of Fertilizer Industry, the Ministry of Power and Electrification, and certain others. This results in 'vigilance,' a fearful attitude, which are entirely groundless. I would like to express an idea which I came upon long ago, but which we do not often repeat. Democracy—a democratic state based on law—presupposes not only protection of civil rights by law, but also protection of the citizen from the legislator. Legislators also make mistakes, they are also capable of adopting bad and improper laws which can cause much evil. If we concur a priori with the idea that the legislator is always right, we will not be able to avoid mistakes, but in a democratic state based on law all of us—regardless of whether we are delegates, deputies, or commissioners—just as in any collective, must have the right to express our opinion on what concerns the main issues of our life and our destiny. In that sense, what is happening now is a school of democracy for us. Its first lessons are, of course, unusually difficult. It is hard for us to understand them and assimilate them all at once, but we must do it so as to take the next steps along the road of democratization. I, of course, have my own attitude toward the various versions of the amendment to the ESSR Constitution. At first, I also approved and supported the first version of the Laak-Preyman amendment, but now that I have seen the second version, which Comrade Laak has described so well, I also hold the opinion that we have a choice. But we need not force them to compete. But if we must choose one of the two, then in my opinion the new text is better. In essence, we are not retreating from anything, but we express the essence a bit differently, in a form that is a bit more acceptable to the union departments, and I would even say in a more democratic form; after all, we have something to choose from. The first amendment signified that we were standing erect, as stiff as a poker, and saying: We will not retreat one iota, nor do we intend to speak to anyone, we have already made a declaration that covers everything. That is a political declaration. The second amendment is more parliamentary, it has a better legal foundation, and in my opinion it is better."

"Today, we are discussing and must make a decision on matters of great political importance which have not left a single inhabitant of our republic indifferent regardless of his nationality, social position, or age," deputy N.

Zakkharov (Kokhtla-Yarve-Shakhterskiy Election District No 94) began his speech. "In the city of Kokhtla-Yarve, the bills have been discussed in all work collectives, public organizations, and the city soviet of work collectives, which represents 24,000 workers, engineering and technical personnel, and employees of our city. The main provisions of the amendments to the USSR Constitution were approved during the discussion in most collectives, but additional fundamental proposals were also made and sent to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet.

"They mainly concerned a strengthening of democratic principles in electing the Supreme Soviet and its chairman, increasing the sovereignty of the republic in deciding matters that affect the interests of inhabitants of Estonia and its work collectives. They have been reflected in the part of the draft decree of the republic's Supreme Soviet that has been taken note of.

"As for the draft of the Law on Elections, most voters feel that in spite of a number of provisions, about which Comrade Kiris himself has spoken, which fall outside the limits of the way we perceive democracy today, the elections of the deputies of soviets should be held, assuming certain changes which are today in the draft, conclusions should be drawn from the experience gained, and the new body of popular sovereignty should subsequently be ordered to adopt the relevant supplements and amendments.

"The absolute majority of the proposals of the workers are in line with the decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the 11th Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee. The agenda announced earlier has not been changed in the session today, but the drafts of the proposed documents were presented to the deputies only today, which causes certain difficulties as to their detailed study and a particular responsibility is for that reason placed on each of us. But proceeding from the programmatic provision of the 11th Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee as to consolidation of the efforts of all public organizations, work collectives, workers, and all citizens of the republic in the fight for restructuring and to overcome the difficulties that have arisen, I think that we will free ourselves of emotions and adopt a correct and judicious decision.

"Yes, there is little time for us to study these documents, but time is what we have the greatest shortage of today. And probably this is not the only time we will have to decide very difficult issues in the face of a tight deadline. There is no question that haste has no place here, but these fundamental issues have to be resolved promptly.

"On behalf of the group of deputies from the city of Kokhtla-Yarve, I declare that the proposed draft of the ESSR Law on Amendments and Supplements to the ESSR Constitution is in line with the proposals of our constituents as to expanding the sovereignty of the republic in deciding matters in its competence. This is all the more important to us from Kokhtla-Yarve, since it

largely concerns the use of natural resources, air, water, and the continental shelf, a matter that is particularly acute for our region. I am thinking above all of ecological issues and what is set forth in Article 4 of the proposed version.

"As for amending Article 74 of the Constitution, I see no contradiction here with the USSR Constitution. It goes further in spelling out the present situation and increases Estonia's sovereignty in deciding matters which are in the republic's jurisdiction or if a decision made by a higher body has not taken our specific situation into account. I am convinced that such an amendment must be made, and it is in the spirit of the times and party decisions on the questions of developing democracy."

"For the first time in history, the deputies can honestly say that they are acting on behalf of the people, on behalf of the people of Estonia," said deputy T. Kork (Tamsaluskiy Election District No 233). "We can say so because we know the results of the popular vote; after all, 900,000 signatures represent virtually a referendum. This must be a guide for all of us as to how to proceed. Now the country's leadership will have to honestly admit that in the form presented the amendments to the Constitution represent an appreciable blow to the prestige of the Politburo, an appreciable blow to the course of the party toward renewal. Now we need to adhere clearly to the course adopted by the 19th All-Union Party Conference, to follow the road of the 11th Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee; there simply is no other road for us. Our slogan might only be 'Not a single step backward on the road toward democratization.' Quite a bit has already been said today about the draft of the amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution. Its basic orientation is centralization, a clear concentration of state power at the center. At present, we are in 74th place in the world with respect to per capita generation of national income. Argentina is ahead of us and Mexico behind us. In my opinion, that 74th place is mainly the result of excessive centralization. But in that case I do not understand why our party and government leadership brings about a situation in which it is impossible to look people straight in the eye, because our table is very scanty, just as it was before, and the clothing and footwear we wear are by no means always able to protect us from the northern cold. There are many difficulties in the country. And I see no reason whatsoever why all these difficulties have to be dumped on the shoulders of those good people who live and work in the center, in Moscow.

"The wisdom of the people knows no boundaries. There is no reason whatsoever to suppose that all that wisdom has been concentrated in one city, in one center. Something has also been left in Estonia, in Siberia, or Central Asia. Let us share those difficulties among the regions and say to each one: think and act, use your head. Then we will be able to get out of the situation that has come about and we will begin to live like human beings. It is the duty of our leaders to explain to Moscow that our

objective in weakening centralization is to help it to see clearly that the constitutional amendments that were presented cannot in their present form help the state. And if they are unable to do that, then they need to be withdrawn and new ones prepared. As for the amendments to the ESSR Constitution, I find grounds to approve them. This has to do with Article 74, to which the Laak-Preyman amendment pertains. The editorial commission must work out the final version, and we would not like both versions put up to a vote. I still think that we can trust the authors of the draft. Now as to the Declaration of ESSR's Sovereignty. It is extremely necessary. The people expect it and simply demand it. There is evidence of this in what we saw and heard during the meetings in advance of the elections. I consider it one of the principal documents of the present moment. It is a pity that this issue has been touched upon only by E. Pyldroos, but it is at least a good thing that he did so. My viewpoint coincides with his opinion."

T. Kork dwelled in conclusion on those provisions which the rayon deputies of the rayon soviet proposed to supplement the draft of the Declaration of ESSR's Sovereignty.

"My heart was at ease when I sat down here today, because I felt the support of my constituents," said deputy T. Leyto (Tallin-Rakhumyaeskiy Election District No 72). "Moral support has also come from letters received by the editors of the newspaper RAKHVA KHVAEL, which have mainly spoken about one thing. About how the draft of the USSR Law on Amendments and Supplements to the USSR Constitution is a document that runs counter to the general course of restructuring, is not in accord with the decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, strengthens the hegemonic power of the state, thrusting us onto the hazardous road of reinforcing the unitarian state.

"The decision of the work collective of the Chemistry Institute of the ESSR Academy of Sciences, for example, notes that a further strengthening of central power will result in a compounding of undesirable things, the demographic situation will worsen, economic problems will begin to be solved less promptly, the use of natural resources will be less efficient, and so on. And the main thing is that this draft represents an extremely serious threat to Estonia's sovereignty. And the law would deal a fatal blow to the IMYe, and that is what made the people stop and take pause. Not often in our history have we seen such an outpouring of sentiments, when almost every person who cherishes the destiny of his land has expressed his opinion. This undoubtedly makes it simpler to make decisions, but it also makes it more complicated for us today.

"Soberly, casting emotions aside, we must today make sound political decisions, and they are political decisions, even though the documents prepared for today are legal in nature. We must make decisions guaranteeing

Estonia's sovereignty, its right to self-determination and to the free development of the Estonian people. We cannot retreat even one step from that.

"Thanks to the first successes of restructuring, we have at our disposition a broad range of political methods, and we would be remiss if we did not take full advantage of them. That is in fact what we must do today. We, of course, cannot fail to be mindful of the fact that other documents which are not in line with the spirit of restructuring have also been drafted at the center in the recent past. But I think that such ups and downs are inevitable in the development of restructuring and that our political activity must be a guarantee in this respect that the downs will not be so great. At the same time, we must show political vigilance every second. I feel that the drafts of the documents presented to today's session are a good basis for making a decision. I would particularly like to emphasize that the amendments to the ESSR Constitution, although they will have to be made largely on the run, are sound. It would, of course, have been better if they had been discussed by the people before adoption, but we now have an extraordinary session, and this is not an ordinary situation at all. In such a situation, the decisions must also be out of the ordinary. I think that we have the strength and the boldness to take all the responsibility on ourselves. I think that the Estonian people will be grateful to us for it.

"I also think that there is no sense in continuing the argument about Article 74. In my opinion, it is more important for us to adopt a sensible decision, and it has been found in the draft that has been submitted. Deputy T. Laak offered in his speech a clear and unambiguous assessment. I think that it would be incorrect to put competing versions up to a vote here. While little would be gained, we could lose much more, and we do not have the right to lose more."

"I, a worker in the Tyuri Timber Combine, am speaking in today's extraordinary session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet on instructions from almost 30,000 voters of Paydeskiy Rayon and the deputies of the ESSR Supreme Soviet elected from that rayon," said deputy R. Shmidt (Tyuriskiy Election District No 204).

"The population of Paydeskiy Rayon, having discussed the draft versions of the USSR laws on amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution (Fundamental Law) and on election of people's deputies of the USSR, feel deep alarm about the future destiny of the restructuring which the party initiated. It is quite obvious that these documents were drafted in offices, and the union republics did not take part. Nor do the draft laws take into account the unique identity of the union republics and their differences. In our opinion, these documents cannot serve as the basis for creating a democratic state based on law or for further development of a union of states based on the principles of equality and sovereignty. We feel that the drafts contradict the resolutions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the positions taken by the 11th Plenum of the Estonian CP

Central Committee. Adoption of the amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution will not strengthen the sovereignty of the union republics, it will preclude the possibility of independent decisions both in the economy and also in sociopolitical life and will make it possible to implement the principles of the IMYe. On the basis of what has been said above and instructions from the voters of Paydeskiy Rayon to the deputies of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, we support the draft of the decree of the ESSR Supreme Soviet submitted to the present session, which contains proposals for bills to amend and supplement the USSR Constitution (Fundamental Law) and election of people's deputies of the USSR. As for the draft of the ESSR Law on Amendments and Supplements to the ESSR Constitution (Fundamental Law), in the opinion of the session of the Paydeskiy Rayon Soviet and also a majority of the rayon's work collectives, which the deputies of the ESSR Supreme Soviet elected in the rayon have also joined in, it should be worded according to the second version of the draft handed out to us. That is, as follows: 'USSR laws take effect on the territory of Estonian SSR upon their approval by the ESSR Supreme Soviet. Amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution take effect on the territory of Estonian SSR upon their approval by the ESSR Supreme Soviet and when amendments and supplements are made to that effect in the ESSR Constitution.' We also support the draft versions of the Declaration of the ESSR Supreme Soviet and the Resolution of the ESSR Supreme Soviet on the Compact on Union. In our opinion, making the changes that have been mentioned in Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution does not infringe on the interests of a single nationality living in the republic. On the contrary, this would be one of the most essential conditions for the broad participation of the people in deciding both economic and social matters and also political issues, for further development of democracy, for implementing the IMYe program, so that the course of the party toward restructuring, whose main objective is to essentially increase the prosperity of our people, would be implemented to the fullest.

"The proposed approval in the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the draft of the USSR Law on Amendments and Supplements to the USSR Constitution (Fundamental Law) threatens to eliminate even that insignificant right of the union republic to self-determination which it still has now," said deputy U. Saksladu (Sondaskiy Election District No 201). "The rights of the union republics in deciding issues in their social and cultural life and even their national culture would be essentially diminished. The sovereignty of the union republics has to be preserved. The USSR Congress of People's Deputies should establish that the adoption, amendment, and supplementation of the USSR Constitution and other constitutional laws of the USSR would extend to the territory of the union republics after their approval. Pursuant to Article 113 of the USSR Constitution, Estonian SSR possesses the right of legislative initiative, that is, the right to submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet through its own Supreme Soviet drafts

of USSR laws drafted in the republic, including the new draft of the Law on Amendments and Supplements to the USSR Constitution. The main thing that we must demand is that Estonia be able to deal with its own affairs. It is quite obvious that if we should demand from Moscow complete withdrawal of the amendments to the Constitution, then possibly we would end up in the role of a voice crying in the wilderness. But we really have to demand alteration of the constitutional amendments in Sections 12, 13, and 15 of the bill, which are undemocratic and go against Leninist ideas.

"The USSR Supreme Soviet should make a proposal to draft and adopt the USSR Law on Procedure for the Drafting, Adoption, and Implementation of the USSR Constitution. A commission should be created consisting of representatives of the union republics on parity principles to do additional work on constitutional issues and to draft the Compact on Union, and the public at large should become involved. I cannot be persuaded that these proposals will be taken into account, which is why we should supplement the ESSR Constitution, which essentially affords ESSR the right to economic, political, and cultural self-determination. If the amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution are nevertheless adopted in the session, we will have our own law, which would relieve us of the obligation to accept those laws. There is a guarantee for self-determination—the amendments to our Constitution. The first section of Article 5 of the draft version of the amendments should be supplemented with the words: 'Legislative and other normative acts of the USSR shall be accepted for enforcement on the territory of Estonian SSR upon their approval by the ESSR Supreme Soviet.'

"I appeal to everyone to fully support the amendments and supplements to the ESSR Constitution. Their implementation will restore a sense of confidence to citizens of Estonia. In meetings with voters and also in a joint session of the Kokhtla-Yarveskiy Rayon Soviet and the Kokhtla-Yarveskiy Party Raykom, the idea was expressed that together with the proposals of the ESSR Supreme Soviet on amendments to the USSR Constitution amendments should also be adopted to the ESSR Constitution. It was no surprise to us when certain of the speakers here said what they did."

"It seems to me that the most important thing in the constitutional amendments under discussion today is to amend Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution so that later only those laws of the USSR which our Supreme Soviet has specifically debated and approved would take effect on the territory of Estonian SSR," said deputy K. Kaur (Vilyandiskiy-Kelerskiy Election District No 268). "This is the key to arranging our life in the future. If we do not adopt that amendment, we will have to forget about the IMYe and about a decent life in general. It is extremely necessary for our Supreme Soviet to have the right to make its own choice as to what all-union acts would take effect in Estonia and which ones would not. In that way, we would be able to oppose the pressure from all-union

departments, since, just think, what will happen if the All-Union Congress of People's Deputies proclaims our phosphate rock natural resources of all-union importance? After all, then we would have no strength whatsoever to oppose their development. The only possibility is to supplement our Constitution with a provision that in all matters will leave the right to make the final decision to the ESSR Supreme Soviet.

"Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution is a matter of life and death for us, and we must amend it. Aside from everything else, this also affords the possibility of resisting the supplements and amendments to the USSR Constitution which are now under discussion. In our election district, we have talked with many people, and it is clear to us that these amendments do not suit us. We should fight them and above all amend the ESSR Constitution so that we could in fact ignore the amendments to the USSR Constitution. We must do that so that on the territory of Estonia only the law which you and I have approved will take effect. If we do not make changes in our Constitution to that effect today and do not guarantee the legislative sovereignty of Estonia, we will not be able to look our constituents in the eye. As a matter of fact, the people of Estonia has already had its say. There is evidence of this in those hundreds of thousands of signatures which have come to the Supreme Soviet.

"Allow me on behalf of the deputies of Vilyandiskiy Rayon to appeal to you to vote for the proposed amendments to the Constitution of Estonian SSR."

"I am one of those," Ch. Villmann, scientific associate of the Institute of Astrophysics and Physics of the Atmosphere of the ESSR Academy of Sciences, remarked, "who shed blood to free our small homeland. And behind me stand many of my brothers-in-arms, my comrades in battle, and those who fell in the fields of Russia, giving their lives for freedom, for the sovereignty of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic.

"It is with a heavy heart and anxiety that I speak here. We have stepped into an economic, ecological, and moral blind alley, difficulties have arisen on an ethnic basis. Above all else it must be clear what great errors we have committed in the past. And it is the duty of all of us to find a way out of the blind alley, to a new life. And we will be able to do this only if we all do it together. The thousands of letters and signatures demonstrate the desire there is for this, and, believe me, the entire people of Estonia is now following the proceedings taking place here. We must decide something today, and that is why, dear deputies, we do not have the right to betray the people's expectations. I foresee that if the people does not gain a sense of confidence, then the IMYe and restructuring will go backward. We must nevertheless adopt a decision today that will make it possible for Estonia's inhabitants to sleep easy this very night, we

must make it possible for the fathers and mothers of our children to begin tomorrow with a clear desire to build something new with a feeling of confidence in that new thing.

"I have read in the papers about the documents, I took part in the work of the political commission to draft them, and I have talked with many people. I have formed the impression that certain groups and certain people take as their point of departure, if I may so put it, not the general situation in the republic, but the local state of affairs. It has to be taken into account that we are talking about the republic, about phenomena inherent in it, not about matters at the city or rayon level."

"I also had the happy opportunity to take part in the work of the political commission, and it seems to me that all of its activity was imbued with the spirit that we brought back from the 19th All-Union Party Conference," said deputy Yu. Aare (Khalyalaskiy Election District No 229). "It seems to me that those documents which we have written and which today have been presented to you in the form of proposals have been sufficiently worked out and thoroughly thought through and deserve the most serious attention.

"The key issue, of course, is Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution, about which much has been said already. As a participant in the work of the commission, with all due respect for the lawyers who were members of it and for the politicians we worked with, it is very difficult for me to give up that very clear and simple wording which we presented as the result of our activity. But now, following the first session of the editorial commission, I understand that a somewhat different wording can be found and that a very real legal force of this article of the Constitution can be achieved while preserving the original clarity. Obviously, that wording will be announced by the chairman of the editorial commission. I feel that this amendment to the ESSR Constitution is really of particular importance to us. I emphasize the word particular, because if we think about the state of Estonia's nature in its most varied forms at present: coastal waters and groundwater, inland bodies of water, the air, stocks of fish, the soil, and therapeutic mud, we realize that some regions are in a state of ecological crisis.

"Unfortunately, we live on the shore of a dying sea. In some places, we have been polluting the Baltic and our inland bodies of water in simply fantastic fashion. The rivers and lakes are becoming overgrown with weeds at a very high rate, we have already declared the industrial zone of northeast Estonia an ecological disaster area. And if today we ask what is wrong, why we have gotten into such a barbarous state that our best therapeutic muds at Khaapsalu and Kuressaare are threatened with serious danger, why the female organism is already so poisoned in northeast Estonia that it is having an effect on the physical and mental characteristics of their children, then we might reply that in many respects this is because we have not had Article 74 of the Constitution in the wording we want to give to it today.

"We have not had an opportunity to freely oppose the strong pressure of various union departments which they have exerted in order to develop various sectors of the economy here that do not suit us at all either in terms of natural conditions or economic geography or on any other basis. We have been living on this soil for approximately 5,000 years, and in the last 30-40 years it has been taken to the verge of ecological catastrophe. It is quite clear that if we continue the same kind of economic activity over another 30-40 years, then at best our children will have to buy drinking water in stores. I do not know if they will be forced to go about in gas masks, as was done by many participants in the bicycle tour 'How Is Your Life, Virumaa?' in Kunda, but in any case this land will become hazardous to life. So, the situation in which we have now found ourselves is the direct result of the absence of precisely such a constitutional article, which is vitally important to us.

"I would like to call your attention to the fact that the quality of our land, coastal waters, rivers, and lakes, and the air of Estonia—these are not our internal affair at all. We are bound by international treaties, and if we do not have the ability to carry out our promises as recorded in those documents, both in protecting the air and also in protecting the coastal waters of the Baltic Sea, we will then enter into a serious international conflict, and if a precise and scientific approach is taken to the matter, then in the very near future we will get into a still greater conflict. So adoption of this amendment is of the greatest necessity, a vital necessity. This would make it possible for us to begin developing our economy in a way that suits our natural conditions, our own peculiar economic geography, and so on. At the same time, as a man who studied economics at Tartu University and has many times reread the draft of the USSR Constitution and the draft of the amendments, I understand perfectly, especially after the 'phosphate rock war,' that flared up with particular force in 1987, but which in actuality has continued to this day, that adoption of these amendments essentially opens up all doors. If we are forced to live under those amendments, then one fine day we will have the phosphate rock and the new power plant which has already been christened 'Viru,' and many other things.

"The cost of that program is approximately 3 billion rubles, and should it be carried out over the next 20-30 years, a large portion of Estonia's mainland would become unfit for normal life. Consequently, we need realistic protection against such extremely dangerous things. I emphasize that today ecology is a very important part of international politics, and if we adopt that amendment to our own Constitution, which we have talked about so much today, then we will build for ourselves guarantees of those international relations which are also acceptable to the people living on the other shores of the Baltic. I emphasize, representatives of all the countries of Scandinavia have declared that preservation of the Baltic Sea is one of the most important aspects of their activity. So that I see here a far

greater impact of this Constitution on our future. This is a fundamental issue, resolving it would make it possible for us to carry out the IMYe as well, and also to maintain a more or less normal ecological situation in the republic.

"I would also like to say that in certain conversations the idea has been developed that adoption of such a constitutional amendment and also the adoption, say, of a constitutional amendment on questions of property could allegedly place us in some kind of isolation from the other union republics. I absolutely see no such danger. We have to work in order to live. We work by going to plants, factories, into the fields, and so on. We have shaped very good relations with several union republics, especially with our neighbors. But all of that has to be raised to the level of equivalent exchange. In short, without any sort of limit-allowances or stocks—as they say, 'cash on the barrel head.' And a commodity in exchange. I am thoroughly convinced that we are taking a decisive step today toward a cost-accounting Estonia, toward a politically sovereign republic, toward considerably more meaningful relations among the union republics. That is why in the name of the voters of Khalyalaskiy Election District No 229 I support the proposal to make amendments to the ESSR Constitution and to say a very decisive 'No' to many of the proposed amendments to the USSR Constitution."

■20 Nov p 2■

[Text] "It is also the opinion of agricultural workers that the political situation in Estonia now is rather complicated," noted deputy R. Kaydla (Raykkyulaskiy Election District No 245). "For years, we have just been trying to take a bath with a little hot water. But now we end up on the open sea, open to wind from every direction, and the ship has begun to roll a bit. But the wind is necessary. When during an assembly in any city enterprise passions flare up too much, take a break and go out into the country. Come to us at the Sovkhoz imeni Michurin. We will consult, debate, take a walk in the forest, in the fields, and sit down in the office. I would like to say that the inhabitants of Raplaskiy Rayon, who elected me to the ESSR Supreme Soviet, and the entire collective of the Sovkhoz imeni Michurin, where I work, firmly support the policy of the Estonian CP. Especially that policy whose foundations were laid down by the 11th Plenum of the Estonian CP Central Committee. Estonia is a homeland that belongs to all those who are here. We must save this land and protect it. We can save it and protect it above all with the help of the ESSR Constitution. Recently, Estonia has been frowned on more than once, and at the same time the USSR Ministry of Fertilizer Industry is licking its chops over the northeast of the republic. It is reaching out its hand for the soil which feeds and extends a hand to a neighbor with clean water drunk by all the people living in Estonia. The toxic fumes in the air of Kokhtla-Yarve and Maardu are making people sick and killing them. We need to join together in protecting Estonia's soil, water, and air. Let us join hands this very day, and we will be able to protect

our right as steward in the ESSR Constitution. This will unflinchingly be furthered by adoption of Article 11 of the Constitution in the version that has been presented in the draft. And this is quite correct.

"Implementing the principle of a cost-accounting Estonia, including agriculture, depends on whether we are a sovereign state or not. At this point, the voters are waiting for us and looking to us. My constituents are also waiting today. The inhabitants of Raplaskiy Rayon are thoroughly familiar with the problems which we have been debating here now and have expressed their opinion. The people is demanding of its deputies, is demanding of me as well, that a decision be made guaranteeing Estonian SSR sovereignty. That is the main demand of our voters. In the name of developing restructuring in Estonia, strengthening democratic society, so that we might be able to implement the principles of a cost-accounting republic, I consider it indispensable to adopt as a law and without amendments the bill on amendments and supplements to the ESSR Constitution which has been submitted by the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet. We understand that Article 74 is undoubtedly extremely important as well. During the break, I consulted once again with the legal experts after the speech by E. Savisaar and began to have slight doubts. It would do no harm if today some of the legal experts on the commission of experts set forth the legal essence of Article 74 once again. If, of course, this is seen to be necessary. The new version of this article presented by the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet seems an order of magnitude more modest than the one which expresses the opinion of the people from Tartu. Even quite recently I have praised the latter very much. But now I favor adoption of Article 74 in the form in which it was presented in the draft. This is very important in political terms, and I emphasize that we need a general point of view.

"A few words about another draft. The amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution, in the opinion of my constituents, are undemocratic in many points and restrict the republic's sovereignty in the form in which they were put up for nationwide discussion. That is why I support the positions of the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet expressed in the relevant draft."

"The Declaration on Sovereignty of Estonian SSR has essentially developed one of the central declarations of the Great October Socialist Revolution—Lenin's Declaration on the Right of the Nationalities to Self-Determination," were the words with which deputy Y. Tasa (Vazalemmaskiy Election District No 178) began his speech. "Today's document will go down in the political history of the people of Estonia as one of the worthiest. The impetus for adoption of the present declaration was furnished by the recent bill on amendments to the USSR

Constitution, which threatens to eliminate in Estonia the rights of all inhabitants to arrange the republic's life in the future, leaving them completely under the power of union ministries.

"We are talking about a fundamental enactment which actually should have been adopted long ago. Article 74 of the ESSR Constitution establishes in law that Stalinist violence which took place in 1940. Many of our problems today started there.

"The Resolution on the Compact of Union ought to refute all charges of separatism which have sometimes been made by people who do not understand us. The Compact on Union signifies refinement of sovereignty on the basis of equal cooperation. The Compact on Union is an enactment that serves as a means for pursuing the common interests, for protecting the interests of the small state in the international arena, while at the same time it preserves the possibility of arranging our lives ourselves, which is in the interests of all inhabitants both of Estonia and also of the Soviet Union as a whole. The tone of the declaration meets the requirements of the times; it is solid, and the idea has been clearly expressed in both legal and political terms.

"Possibly, more space should have been given to the usual qualifications, but it seems to me that in this form the document is quite up to the present level of political sophistication in Estonia. Possibly the historical section should be supplemented. For many of us both in Estonia and outside it, this declaration will become the point of departure for getting to the source of today's conflicts in Estonia. The discussion of Stalinist policy could have been expressed more straightforwardly. These are the possible additions to the proposed minimal version of the declaration. Nothing more can be taken from it or edited to make it less definite. The main wordings are correct, and that is the way they need to be adopted.

"It seems to me that an excessive bent in the direction of emotions has been observed in our treatment of the term 'sovereignty.' It seems that the explanatory effort has been incorrectly done among the Russophone population. This is indicated by the fact that certain deputies have broken off conversations in which sovereignty was incorrectly equated with leaving the fraternal family of Soviet republics.

"The proposed legislative enactments need first of all to be seen as a possibility for averting decisions that do not conform to the interests of all the inhabitants of Estonia, thereby opening up the possibility for raising their standard of living. Having weighed both versions of Article 74, I have come to the conclusion that there is no way we can avoid conflicts with the USSR Constitution. If we adopt the first version, then this conflict arises immediately. In the latter case, it is delayed until we revoke or stay some all-union law.

"On behalf of my constituents and work collective I express support for the version of the law which has been proposed to the Supreme Soviet."



### Newspaper Begins Public Forum Column

18110028 [Editorial Report] Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian on 4 December 1988 carries on page 4 a 700-word article by Fedir Makivchuk in conjunction with the appearance of a new rubric in the paper "Ostap Vyshnya's Mailbox". Ostap Vyshnya is the pen name of Pavlo Mykhailovych Gubenko, Ukrainian "national" humorist and satirist. He was a Stalin purge victim in 1933 and spent 10 years in labor camps. Makivchuk states that Vyshnya's humor is "deeply national". Vyshnya has been writing for RADYANSKA UKRAYINA since 1944, when he was freed. The new rubric is to be a type of public forum where all can air their grievances. The newspaper asks for letters from "simple workers" about mismanagement, bureaucratism evidenced in officials, and about similar "anti-restructuring forces". Jokes, humor and tales are also being elicited.

### UkSSR Official On Republic's Video Boom

18110025 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian  
18 Nov 88 p 4

[Unattributed article: "'Orbita' and Others"; Under the Rubric: "On the Screen at Home."]

[Excerpts] Lately the showing of videos in the country is gaining in popularity. New video libraries, video booths and video cafes are opening. The desire to watch films on a screen at home is increasing. Readers of RADYANSKA UKRAYINA are interested in how matters on this front are progressing in our republic and especially in Kiev. How many video libraries and video booths are there now? What are the perspectives for the development of video showings in theaters? We asked Volodymyr Yakovych Nesterchuk, chief engineer and head of the production-technical division of the UkSSR Ministry of Culture's Department of Movie Video Rental, to inform us about this. Here is his response.

I want to point out that video viewing is gaining in popularity in Ukraine. Watching films on video cassettes is becoming ever more desirable. For example, there are two video libraries presently operating in Kiev. There is one in the Orbita movie theater on Khreshchatyk Boulevard and also one in the Kiev Oblast movie film rental office on Vasylkivskiy Street. Soon another one will be opening on Andriyivskiy ascent [street on a steep rise]. Moreover, there are also 40 video parlors operating in the capital of Ukraine. These are located in various places, in movie theaters, palaces of culture, at the railroad station, at the Zhulyany airport and also in the central railroad ticket sales offices on Shevchenko Boulevard. There are video parlors in the Legenda cafe, Dytyachiy Svit [Children's World] Department Store in Darnytsa and in the Children's Library of Lenin's Kom-somol.

There are 150 video parlors, 46 video booths, 26 video cafes, 16 portable VCR units and 35 video cassette rental centers now operating in the republic.

It is interesting to note that in a 10-month period this year in Kiev alone close to 300,000 people have availed themselves of the services of video libraries, video parlors and video booths. And there are now 50,000 movie video cassettes available in the republic.

The films on video cassettes are quite varied in subject and genre. These include historical-revolutionary, military-patriotic, historical, and contemporary subjects; films made of literary works, adventure films, films for children and youth, and popular science films.

There are quite a few musical, comedy and concert video films.

[Passage Omitted]

It is interesting to note that we get some films on video cassettes earlier than the films become available in movie theaters.

So, we invite you, dear residents of Kiev and guests of the city, to visit our video libraries and video parlors and to watch whatever films you desire. The selection is large. We await your requests and suggestions.

**Armenians Fault Editors' Response to Charge of Publishing Anti-Armenian Article**

*18300194a Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian  
16 Nov 88 p 4*

[Article by V. Aloyan: "Facts, Or Apologies!"]

[Text] A month ago the weekly VETERAN, a supplement to the newspaper TRUD, carried an article titled "Special Situation" that aroused a wave of general indignation in Armenia.

Our newspaper for 18 October carried a letter from a group of war and labor veterans that appraised the article as a shameless insult to the Armenian people's national dignity and an incitement provoking a new exacerbation of the situation in the republic. The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, fully sharing the indignation of the veterans and of the public in the city of Yerevan, addressed the editors of the newspaper TRUD with a demand to sort out this matter, strictly punish the guilty parties and inform readers of that.

One should have expected that the editors of TRUD would take a self-critical and principled attitude toward the justifiable criticism of its supplement and figure out how such an irresponsible article that disoriented public opinion could occur in the weekly. But...

The editors recently received a reply over the signature of F. Khalturin, editor in chief of VETERAN. In other words, in the spirit of the best old bureaucratic traditions, the complaint was sent to those who were being complained about. That might still have been understandable if F. Khalturin, in reply, had made apologies or explained the source of such serious accusations against the republic's inhabitants. But the reply, with a frivolous irresponsibility that is evidently becoming the norm for that publication, states that: "...the harsh assertions contained in the publication in the newspaper KOMMUNIST are groundless."

Comrade Khalturin finds the best way out of a situation that is difficult for him in a verbose explanation of what the VETERAN correspondent meant to say. It turns out that the republic's people and leadership had no grounds for indignation. After all: "The article's chief point consists in showing how in the present, complex situation, the working people of Armenia and the NKAO ■ Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast ■ are finding true ways to improve the situation, and the forced, temporary presence in such regions of units and subdivisions of internal affairs troops is contributing to its stabilization.

"The article emphasizes the positive facts of relations between the inhabitants of Yerevan and Stepanakert and the military personnel. In this context, the words of one participant in the discussion, Lt Col Rakitin, addressed to local inhabitants, sound warm and cordial: 'Thank you, friends, for your attention to and concern for our servicemen and for your hospitality and goodwill.'"

No matter what curtsies the reply's author has made, elementary common sense suggests that the item's gist, its principal thrust, was a description of the difficulties and critical situations that servicemen in the internal troops' units encountered in Armenia. After all, Col Rakitin, without blinking an eye, states in the article that the soldiers have been offered "large sums of money, alcohol, drugs and women." And all this "for a momentary loss of vigilance."

"If such cases can occur," write the many thousands of employees of Yerevan's Basalt Plant in their letter, "a legitimate question arises as to why those who are supposed to uncover and stop the provocateurs' actions failed to do it. Why were the drug dealers and the pimps not brought to justice?"

"Just what purpose, in Col Rakitin's opinion, were the 'provocateurs' from the Yerevan population pursuing in 'trying to bring about a momentary loss of vigilance in the performance of duty' on the part of the servicemen under him? Isn't the reason the aforementioned officer used the impersonal sentence construction that he had no specific facts whatsoever to offer?"

However, in F. Khalturin's letter there is no answer to a single one of these questions. It is true, he writes, that participants in the conversation were relying on documented facts "...about which local authorities were promptly informed by the command of the internal troops' unit and subdivisions." But the editor in chief, following his correspondent, repeats the same mistake—he does not indicate a single specific name or fact. And furthermore, neither the party Central Committee, nor the Ministry of Internal Affairs, nor the republic procuracy, which we were forced to contact ourselves, had the slightest notion of these "documented facts."

Khalturin continues in an equally "specific and cogent" fashion: "Those who objectively appraise the complex processes occurring in connection with Nagorny Karabakh are well aware of the cases of irresponsible behavior by certain persons, whose efforts have been aimed at inflaming passions and further complicating an already complicated situation. We all understand that they are not the ones who embody the character of the Armenian working person, but it is impossible not to see their destructive activities, which are undermining our unity and the friendship among peoples. I think that the labor collectives and public of the republic and the NKAO are rightfully making certain demands on them, for they are the ones who are casting a shadow on the Armenian people's good name and national dignity and attempting to undermine the profound respect that we have invariably felt for them."

Well, that is indisputably good advice, except it seems that we have a right, first of all, to make such demands of the editors of VETERAN, whose insinuations have aroused a mighty wave of indignation and once again put

the republic on the brink of destabilization. After all, what the provocateurs are unable to do, certain mass media that publish articles of the type "Special Situation" are trying to do.

One can, of course, understand the serviceman who, in an interview with the correspondent of an all-union publication, tries to adorn his story with piquant and breath-taking fantasies. But how can one understand professional journalists—the correspondent and his editors—who reprint these fables in their newspaper?

"Isn't this the sort of case," ask staff members of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Geological Sciences in their letter, "in which certain Soviet journalists, forgetting their duty and calling, are going after sensation?" That is why, expressing the opinion of many, many individuals and collectives, the institute's staff members write: "We demand official explanations and apologies. Otherwise, each of us has the right, according to Soviet legislation, to file suit against the editors and authors and demand a judicial inquiry; the persons who have unceremoniously injured our people's honor and dignity should be held strictly accountable."

How can one fail to recall here the idea concerning the problems of internationality relations that was expressed by V. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee's Ideological Commission, at a conference held just recently in the CPSU Central Committee: "Articles in the central press on this subject have not always been sufficiently profound, carefully weighed and dialectical. Sometimes they create highly optimistic superficial notions concerning rather complicated processes. Such articles disorient public opinion."

The editors consider that the question of the offensive article in the newspaper TRUD's weekly remains open. Armenia's public awaits a specific elaboration of the facts cited in the article "Special Situation"—or apologies.

**Armenian Daily Reports Sumgait Trial Events**  
*18300194b Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian*  
*16 Nov 88 p 4*

[Article by staff correspondent S. Zheltov, under the rubric "At the USSR Supreme Court": "Sent for Additional Investigation"; transmitted by telephone]

[Text] Moscow—In its past three sessions, the USSR Supreme Court's Criminal Cases Collegium, chaired by R. Brize, has heard the testimony of additional witnesses summoned to the court on petition by the lawyers representing the victims. Not all of them appeared. Some were unable to come for valid reasons, and the whereabouts of others is unknown—from Sumgait they registered to reside in rural regions of Armenia, but they never arrived there. Their testimony in the preliminary investigation was read by the court secretary.

Since the beginning of the trial of A. Akhmedov, I. Ismailov and Ya. Dzhafarov, dozens of witnesses have passed before the court. Their testimony has made up a whole volume of terrifying narrative concerning the tragedy of the city of Sumgait's residents of Armenian nationality. A tragedy that has evoked acute pain in people's hearts and remains an open wound in their memory. A tragedy that calls for justice and humaneness.

In the course of the judicial investigation, the charges brought against the defendants were completely confirmed. However, as the lawyers P. Shaposhnikova and R. Rshtuni, representatives of the victims, stated in their petition, not all of the criminal acts committed have been legally classified. The case being considered by the court has been unjustifiably singled out, the causes and conditions contributing to the commission of the crimes have not been identified, and the organizers and instigators of these monstrous crimes have not been established.

The lawyers addressed this petition to the court on 11 November. They are asking that the case be sent for additional investigation.

The petition explains: in the charge brought against Ismailov, it is interpreted that the crimes were committed by him out of hooligan motives, and only such motives. Up until now, the mass media, especially the central press, central television and, most importantly, the preliminary investigation, have from every indication, not wanted to admit that the underlying theme of the mass killings of Armenians in Sumgait was national enmity. Yet the materials of the preliminary investigation indisputably establish that the pogroms, butchery, robbery and rape were preceded by agitation aimed at arousing national enmity and discord and, what's more, the destruction of Armenians.

The ignoring of this circumstance resulted in the fact the ideal combination of crimes committed has failed to be reflected in the legal classification, although our legislation stipulates liability for crimes based on nationality.

As is known, Art. 36 of the USSR Constitution states: "Any direct or indirect restriction of or establishment of direct or indirect advantages for citizens on the basis of racial and national features, like any advocacy of racial and national exclusivity, enmity or contempt, is punished by law."

Proceeding from the Basic Law, the criminal legislation, and Art. 67 of the Azerbaijan SSR Criminal Code in particular, stipulates liability for the violation of national and racial equality consisting in propaganda or agitation aimed at arousing national or racial enmity and discord.

Proof of the fact that the actions of Akhmedov include the elements of the aforementioned crime—in particular, agitation aimed at arousing national enmity—is

found in the formal charges, which state: "On 29 February 1988 at approximately 4:00 pm in the region of the bus terminal in the city of Sumgait, Akhmedov took part in a spontaneous rally. With the use of a megaphone he started calling on the people assembled to carry out reprisals against citizens of Armenian nationality." In addition, it was also established in the course of the judicial investigation that Akhmedov appealed to the assembled mass of people in the region of the bus terminal to go kill Armenians in order to rid Sumgait of them, to smash up their apartments, and to destroy their property.

Akhmedov led the large crowd (200-300 people) with him to block No.41.a. There he once again addressed them with the appeals: "Death to Armenians!", "Long live Azerbaijan!" (witness Ya. Rakhimov), "Kill Armenians!", "If you're hiding them, it will go badly for you!" (R. Adilov), "Muslims! Show where the Armenians live! (M. Ilyasov), etc.

On the basis of what has been set forth, the lawyers claim that additional charges should be brought against Akhmedov in connection with agitation aimed at arousing national enmity, under Art. 67 of the Azerbaijan SSR Criminal Code.

The petition emphasizes the need to combine in a single trial the cases connected with crimes committed in block No. 41.a of Sumgait.

On the basis of a 24 June 1988 ruling by V. Galkin, the USSR procurator general's investigator for especially important cases, the case of Akhmedov, Ismailov and Dzhafarov is singled out for separate prosecution from criminal case No. 18/6026888, in connection with mass disorders, killings and rapes that took place in the city of Sumgait. In light of the fact that the aforementioned case lacks materials supporting the correctness of singling it out, the lawyers P. Shaposhnikova and R. Rshtuni petitioned to demand appropriate information from the procuracy in order to verify the substantiation of the 24 June 1988 ruling. Their petition was granted. The USSR Procuracy presented a letter over the signature of G. Karakosov, chief of the investigative unit. However, it did not give a precise substantiation of the correctness of the procuracy's determination on singling out the case. No answer has been received as to whether the procuracy or courts have cases in progress against other persons besides Akhmedov, Ismailov and Dzhafarov who have been criminally charged for participation in the mass disorders in block No. 41.a.

In the meanwhile, in and of itself the element of the crime, "mass disorders," on the basis of which the criminal actions have been classified indicates that many of those who burst into block No. 41.a participated in them. Moreover, during the judicial investigation it was established that a number of persons summoned as witnesses in the case are being charged in other cases for mass disorders and other crimes committed by them in that block.

For the sake of completeness, objectivity and comprehensiveness in the study and resolution of the case, the petition stresses, it is necessary to combine the case of Akhmedov, Ismailov and Dzhafarov with the criminal cases against all persons who committed mass disorders in block No. 41.a, regardless of the fact that they are charged with other crimes.

Also contradictory to the materials of the case is the assertion in the aforementioned letter of the USSR Procuracy to the effect that insufficient evidence has been gathered to bring criminal charges against other persons for murder and attempted murder in block No. 41.a. But how, then, is one to understand the testimony of G. Mamedov, who has been criminally charged in another case? He stated that he personally struck an elderly man three times on the head (in court he clarified—two times on the head and once on the back) with a piece of steel concrete-reinforcing bar, and it was established in the case that that was Sogomon Melkumyan. G. Mamedov also testified that the man had been beaten by Islam Mamedov with a board off a box with protruding nails and by Aleksandr Drach, an ex-convict nicknamed "Hitler" who had struck two or three blows with the blade of an axe. This testimony is confirmed to a certain degree by the finding of forensic medical experts, according to whom S. Melkumyan has 13 wounds in the parietal-occipital and right temporal part of the skull, wounds which were evidently caused by more than one person and more than one instrument.

G. Mamedov also testified that Nizami Mageramov and Fazuli Fataliyev threw a young man into a fire (according to the materials in the case, it has been established that this was Eduard Melkumyan).

The lawyers believe that criminal charges should be brought against the aforementioned persons in connection with participation in the murder of Sogomon Melkumyan and Eduard Melkumyan, and on those grounds the case should also be sent for additional investigation.

The petition states: "In violation of Art. 14 of the Azerbaijan SSR Criminal Code, the investigation of the case was conducted incompletely, and the organizers of the crime, as well as the causes and conditions contributing to the commission of the crimes, were not identified."

The materials of the case contain evidence that one of the causes and conditions contributing to the commission of the crimes in the city of Sumgait was the inaction of the militia. On 28 February 1988 troop units for maintaining law and order were introduced into Sumgait. But they took no action to stop the pogroms, arson and other crimes, and engaged in self-defense. What was the cause of their inaction? On 29 February at 3:00 pm the directors, chief engineers and foremen of all the city's housing operation offices were summoned to the city soviet and for no reason stayed there until 8:00 pm. Why

did they need to be isolated during the mass disorders? After all, they were the ones who should have been the first to come to the population's aid.

The facts persuasively indicate that the crime was prepared in advance. On 13 May of this year the newspaper KOMMUNIST SUMGAIYA carried an article titled "In the Sumgait City Committee of the Azerbaijani Communist Party." It states: "...during the days of the complex situation, the manufacture of axes, knives and other objects that could be used by hooligan elements took place in the mill's shops (the pipe-rolling mill)."

That same article notes that a whole series of party and soviet officials in Sumgait (Yu. Tabasaranskiy, first deputy chairman of the city soviet; A. Tagiyev, deputy chairman of the city soviet; A. Abdulayev, director of the knitwear mill, and others) have received strict party penalties for improper performance of their official duties, and that the existence in their actions of the elements of criminally punishable acts is not ruled out.

In Sumgait's block No. 41.a, A. Akhmedov led a crowd armed with steel rods, knives, axes and other objects manufactured beforehand. By whom, where and when these objects had been manufactured, and on whose initiative the pogrom perpetrators had been armed with them are not established in the case. Nor is it established by whom and for what purpose the Sumgait-Baku Highway had been obstructed by a pile of stones at the bus terminal on the night of 27-28 February. Who organized the inspection of buses and other motor vehicles around the knitwear factory in order not to let persons of Armenian nationality out of the city?

The speed and efficiency with which the traces of the crimes were covered is surprising. On the second day after the pogrom all the broken and smashed household items of the victims had been hauled out of the city and buried. The hole had been leveled by bulldozers.

"We request," the lawyers conclude, "that the case against A. Akhmedov, I. Ismailov and Ya. Dzhafarov be sent for additional investigation, inasmuch as the actions of persons closely associated by unity of intention must be investigated and tried in a single case. Only such investigation and trial will make it possible to achieve the necessary completeness and objectivity in identifying all participants and the crimes they committed in block 41.a in their totality, to make the correct legal appraisal of them, and to organize preventive work in order that the horrors of Sumgait are never repeated, as well as to designate just and harsh punishment."

On 14 November the USSR Supreme Court's Criminal Cases Collegium heard the petition of the lawyers representing the interests of the victims. A ruling was made that the petition be granted. The case is to be sent for additional investigation in regard to the defendants I.

Ismailov and Ya. Dzhafarov. In regard to the defendant A. Akhmedov, the court found that there is sufficient evidence for the final trial of the case and delivery of a verdict.

The victims have refused to take further part in the trial and to be represented by lawyers in connection with the fact that the court deemed the petition to be unfounded in the part of it that speaks of additional charges under Art. 67 of the Azerbaijan SSR Criminal Code. Nor did the court support the petition concerning the need to identify the organizers of the crime and the causes and conditions contributing to their commission.

#### **Tallinn Russian Section of Estonian Popular Front Formed**

*18000328a Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII in Russian  
16 Nov 88 p 4*

[Text of Tallinn Popular Front Russian section statement: "A Tallinn Russian Section of the Popular Front Has Been Set Up"]

[Excerpt] On 12 November at a meeting of representatives of Popular Front support groups in Tallinn city, and also of people sharing the basic aims of this movement, it was decided to set up a Russian-speaking section.

In reaching this decision those attending proceeded from the tense political situation that has been created in the republic. In its practical activity the Popular Front leadership has inadequately taken into account the specific interests of the various national groups in the Estonian population. The result has been the emergence of Interdvizheniye as a political movement among the Russian-speaking population, and interethnic relations in the republic have become sharply exacerbated. It is clear that both sides are losing from this contradiction. However, despite the mistakes that have been made in the approach to national questions the Popular Front today is assuming a more constructive stance in questions of perestroika.

In this situation, in our view the only realistic and promising policy is to consolidate the various political movements and organizations on the basis of mutual compromise. The republic party organization headed by the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee is capable of assuming responsibility for accomplishing this task. The time has come to move to real action.

Creation of the Russian-speaking section does not signify a split in the Popular Front because it recognizes the basic provisions of the program and charter of this movement and its purpose is to unite the people of Estonia in joint work to solve the common problems and eliminate the present national confrontation.

The following are the main principles in the creation of the Russian-speaking section:

—The section is a structural unit of the Popular Front of Estonia. It will be made up of Russian-speaking support groups set up at enterprises, establishments and farms or at places of residence, and also of individual members. A board has been elected to coordinate activity;

—Together with the realization of problems common to the people of Estonia, the section reflects and defends within the Popular Front of Estonia the specific interests of the republic's Russian-speaking population through its representatives in the leading organs of the Popular Front.

The meeting passed a resolution on the draft Law of the Estonian SSR on Language and a resolution on two of the all-union drafts, namely, on changes and additions to the USSR Constitution (Fundamental Law) and the election of USSR people's deputies.

In the first of these resolutions the meeting proposed that Estonian be constitutionally adopted as the official language with simultaneous guarantees for the use and development of Russian and other languages on the territory of the Estonian SSR. Because of inadequate work on the draft Law on Language and the extraordinarily short time for its debate, the meeting decided to ask the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet to extend this period, and also to re-examine the makeup of the corresponding working group so as to make it more representative and insure glasnost for its activity.

In the second resolution the meeting recognized the ambiguity of the draft laws on amendments to the USSR Constitution and the election of USSR people's deputies, as submitted for national debate. Adoption of the draft laws in their present form could possibly promote acceleration in the process of democratization in some parts of the country but would at the same time be a step backward away from the level of democracy already reached in other regions (including Estonia). This would ultimately lead to the creation of a state and public system for the USSR that is less democratic and socially just than the present system; this affects by no means only the question of the sovereignty of the union republics.

Historical experience shows that the reaction to extreme centralism is separatist trends in particular regions, which under our conditions would lead to a deterioration of relations between republics and between national groups within republics. Centralization of state power can sometimes lead to temporary stabilization of the political situation but guarantees future instability. Centralized management of economic life deprives it of essential mobility and hence, as the experience of our own country shows, leads objectively to stagnation and decay and a decline in the living standard of the people. All of this contradicts the Leninist principles of the socialist all-union state and the resolutions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

The meeting therefore also concluded that it would be proper to remove from the agenda consideration by the upcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of both draft laws so as to enable further consideration of the new draft laws with the participation of representatives from all 15 of the USSR union republics. At the same time, taking into account the demands of the specific political situation, the meeting deemed it possible to support adoption of the draft law on the election of USSR people's deputies with significant amendments at the next session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The meeting deemed this step advisable since it will provide an opportunity in the future to submit the draft USSR Constitution for national debate and to hold a referendum after consideration of the draft by a congress of the USSR people's deputies elected in accordance with the new law on the elections.

The meeting also discussed the question of proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Estonian SSR. The meeting called on the deputies of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet to take into account the opinions and interests of the republic's inhabitants when considering the amendments. In the present explosive situation the decision of the session should not serve as a detonator.

The resolutions of the meeting have been sent to the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee and the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet.

At the joint meeting of the Tallinn section and representatives of the Russian-speaking sessions from Tartu, Kokhtla-Yarve, Sillamyae and Narva it was decided to set up a republic Russian-speaking section of the Popular Front of Estonia and to draw up a provision defining its aims and tasks. [passage omitted]

(signed) The Board of the Tallinn Russian-speaking Section of the Popular Front of Estonia.

**Medvedev Converses With Latvian Students**  
*18000217a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian*  
16 Nov 88 pp 1- 3

[Report on meeting between V. A. Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Central Committee secretary, with students and faculty at Latvian State University imeni P. Stuchka: "High Goals for Higher Education: Meeting Between V. A. Medvedev and VUZ Students and Instructors"; discussion published in abridged form]

[Excerpt] V. A. Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Central Committee secretary, visited Latvian State University imeni P. Stuchka. He met with a group of students from a number of departments in the P. Stuchka Memorial Auditorium. The meeting was conducted by Yu. R. Zakis, rector of Latvian State University.

The first speaker was Vīvesturs Koziols, chairman of the university's student trade union committee. He said that students, like all people in the republic, unanimously support the republic's new leadership, and he asked V. A. Medvedev whether he intended to meet with representatives of Latvian informal organizations so that he would not have a one-sided view of the processes taking place within Latvia.

"I have already talked with the republic leaders who, as you yourself have said, enjoy universal support," said V. A. Medvedev. "They are well informed concerning all the processes occurring in Latvia, and from various viewpoints at that. Therefore one can scarcely overstate the value of such talks with regard to study of the situation in this republic. The talks I had with labor collectives at the VEF and Alfa production associations were also extremely beneficial. These were not merely formal meetings; there were no limitations on information or one-sidedness. You can attest to that yourself if you watched the televised coverage of the meetings. I also had a very intense, frank discussion with the republic ideological aktiv, and I talked with people on the city streets. I am scheduled to meet with comrades who are working very actively in the Latvian People's Front. Please have no fear that either the republic leadership or I will exhibit any tendentiousness, i.e. any desire to listen more to the opinion of one side and to ignore the opinion of the other."

**Ivars Kibermanis**, third-year student in the Law Department: "The 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th Party Conference laid down the orientation toward democratization that is assuming such a large scale today. But the changes and amendments to the USSR Constitution which are currently under discussion are confusing, at least to those of us in the Law Department. How can one speak of democratization when an article is envisioned according to which a republic would not be able to decide whether to remain a part of the Soviet Union or not? Lenin himself wrote about this guarantee."

**V. A. Medvedev**: "This is a matter requiring serious discussion. Incidentally, such a discussion was held on 11 November, in great detail, a frank discussion, with the republic's leading jurists, both practical workers and scientists, including instructors from the Law Department of your university. The need for this discussion arose in connection with the fact that following the publication of two draft laws—on changes and amendments to the USSR Constitution and on the election of people's deputies—in some republics, the Baltic republic to be precise, Estonia in particular, there was a sharply negative response to the proposed laws. And the reason given was that supposedly both proposals were a deviation from the decisions of the 19th Party Conference and were in contradiction to those decisions in the sense that they marked a movement away from democratization and toward limitation on republics' rights and greater centralization."

"At the meeting with jurists we went over all of this in detail and I feel confident in stating to you that there was no deviation from the decisions made at the party conference. I repeat, with one exception we did not find a single fundamental deviation from the decisions of the party conference. Everything was gone over step by step, all the arguments presented by your fellow jurists. The discussion was unconstrained, and I do not believe that there is any need to repeat it. You professors can tell you about it. The assertion that the draft laws in question run counter to the decisions made at the party conference is absolutely without foundation. It is simply that some people have wrongly interpreted the nature and objective of these documents. Some people think that they contain an answer to all the questions brought up at the party conference and to all its resolutions. Yet that is far from the truth. They are merely the first real step on the road to improvement of the Soviet political system and improvement of legislation pertaining to just one issue: the structure and prerogatives of our country's highest organs of state authority."

"As for the jurisdictional relationship between the Union and the republics, as for the problem of republic economic administration, as for other problems, including the language problem, the matter of citizenship and so on, these are not dealt with in these draft laws. Those matters are currently under consideration and are being elaborated. You can read the text of a Central Committee resolution on preparations for a CPSU Central Committee Plenum entitled 'On Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the USSR,' which resolution has been published in the newspapers; there this point is discussed clearly and unambiguously. It would be wrong to seek answers to these questions in the draft laws."

"Now more specifically about the right of a republic to withdraw from the USSR. Read Article 72 of the current USSR Constitution. It remains unchanged and will not be affected by these draft laws. However, they do refer to new prerogatives for the USSR Supreme Soviet, which would be a different organ than what it has been in the past. This is being done in consideration of world parliamentary experience. It would be a virtually continuously functioning organ, something like a state council. It would function on a regular basis both at its plenary sessions and through its commissions and other organs. The prerogatives of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium and a number of other issues also need to be resolved. Hence the need to adopt the two aforementioned documents at this stage, in order to resolve these issues."

"As for matters of regional, including republic-level, cost-accounting, matters, I repeat, concerning the distribution of authority between the Union and the republics, we will not avoid these issues. All of them will be resolved, but we must not try to solve them all at once. That is what I am saying."

"And a word about the right of a republic to withdraw from the USSR. In my opinion there is no contradiction here, either, because this amendment to the Constitution does not deal with a republic's right to leave or join the Union, but rather with the procedure for the USSR Congress of People's Deputies to reach a decision on this question. The constitutional standard regulating the composition of the Soviet Union, i.e. the number and identity of the republics that comprise it, is solely the prerogative of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. There is no contradiction in that. No one is infringing on peoples' right to self-determination. The constitutional right of republics to withdraw from the USSR as expressed in Article 72 is not affected by the draft laws in any way whatsoever; it is not the subject of the two documents. Therefore there is no reason to interpret what is happening now as a limitation of republics' rights or a reinforcement of centralized functions. The only thing being discussed is practical definition of the powers of central state organs, in order to determine what sort of organs people are going to be electing deputies to after the Constitution has been amended. Discuss this again in detail, read the documents carefully, and you will see that the rights of union republics are not being infringed in any way. The draft election law envisions a multi-candidate system. For some reason no one here has mentioned the fact that plans are being made to put two or more candidates on the ballot for deputies to the Congress of People's Deputies. For some reason no one has said anything about expansion of the Supreme Soviet's functions or the transition it is going to make to continuous operation, about greater rights for commissions or legislative control over the functioning of executive organs. For some reason no one is talking about these things. Yet all of them are precisely in accordance with the letter and spirit of the conference. You need to read carefully and not yield to vague sentiments that are based on very superficial study of these documents."

**Yu. R. Zakis:** "Yesterday renowned jurists Boyars, Bisher and Plotniyeks participated in a discussion that lasted until about midnight; they defended our republic's interests. Today they are otherwise occupied, else they could tell you about that discussion. As it is it seems we will have to go over all the same issues again."

**V. A. Medvedev:** "We agreed with them that all the suggestions and doubts that they had which could give anyone reason to think that any limitations are being placed on democracy will all be presented to the Supreme Soviet working commission that is handling these matters. And they will be presented in Moscow by the aforementioned individuals personally, so that all these questions can be gone over there in greater detail and with consideration given to all their legal nuances. What we are talking about here is the incorrectness of the 'ultimatum' approach. Almost immediately, just one or two days after the draft laws were made public, assertions were made that the laws were antidemocratic and even counterrevolutionary and therefore unacceptable; in short, that they need to be withdrawn from discussion.

But we have just one request: that people read these documents carefully, and this will without fail convince any unbiased reader that they are in accordance with the letter and spirit of the party conference."

**Viya Shmaukstele,** a fourth-year student in the Law Department: "Nonetheless I would still like to address the draft law on changes and amendments to the Constitution. At the 11 November discussion, where, by the way, I feel that the opinion of the majority of our republic's people was not expressed, it was stated that the amendments would affect only the country's highest organs of state authority. But the Constitution of the USSR is a unified document, and everything is interrelated, everything will in some way be reflected in the lower-level organs of state authority. I feel that a document like the Constitution should be reexamined as a whole. This is the opinion of a majority of students in our department. We could find ourselves in the situation of adopting these amendments and later having to amend them again. Incidentally, this also applies to article 72 and 108 of the Constitution, which in my opinion are mutually contradictory, i.e. the new redaction of Article 108 limits the right of a republic to join or withdraw from the USSR."

**V. A. Medvedev:** "I can only say one thing in reply. The Constitution is a fundamental, exceptionally serious document; indeed, we must take a very responsible attitude toward all amendments to it. I agree that many other articles of the Constitution also need to be amended. And they will be amended. Among other things, the preamble to the Constitution has for many reasons become outdated. It was written when we were guided by different principles, not quite realistic or even absolutely unrealistic. That is all true. When this matter was brought up the question of whether to review the entire Constitution at this time was discussed. But we are not yet ready for that; we are not ready to consider all at once all the questions pertaining to union republics and local organs. These questions require study. We are also not ready to resolve many other issues. We simply need time to do so. I think that the time will come when the Constitution as a whole will be reviewed, including its preamble. That is not the most correct way; it is not very good to be making amendments to the Constitution every six months. But that is the sort of period we are now experiencing, a tumultuous period of changes that makes it impossible to foresee all the changes and embody them in a single, one-time legal act. Where should we begin? With the structure of the highest organs of state authority. Next year in connection with elections to union republic Supreme Soviets and the formation of local organs of state authority the issue of revising republic constitutions will also come up. We must not lump all these issues together now. We have to start somewhere. And this is where we have started. But this does not exclude the possibility of resolving other matters, although I must admit that there are indeed some shortcomings in the Constitution of the USSR."



"It will be necessary to come back repeatedly and make changes in various articles. Such is this time of marked and very serious changes, changes that even now are difficult to foresee and for which it is even more difficult to draw up any sort of permanent constitutional standards."

**Aleksandr Firsanov**, second-year student in the Law Department: "Nevertheless I would like to return to the subject of the draft laws. Firstly, it seems to me that one month is far too short a time for discussion of them, since these amendments to the Constitution contain many new points such as the Congress of People's Deputies, the Constitutional Review Committee [Komitet konstitutsionnogo nadzora] and several others. Secondly, there should be some publication that would report on the proposals being received by the commission that is assigned to summarize suggestions. The people should know what sort of suggestions are being received, which ones are being rejected and which are being adopted as the draft law takes shape. I, too, have a suggestion to make. I feel that the new draft law is undemocratic. In what way? In that it will lead to excessive centralization of the organs of power. In my opinion the Supreme Soviet is a superfluous branch rather than democratization."

"Now a word about the educational system. As a student I am very dissatisfied with it. It is taking far too long to write new textbooks, in particular textbooks on CPSU history and political economy. When I was preparing to enter the university there was no history textbook. There was none during my first year, either. I am also dissatisfied with the way knowledge is tested. I feel that a new centralized system should be developed. Our examination system is in my opinion outdated. It does not show the whole picture. The result is that a VUZ mainly produces incompetent graduates. What is your opinion on this point?"

**V. A. Medvedev**: "Not enough time has been allotted for discussion of the proposed amendments, of course. But if you take into consideration the fact that all the fundamental issues were also discussed in preparation for the 19th Party Conference, then the time does not seem so short. The Congress of People's Deputies, the Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Supreme Soviet chairman and the new election law—all these basic issues have been very hotly debated, and some matters were even voted on at the conference."

"The present period of general public discussion was determined with a view toward adopting a new structure, a new system of state organs and a new election law so that elections to the Congress of People's Deputies could be held. This will take some time both under the current Constitution and under the future one. And we still have to have elections on the republic level. We need to have a complete constitutional basis for them as well. It is envisioned that overall reform of our country's political system will be complete by the end of next year. That is to say quite a lot of time will be devoted to the reform,

and there are other no less important issues in the realm of the economy and social issues. We should bear in mind that in the end the fate of restructuring will be decided in precisely those areas. It was in consideration of all these things that the time frame and sequence for publication and discussion of documents was established. We simply need to conduct the discussion more intensively and keep sending our suggestions to the Supreme Soviet."

"As for your suggestion concerning information on the status of the discussion, I think you are right. Such information does exist to a certain extent, but it is indeed essential that it be expanded, particularly when actual discussion of the new draft laws by a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet begins."

"Now a word about social science textbooks. We began working on a political economy textbook at the end of the summer last year; I was assigned to be in charge of that work. In May of this year the compilation of the new textbook was completed and it was signed to press. This will be a textbook with new, nontraditional approaches. This has been reported in the press, and the structure of the textbook was published for discussion. The manuscript itself was discussed in a number of cities around the country, including here in Riga. As you are aware this is a tremendously difficult task, because the process of economic restructuring has essentially just begun. Thus, this new textbook is merely a first attempt to interpret the problems of political economy in light of restructuring, in light of the kind of society that will emerge as the result of restructuring. This will be a new expostulation of the problem of property, production relationships, cost-accounting and the market. Much remains unclear and much has not yet fully proven itself. Nonetheless work on the textbook has, as I said, been completed and it will be published by the end of this calendar year."

"The same difficulties are being encountered in connection with the creation of a new CPSU history textbook. Therefore the decision has been made to publish in the interim a book of essays on CPSU history instead of, so to speak, a canonized and stabilized textbook. True, much is already clear in principle, and evaluations of the 1920's and 1930's have already been given. But only on key issues. Much remains to be weighed with regard to the fundamental historical periods. CPSU history also still needs to be populated with specific individuals and evaluations given of them that will be based not on the subjective views of Stalin or anyone else, but instead will reflect real tendencies in the historical process, objective processes and needs. This is a task of exceptional importance. Therefore I cannot make any promises concerning a publication date for the CPSU history textbook. It will probably take another year to evaluate CPSU history; this will be a weighty tome, perhaps even two smaller books, by the time it reaches the readers. But I am certain that it will be a good, interesting book."

**Aynars Bruvelis**, fourth-year student in the Department of Physics and Mathematics: "We, as apparently other students all over the country, have a pressing problem: our stance on military service. In this regard the following issues can be defined: firstly, the appropriateness of inducting students into active military service at all, as this interrupts studies for two years and has a major influence on which basic degree one receives. Secondly, studies in the Military Department. In this regard the following points can be delineated. There is a lack of correlation between military specializations and civilians ones, there is a lack of correlation between the military specialization learned and the one which a student studied while serving in the army. Naturally all this results in time lost from study of one's basic specialization. Many more hours are spent in the Military Department than in any other subject of a student's basic civilian specialization. And, finally, there is the question of the possibility of establishing regional military units."

**V. A. Medvedev**: "In the future all problems, including the question of military training for students at VUZs and their induction into active military service, will be resolved against a backdrop of the changing world situation, greater detente and a lessening of military confrontation, but at the present time military service is the duty of every citizen. Everyone is well aware of that. The same applies to the appropriateness of continuing studies toward acquisition of an officer's rank at VUZ military departments. These issues will be resolved. As for matters which need to be resolved immediately, which depend solely on you, i.e. depend on the heads of the educational system and on the appropriate military authorities, there should indeed be a precise correlation between a student's military training and that student's basic specialization."

"Concerning an end to induction during the academic year. I am aware that this continues to happen; it is wrong, it is in violation of existing agreements and existing documents. A person can only be inducted following completion of the first or second year of study. Otherwise irreparable harm may be done. But, I repeat, in the future this matter will be considered in greater detail. With consideration given to whether officer training without interruption of study is appropriate to present-day tasks and whether such training has proven to be feasible. As for regional military units, I must say quite frankly that I am not really sure what that means. These are questions of a military nature. If you are referring to the possibility of performing military service at the place of induction, then I can tell you quite frankly that, even though you may not like it, from the standpoint of military training and military policy this is unrealistic and difficult to accomplish. Policy can also go in the other direction: it might be convenient for someone inducted in Central Asia to serve in Russia, or vice versa. But what is decisive in this respect is military necessity; it has its own criteria. That is the answer to your question."

**Yanis Turlays**, fourth-year student in the Geography Department: "We have still not touched on a question that is one of the most sensitive for us: the nationalities question. Yesterday a female worker, from the Alfa Association, I believe, got up and alleged that ethnic relations in our republic have been made more complicated by the founding congress of the Latvian People's Front. As far as I know these problems were always complicated and this problem has always existed in Latvia during the postwar period. From a former share of three-quarters there are now less than one-half Latvians, the indigenous nationality, in this republic. And that is a critical boundary for further normal development of an indigenous nationality. Despite the fact that the decision is now being made to end migration, one thing is clear: with the existing demographic situation in our republic the percentage of Latvians will continue to decline, because we have more elderly people. Therefore I feel that we need not only to halt migration, but also create the proper conditions for the culture of the indigenous nationality to flourish, and that of other nationalities as well, but the native population in particular. For where else can it flourish if not in the territory inhabited by its people? I also think that the government of the USSR needs to improve the situation in those regions from which the majority of workers have emigrated to Latvia: the Non-Black Earth Zone and Pskov, Novgorod and Kalinin oblasts, places where villages stand abandoned today. These oblasts need state assistance to help them solve their labor-resource problem. I think that here we can handle things ourselves through an increase in labor productivity. What is your opinion on this issue?"

**V. A. Medvedev**: "I have already expressed my opinion on this subject on numerous occasions, including at a meeting with your republic's ideological aktiv. I agree that problems with interethnic relations have come about gradually and have accumulated without being resolved as they should. This applies to the status of the republic and excessive centralization, especially with regard to the economic ministries. They have devoted too little attention to social issues. Production facilities were built, but social issues were relegated to local organs. This applies to problems of regional cost-accounting, demographic problems and the republic's ethnic composition. I will repeat what I have already said: at this point in time it is difficult to accuse anyone of letting this happen. I do not think that anyone could imagine that someone carried out a careful, well-planned policy of settling Russians here and reducing the proportion of the native population. More likely this occurred because the process was not noted and not enough significance was attached to it."

"Now when figures on industrial development are cited we stop and ask ourselves whether such development is positive or negative. I think that industry is the basis for this republic's economic development. Today no state, no country can exist without its own industry. Particular

those sectors that are on the cutting edge of scientific-technical progress like electronics, microelectronics and certain others. It is another matter altogether that when enterprises were established in this republic consideration was not always given to where they would get the materials and labor to operate. As a result it has been necessary to import labor. In this respect many things were left undone, even determination of income and salary levels at such enterprises. Prior to this trip I talked with Estonian representatives, and it turns out that at 10 enterprises in their republic which are under all-union jurisdiction the average pay is lower than in local industry. So everything is not just black or white, and one should not see ill will or some sort of sinister intent and objectives behind everything."

"Everything should be analyzed. Take the problem of the ethnic composition of the working class. The Latvian proletariat is our pride, the pride of the republic, of our people, of our revolution. But this was lost sight of; after a while there began a process of dissolution or, in any event, a reduction in the percentage of the native population in the working class. It was necessary to take some kind of measures and conduct economic and social analysis. Take the composition of students at vocational and technical schools. There the percentage of young people of native ethnicity is lower than in the working class and in the population as a whole. The same picture is found at technical VUZs. In talks with Alfa workers it was discovered that often needed engineering-technical cadres come from VUZs in Moscow and Leningrad. Why? It turns out that Riga Polytechnical Institute does not offer cadre training in the appropriate specialized fields. Who should be thinking about that? Everyone should, but most of all you here in this republic should. These matters need to be resolved rationally. Instead of inflaming passions and yielding to emotion, people should deal with these issues in a specific matter."

"As for Latvian culture, it is a distinctive and brilliant phenomenon. And everything possible should be done to ensure that it will flourish, to ensure that the Latvian language remains on a high level. But these problems must be resolved on the basis of the Leninist principle that there must be no bureaucratic pressure, that actions must be taken on the basis of people's real needs, real sentiments, interest and wishes. All these things should be the subject of serious, in-depth analysis. We all have a stake in ensuring that cooperation between our peoples grows stronger, that relations between people in this republic are normal, health and comradely, as was true here in the past. The so-called migrants should not be blamed. It is not their fault. Nothing should be done to offend them or attack their dignity. Just as, of course, full respect should be shown for the ethnic needs of the Latvian population."

**Response from the audience:** "It should be made clear that these tendencies were determined in Moscow, not in Latvia. That has now been confirmed. I read in an Estonian newspaper that at a plenum of creative unions

in that republic the following statistic was cited: in 1940 Estonia, and by extension our republic as well, was on a par with Finland, yet today we are lagging behind it by 15-20 years. What is the explanation for that?"

**V. A. Medvedev:** "Well, you see, we need to read through the whole treatise and determine where you are lagging behind and where you are not. You know, statements like that do not really amount to much because they are based more on emotions than on rational analysis. Yes, in some ways you are lagging behind, and the country as a whole is lagging behind in many areas. We are all analyzing that and criticizing it. Now that our country's leaders have opened up the prospect of restructuring and set an example of unbiased analysis of our problems, we are beginning to criticize them for things that happened in the past. Yes, we need to analyze so that mistakes will not be made."

"On the matter of whether everything was decided in Moscow. True, many things were decided in Moscow. But it is bad that the appropriate decisions were not made in this republic. There is no need to seek out those who are to blame for what happened. We need to seek ways of getting out of this situation and of solving all the problems we are facing today."

**Aynis Tora,** third-year student in the Department of History and Philosophy: "You spoke of regional cost-accounting. I do not like that word; it would be better to call it republic cost-accounting. And if that is introduced, many problems would be solved. What is your opinion on that point?"

**V. A. Medvedev:** "I am favorably inclined toward the idea of regional and republic cost-accounting. You do not like regional cost-accounting, but we are talking about transferring oblasts and krais to cost-accounting as well, not just republics. What is the purpose of regional cost-accounting? To create a closer correlation between the quality of a republic's work and its people's standard of living."

"The idea is a correct one, as is the idea of cost-accounting overall. A republic utilizes the resources which it possesses, performs certain duties for the benefit of the country and disposes of the remainder as it wishes. This applies to finances and food and other matters. So where is the problem with this? In the question of whether to put economic sectors under central, republic or local jurisdiction. This is a real problem. I think that the idea that all enterprises located within the territory of a given republic should be completely withdrawn from control by all-union departments is simply unrealistic, because many of them are bound to other enterprises by ties of cooperation. The thing to do is not to remove them from all-union control, but to put all-union enterprises on full cost-accounting. So that they can manage their own resources, operate on a basis of full cost-accounting, hopefully on the second model of it, fulfill their obligations to society, and divide the remainder of their income among the members of the collective. And

so that they will have a well-defined relationship to the local budget and local soviets. So that the development of the social infrastructure will be the responsibility of all-union enterprises. That is the way things should be done. And in other areas, in the sense of finances and food, the relationship should be thus: a set level of obligations to society, because the state as a whole has needs, with the remainder to be disposed of by the republic. I am in agreement with this principle. What do I mean 'I am'—Lenin himself set forth this principle in the idea of a food tax. Under other conditions, as part of other processes, true, but the principle is the same. Firm obligations to society, with the remainder to be used at one's own discretion."

**Response from the floor:** "You have insinuated that our republic itself is to blame for many things not being done here. But we feel that after 1959 we did not have our own leaders, just puppets. Avgust Boss, for example. Yet today it is he and people like him who are going to decide how we shall live in the future, because they are Supreme Soviet deputies. They will also decide what our new constitution will be like, whether like the draft law or a different one. Where is the democracy in that? Would it not have been better to pass a new election law first and then draw up a constitution?"

**V. A. Medvedev:** "Actually that is what was done. The main subject of discussion is structure and procedure. Comrades, I do not have any authority or grounds upon which to evaluate the former leaders of your republic. This question does not fall within my area of personal competence, thus I will refrain from answering it. I would like to emphasize that in the final analysis the problem does not lie with specific individuals, but rather with the general principles of leadership. The soviets' role was indeed undervalued. We are currently working to restore that role. There was indeed excessive centralism with regard to a number of issues. We are currently working to rectify this. We are going to do this now so that the republic, upon which responsibility for the state of the economy and for the state of social issues will be placed, will be genuinely capable of solving these problems. Problems like the distribution of production facilities, ecological problems, problems in the social structure. And so that republic organs of authority will be under the strictest control from below. The Supreme Soviet will be controlled by the voters, and party leadership organs will be under the control of rank-and-file party members and party organizations. This work is being done everywhere; it is the essence of political reform. That is what we want to achieve in the end, the goal toward which we are moving. Let us move toward it faster and better so that we will not have to return to these matters. And, most importantly, this means democratization, this means control from below, by the voters and the masses and, finally, by you. Your own activism is what our party is appealing for and is the path upon which we now stand."

**Gunars Kusunsh,** fifth-year student in the Law Department: "I have three questions for you, Vadim Andreyevich. What is your stance on the idea of paid studies at

VUZs? Second question: what is the status of work on a youth law and, if possible, what is your opinion as to the appropriateness of such a law? And my third question, which pertains to me directly, is as follows. After graduation from a VUZ a young specialist often receives a salary of 120-140 rubles per month. Considering the present rate of inflation and hidden price increases that is ludicrous. What is your position on this problem?"

**V. A. Medvedev:** "Concerning paid study. If you mean the student pays, then I am opposed to that. I feel that that contradicts the principle upon which our society is based and runs counter to social justice. Because it is unfair to make access to higher education dependent upon the income and the material status not so much of the young person himself as of his parents. Free education is an achievement of our socialist society. But I am in favor of payment for the training of students at VUZs. This idea was incorporated in the higher education reform. At the time I was working in the CPSU Central Committee Science and Educational Institutions Department. This idea corresponded to a number of other fundamental ideas: radical changes in the relationship between VUZs and practical production work, transition to training of students on a contractual basis, an end to the race for quantity in the training of specialists and perhaps even a reduction in the total number of students. Plus emphasis on quality and on individual forms of training and academic processes in order to raise specialists' level and intensify the connection between science and production at all stages of student life. I am particularly in favor of integration of our country's universities with the academies of sciences of the USSR and the union republics, referring to republic universities. That is my position. Specialists should be paid worth their weight in gold. Organizations and enterprises should order specialists' training so that graduates will know in advance where they will be working. Perhaps this could be drawn in the form of some sort of contract or agreement. Perhaps this would also help solve the problem of young specialists' salaries. I favor case-by-case, individualized training of specialists. That is my position; incidentally, it has to a certain extent been reflected in documents pertaining to the reform of higher education. But some things, and this is my personal opinion, although it is not very proper for a party leader to criticize documents which were published quite recently, but as I personally see things some of the things of which I spoke were approved hurriedly. But nothing has been done that cannot be undone. I think that life will force us to return to these issues sooner or later. In reference to the kind of payment that enterprises, organizations and clients would make to VUZs for the training of each specialist, I feel that this kind of system could change many things, both psychologically, in the economy and socially."

"The youth law. It is being worked on by the Komsomol Central Committee. At this point I cannot tell you anything specific, as we have not yet been asked for advice. I feel that a law of this type should be passed. In

a state governed by law as ours is all processes should be legislatively regulated. All relationships should be regulated by legislative legal acts developed on a democratic basis and passed in accordance with the procedures of various organs of state authority, not by administrative decisions or someone's subjective will. Especially since we are talking about a segment of the population like young people, who are our present and our future. From a psychological and educational standpoint it would have great significance to begin to teach people in their early years to live in a society of law, a society based on the law and the law alone. As well as, of course, on one's own perception, conscience, conscientious attitude toward one's job and other moral incentives to action."

**Gundars Vilks**, fourth-year student in the Department of History and Philosophy: "I would like to hear your opinion on the status of people who took part in the repressions of the Stalinist period. There have been articles in the press stating that they enjoy privileges and wear medals, yet we do not know for what reason they received these things. Even if they cannot be brought to justice, society should at least know why they are privileged. And my second question is whether it is still necessary to limit broad public access to certain literature, use of which currently requires special permission?"

**V. A. Medvedev**: "The complexity and tragedy of those years stem from the fact that many people who were guilty of making accusations against other people became in their turn the victims of repression and perished. This is a very complex issue, one which the rehabilitation commissions run into constantly. Although in principle historical truth should be fully restored and each person should get his just deserts. I am in favor of this, I think that is the only correct thing to do. Everything should be revealed in full. This work is continuing. There are still over 60 major rehabilitation cases to be considered, as well as many other cases. The task of historians and researchers is to restore the entire historical truth. To accomplish this a number of steps must be taken. There is no other way to clear our history and our conscience. Another matter, one on which jurists must have their say, concerns the statute of limitations. We are becoming a state ruled by law, and therefore our laws must be just. But everything should be evaluated in a historical and a moral sense."

"Concerning closed literature. As far as I know, virtually all the special literature sections have been opened up. There are various regimes, for example that of 'for official use only.' But I think that we are heading toward the point where all restrictions will be lifted and all materials in a library will be accessible to everyone. There is also another aspect to this issue. Some people are suggesting that works by many emigre authors, including authors from the latest emigration period, be published in this country. Basically this is being done little by little, in those cases where the works are not of an overt, provocative anti-Soviet nature and the authors'

perceptions of the world are within the bounds of general humanistic and other world-view problems. Such works will continue to be published. It is more difficult when we are talking about works of an overtly antisocialist and anti-Soviet nature, works that are in open contradiction to our ideology and struggle against it and against our policy."

"Can we publish these things? We cannot, although therein lies a problem. People are going to say: let us decide for ourselves. But we cannot publish open incitements to struggle against the existing system."

"A peculiar situation has arisen in our mass information media today. There has never been such openness in the press, such glasnost as today. Nor perhaps is there in any other country. In any society there always exist certain controls on information and ideology. We have removed them. We have done away with the regime of bans and required permission, but we have not established a new one. But one should be established. We need a press law. In any civilized country there are legislative standards which regulate the functioning of the mass media. We need this in our country as well because in some cases glasnost has begun to overstep the boundaries. What do I call a boundary? A boundary is something that may not be crossed, beyond which the underlying foundations our society begin, foundations which no one is permitted to undermine. We cannot allow that, because then we would be bereft of our basis. What is that? It is our socialist choice, the October Revolution, Lenin. We cannot deviate from these positions, yield them and allow them to become blurred, although in principle we are in favor of full, free and thorough discussion of all problems that may arise, in favor of finding solutions to them, in favor of maximum criticism and maximum control from below, including control via the mass media. This is a tremendous force. This is my stance on the question of access to sources of information and this is the position which I attempt to advance as I perform my functions as head of the CPSU Central Committee's ideological commission."

**Yanis Sonis**, third-year student in the Department of Physics and Mathematics: "Are you familiar with the documents from the founding congress of the Latvian People's Front and with documents from Interfront, and what is your position on those documents? My second question: would it not be best to cut out courses on the social disciplines for a period of time, say a year or a year-and-a-half, as there are no new books available in those areas? Then we could make up the courses later. My third question concerns VUZ autonomy that would allow all decisions to be made locally."

"And one last thing. This is in reference to your speech yesterday. Where did you get the figures you cited yesterday, for instance, 84 kilograms of meat consumption per capita annually? Is that the Central Committee's opinion, or were they provided by our republic State Statistical Committee?"

V. A. Medvedev: "Concerning your fronts. I have read the program of the People's Front. I think that my assessments and my opinions concerning this program are no different from those that are taking shape in society. And the gist of them is that in large part the program reflects real needs in the development of our society at this stage of restructuring. Thus the programmatic principles of the People's Front set forth in that section which corresponds to the tasks of restructuring elicit no objections; on the contrary, they deserve support. True, I can tell you that I was a little bit surprised that the word 'socialism' was not used even once in the program of the People's Front. No reference was made to support for the socialist choice. Support was expressed for the 27th Party Congress and the 19th Party Conference. Rightly so. Yet this purely declarative form is avoided and not used. Is that coincidental or not? Let us consider the matter together. Let us note this. I am not even going to talk about the fact that there were also no references to Lenin's ideological- theoretical or moral heritage. There are points that must be disputed, there are points with which it is difficult to concur. These are found mainly in the economic portion of the document. It seems to me that this section is not completely realistic. Incidentally, that is not just my opinion, it is also the opinion of some Western observers that many of the economic proposals are illusory and impossible to implement. They run counter to present-day worldwide trends in economic and scientific-technical development. To put it simply, they are somewhat naive. For example, I am of the opinion that the formulation of structural restructuring of the republic economy with an emphasis primarily on meeting the republic's own needs is at odds with general world tendencies in present-day economic and scientific-technical development. I am talking about integration processes, which are proceeding in Western Europe by leaps and bounds while we have unfortunately lagged hopelessly behind. It is impossible to solve major modern scientific-technical problems within the bounds of individual regions, individual republics or even individual states. We, the Soviet Union, a huge country, now need scientific-technical cooperation despite all our vast resources. A lag in this respect dooms an economy to a vegetative state and in the end is inevitably reflected in its level of labor productivity. I say this to you as an economist."

"To sum up, there are points that coincide with the decisions made by the conference, with our development orientations and with restructuring, and these are worthy of support. On the other hand, we must discuss and debate and not take everything on faith; rather, we must not take anything on faith."

"I have not read any other documents."

"Concerning a hiatus in social science courses. I think that this should not be happen, CPSU history courses included. Many new materials are being published, including the ones published by PRAVDA on a regular basis. You and your instructors should look into these

together. Some articles contain subjective ideas. There are also mistakes and biased assessments. This is a very serious matter. We at the center are currently working with journalists and editors to ensure that they are stricter with regard to these issues. We are now trying to wean our readers, and foreign readers as well, by the way, away from the habit of interpreting every article as an expression of official opinion. Materials will continue to be published. There are many of them, and they should be used in conjunction with lectures, seminars and, yes, even the old textbooks, except that now these need to be examined critically. And perhaps they should not be studied in order to learn the views that they contain, but instead in order to explain the erroneous nature of those views. In my opinion it would be wrong to halt the study of these questions because they are still of interest to you and you are still discussing them. Let us do so together."

"About meat. Those data are from the Statistical Administration. You really do consume 84 kilograms of meat per capita each year in this republic; the nationwide level of consumption is 64 kilograms. These data are absolutely correct; no one casts any doubt on them. It is another matter altogether that they are not fully comparable with the corresponding Western statistics. This is because they include certain first-category meat by-products. Roughly seven kilograms out of 84. But these by-products also comprise part of that figure of 64 kilograms. The data indicate that average per capita meat consumption is increasing in the Baltic republics, including Latvia. You realize that there is a well-known paradox here. Average per capita figures are one thing and the condition of the market is another. I remember the late 1950's when we did not know what to do with all the meat. There were few refrigerators; plans were even made to build natural refrigerators. It was impossible to sell all the meat that was produced. Why? Because of the corresponding level of income; average annual per capita meat consumption for the country as a whole was approximately 40 kilograms."

"I recall that following the reforms in 1947 anything could be bought. There was red and black caviar; they cost four rubles a kilo and were sold straight from the barrel. These things are all relative. This is what we are not doing, or are doing poorly: we are not providing adequate economic regulation of the correlation between labor productivity and salaries, between supply on the market and the public's cash income. There should be a different attitude toward this under the new economic mechanism. Increases in income should definitely be proportional to increases in the volume of goods available. Otherwise our difficulties will continue to mount. Furthermore I can tell you that there is a problem with prices for animal products. Nowhere in the world does there exist the same correlation between prices for food and industrial goods as in this country."

"Nowhere in the world are there double or triple production subsidies. You are probably aware that we pay kolkhozes, sovkhoses and individual producers three to

four times more for meat than it costs to buy it at retail. We pay about 80 billion rubles in subsidies each year for this purpose. These matters need to be evaluated in an economically literate fashion. That is the crux of the problem."

"A word about university autonomy. I think that we are moving in that direction; the rector can confirm that. One year ago the rector was selected in a democratic election. There should also be decentralization of administration in the areas of scientific and pedagogical work; some things have already been done in the areas of finances and staff discipline, though the degree of independence is still not what it should be."

\*\*\*

On the same day V. A. Medvedev met at the university with rectors, prorectors, secretaries of party committees and party buros and heads of social sciences departments from republic VUZs. The meetings was chaired by Ya. Ya. Vagris, first secretary of the LaSSR CP Central Committee.

Speaking at the beginning of the meeting, E. E. Lavendel, rector of Riga Polytechnical Institute, emphasized that a number of serious problems are hampering the training of specialists. One of them is the great degree of centralization in instruction pertaining to the educational process that are received from higher up. "We are a very small republic," he said, "and of the 320 specialized fields in which people are trained in the Soviet Union we—pardon me for citing last year's figures—train people in 120 of them in our republic. As you are aware, there is a system for sending national cadres to VUZs in other republics to study, but the system is virtually non-functional. I.e. very few graduates return to the places that originally sent them away to study. Therefore I feel that we should be able to draw up more general curricula so that we can meet our own requirements for the specialists that currently we are not training."

"Furthermore, I feel that there is no longer much need to talk about VUZ independence with regard to finances, because we are now going through an active period in which it appears that we are receiving all those rights. Now all we need is to be skillful managers. Otherwise it might turn out that we got our rights but then proved unable to manage our own affairs."

"Yet no one can avoid the social and political problems that are currently coming to the surface in our republic; very sharp debates are underway. As a delegate to the party conference from our institute I must follow its resolution and inform you that people at our institute are very disturbed by the draft amendments to the Constitutions. I feel that the amount of time allotted for discussion of these amendments is very short and that this should be done in a more serious manner; therefore I do not feel that it is possible for the USSR Supreme Soviet to adopt this draft law at the present time."

Ya. P. Poriyetis, head of the Latvian State University Department of Political Economy: "Esteemed Vadim Andreyevich, our economists have asked me to notify you of their request that you help our republic leaders ensure that union-level departments become ever more oriented toward the intensive path of development. They are referring to enterprises located in our republic. For many years now the development of our republic has been largely extensive, i.e. involved the importation of additional labor resources and additional physical resources. Metal and other materials were transported from very great distances. And this despite the fact that as far back as 1962 the USSR Academy of Sciences Council for the Study of Productive Forces drew up a document on the Western region and the BSSR which contained the following statement: 'The adoption of faster industrial growth rates in the LaSSR and ESSR will necessitate the transfer of labor resources to those areas from other regions of the country, which is not expedient.' And, further: 'Industrial construction in major centers such as Riga, Tallinn, Vilnius and Kaunas should be restricted.'"

"What was the result? During this entire period, i.e. up until the beginning of restructuring, which we are now trying to work on, the growth rate of capital investment in industry in our republic substantially exceeded the all-union rate. Over one-third of our republic's population now lives in Riga. Now it is becoming ever more difficult for rural workers to supply Riga with food. We bring in most labor from outside; we are one of the leaders among all the republics in this regard. Yet if one compares the growth rate of labor productivity in Riga with that in the rest of Latvia's territory it becomes evident that in the capital these huge capital investments are less effective than in other cities in our republic. I am currently head of the LaSSR Council of Ministers Planning Commission for the Regulation of Migration-Generated Population Growth. I have become convinced that if we do not put a stop to this extensive orientation in the development of our economy now we will be threatening to thwart our republic's Food Program and Housing Program, as well as programs for its cultural development and a number of other programs. Unfortunately I must report that migration-generated population growth of our republic's population is continuing, thus exacerbating an already difficult housing problem." By way of example Ya. P. Poriyetis cited the arrival of one of the union ministries in Olayne. It proposed to spend 41 million rubles on the development of production facilities in that city and only 1.5 million rubles on the social infrastructure. Yet the ecological situation in Olayne is already extremely alarming. Even Riga's water supply is threatened, because Olayne and Riga are located in close proximity to each other. In conclusion the Latvian State University department head spoke of the worsening of interethnic relations in the republic as a result of migration-generated population growth. Immediate restrictions should be placed on the self-interested

approach of centralized ministries that have enterprises in Latvia and do not take the republic's problems into consideration in their operations.

**V. A. Khodakovskiy**, rector of Riga Civil Aviation Engineering Institute: "I would like to direct your attention to the tense situation that currently exists in this republic. Our institute has felt its effects as well. I am referring to the campaign that has been unleashed in connection with the our alleged expression of a lack of confidence in our republic leaders. There have been voices raised saying that it is time to remove our institute from Latvia because it is supposedly causing demoralization. I state once again that this was not true in the past and is not true today. The Riga Civil Aviation Engineering Institute strives to make the greatest possible contribution to the republic economy. We are currently training specialists for the VEF Production Association, i.e. we are striving to overcome somehow the lack of needed specialists in this republic."

**V. K. Drachev**, head of Political Economy Department at Riga Civil Aviation Engineering Institute, expressed his alarm at the movement underway in the republic in opposition to the adoption of changes and amendments to the USSR Constitution. "One would get the impression that discussion of these amendments is intentionally being sidetracked onto secondary aspects," he said, "although it is quite obvious, and repeated clarifications have been issued from the highest level on this point, that the problem of national-state structure is not yet settled, that the corresponding documents are still in the preparation stage. If we in some way hamper the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet toward restructuring of the political system that will be a very real hindrance to the renewal that we have seen in the life of our country," said V. K. Drachev. He expressed support for Ya. P. Poriyētis with regard to the latter's statement that an immediate solution must be found to the problem of migration-generated population growth in the republic.

In his speech I. Ya. Gronskiy, rector of the Latvian Agricultural Academy, touched on the organization of student military training. Then he spoke on the subject of the republic's agricultural orientation. "We actively support the present leadership," he said, "because we feel that it favors agriculture. We have analyzed the situation scientifically and can state that Latvia is a region of stable agricultural production. And that is the type of development that our republic should have. Unfortunately for many years now that has not been the case, and this situation must be rectified. When tables are covered with food many of today's pressing problems will be solved."

Continuing, I. Ya. Gronskiy spoke of training for agricultural specialists. "At the present time, for example, tekhnikum provide one kind of training and VUZS another. There is no continuity in education. For example, we have a mechanization department, the largest. We train agricultural engineers. But we do not yet know whether there will be a need for this type of specialists in

rural areas over the long term. Today we do not need specialists who are left over from the era of machine-tractor stations. They are slaves to equipment; whatever happens in the fields or to the livestock is of secondary importance to them. Above all we need farmers and livestock breeders who also know equipment."

**V. A. Medvedev**: "It would be interesting if you would write down your ideas on changes in the nature and training of agricultural equipment operators. They will be of great importance to the Central Committee Plenum. In my opinion they are very much to the point."

**Yu. Yu. Saulitis**, head of the Political Economy Department at Riga Polytechnical Institute: "Life is moving ahead very quickly and social science materials are rapidly becoming outdated. We are encountering great difficulties as a result. We are supposed to follow mandatory curricula, yet even the latest curricula we have received are already outdated. Nevertheless we are forced to adhere to the officially-approved curricula. We cannot go on operating like that today. Each one of us is as a communist ideologist responsible for his or her particular area. But we need to have a right to choose for ourselves what is essential today and to give it to students, else we will fall behind the times."

"My second question concerns greater independence in students' work. The basis of that work is the textbook, but there is no textbook now. However, since we hold scientific titles and degrees we could probably compile the necessary materials within about three months. I think that we should have a right to do so."

"My third question. Some of us are writing long dissertations using materials published in Latvian. I propose that the republic Academy of Sciences be given the right to grant candidates degrees without their papers having to be translated into Russian."

**Ya. A. Pokulis**, secretary of the party buro at Daugavpils Pedagogical Institute: "We also have a pressing problem resulting from the induction of students into the army. But there is another no less pressing problem: students' seasonal work on kolkhozes and sovkhoses. Of course they do acquire certain skills and abilities and a love for labor by working there, but this work takes a great deal of time away from their studies. Now that students must do much more independent study than was previously the case this leads to serious problems. I think that this problem needs to be solved as quickly as possible."

**D. B. Klyavinsh**, prorector of the Latvian State Conservatory, commented that of late there has been an extreme upsurge in students' social and political activism. In this respect today's student learns more in a month than students used to learn in a year. The most heartening thing to see is that students are learning to shift the emphasis in the phrase "democratic centralism" from the second word back to the first; this is a sign of our times.



"The Latvian Conservatory, which trains musicians, educators, cultural workers and theater specialists is one of the smallest VUZs in our republic. Therefore the years of bureaucratic administration are especially vivid in our memory; in those years we were forced to adhere strictly to quotas drawn up somewhere centrally and designed for large VUZs without any consideration for the specific characteristics of institutions that train cultural specialists."

"I think that today's discussions between the two fronts, the People's Front and the International Front, discussions in which our students are participants, will be beneficial in the end, if we are able to grasp the fact that young people today are learning. They are learning political activism. They are learning how best to govern their own country. They are learning to fight the bureaucratic apparatus, which, as the people like to say, has its hands and feet in the republic and its head and money in Moscow. I agree that many problems cannot be solved immediately."

The prorector brought up the problem of cultural and aesthetic training for young people, a problem that remains to be solved. "It is time to truly put an end to the 'leftover principle' that still prevails in financing of the cultural realm," D. B. Klyavinsh said in conclusion.

**A. A. Silakova**, head of the CPSU History Department at Riga Civil Aviation Engineering Institution, focused attention to the need to publish a new party history textbook. It is also important, she stressed, to give historians a real opportunity to utilize archival materials. Then she said that steps must be taken to ensure that the LaSSR CP Central Committee Buro has the broadest support of communists in its work. This will help expand the role of party. Then both fronts, the People's Front and the International Front, will probably work for restructuring. As for the Riga Civil Aviation Engineering Institute, it is wrong to link it to the International Front. A group of its supporters has been organized at the institute, as at a number of enterprises. This group is attempting to exert a restraining influence on the movement, because both the International Front and the People's Front have extremist elements. "I was at the first meeting of the International Front organizational committee and chills ran down my spine when I heard some of the speeches. But it speaks well of the people chairing the meeting that they attempted to restrain that type of speaker. Our institute, I repeat, also does not support that kind of extremism."

**I. A. Zarin**, rector of the Latvian State Art Academy, expressed support for conservatory prorector D. B. Klyavinsh's thoughts on the need for a radical change in attitudes toward the material base of cultural institutions. There is an acute shortage of theaters, concert halls and exhibit space in the republic. However, there is a chance to earn money by selling paintings, graphic art and ceramics abroad and through exchanges of creative collectives.

**U. E. Augstkalns**, head of the Scientific Communism Department at Riga Polytechnical Institute, requested an explanation of how republic organs can defend the republic's interests when under the proposed amendments to the Constitution decisions made by union ministries are obligatory throughout the territory of the USSR. Would it not be more logical to base the Constitution of the USSR on republic constitutions instead of the other way around?

**A. E. Putninh**, party committee secretary at the Latvian Agricultural Academy, noted that the historical events of 1939 and 1940 in Latvia are of great significance with regard to the ideological situation in the republic. Perhaps archival materials need to be opened up. Latvia's historians do not have the materials they need to counter the assertions of those who claim that Latvia was occupied in 1940.

[passage omitted]

**Medvedev Addresses Latvian Scientists**  
*18000225 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian*  
*18 Nov 88 pp 1-3*

[LATINFORM report: "To Enhance the Prestige and Role of Science. V. A. Medvedev Meets With Scientists"]

[Excerpts] The problems of perestroika in science, the difficulties and prospects of its development, and the resolution of problems facing social scientists in our revolutionary time were the topics at a meeting of V. A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with members of the presidium of the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences and a group of scientists held in the morning of 14 November in the Academy's high-rise building. The meeting was also attended by Comrades Ya. Ya. Vargis, A. V. Gorbunov, I. Ya. Kezbers, V. P. Sobolev, and S. V. Zukul.

The meeting was opened by B. A. Purin, president of the Latvian Academy of Sciences and member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

At the end of the meeting it was addressed by V. A. Medvedev:

First, I would like to stress the profound connection between the restructuring [perestroika] undertaken on the initiative of our party and its new leadership after the April 1985 Plenum and science. Obviously, many specific problems in the sphere of organization of science are still to be resolved and discussed, but I must say one thing: From the very beginning, from the very first steps in the activities of the present Central Committee leadership, its unswerving principle and guiding rule was close ties with science, reliance on science. In all our

undertakings—economic, scientific, technical, political—we consult extensively with the Academy of Sciences and the scientific community, involving, one could say, the best minds of our Soviet society.

Practical steps have also been taken to enhance the prestige and role of science in our country's development. Great attention is given to the Academy of Sciences and the entire scientific establishment, including the republican academies of sciences, regional science centers, and so on. A very important document on the development of fundamental sciences is being prepared.

Many comrades attended the Academy of Sciences' general membership meeting, heard the evaluation, or more precisely, self-evaluation of the state of our fundamental sciences, and can appreciate how pressing and acute the problem is. Soviet science has begun to lose its traditionally strong world positions in many areas of major scientific and technical problems and in various areas of the country's development, in economic and social development. I would also like to stress science's great role in processes taking place in the republic and the need to enhance that role. I think this is true of all problems without exception on which your public attention is currently concentrated. Thus, all collectives are heatedly and passionately discussing questions of the republic's ethnic composition and how to regulate it.

It would be wrong to think that there was any deliberate, thoroughly thought out, elaborate policy of reducing the proportion of the republic's Latvian population. It was a spontaneous, uncontrollable process. Meanwhile, departmental interests also came into play, and in the absence of control over that process they led to such results. Both in the republic and, probably, in the Union as a whole. So what is the way out? In my view there is one way out. It is to raise the scientific-technical and organizational-economic level of the republic's economy, to take more resolutely to the road of intensification, of raising labor productivity.

I don't think there is any need for declarations that we are for the preservation of the Latvian nation. That is not the issue. Comrades here said that it was necessary to have confidence. Why are such reaffirmations necessary? It all depends on our work. The basic attitude towards the Latvian nation, as towards other nations, is absolutely clear. It derives from our policy, all the more so in the conditions of perestroika. We are for the development and flourishing of all our country's nations and peoples. Is there any doubt about this? But this must be taken more fully into account in the practical sphere, in economic and social policies. Now great opportunities are appearing for this in the sense of expanding the rights of republics, in the sense of transferring state power to the Soviets. Party leadership will be effected not by interfering in the decisions of government agencies but through communists working in government and other agencies.

It seems to me that in this connection the role of science must increase considerably. And all that is being done here to increase the practical returns of science, including academic science, to develop the economy and raise its qualificational, scientific and technical level is very important and deserves the most ardent and most resolute support.

The social sciences and economic sciences have before them a vast field of activity associated with rational forms of organization of the economic process as well as with formulating the most optimal decisions pertaining to the distribution of productive forces, specialization of the republic, and the prospects of its further development. I feel that work is in progress. It must be done, it has to be done, for practical purposes as well as for ideological reasons and for carrying out political work. Because at times naive, illusory notions appear, which are also reflected in some statements. For example, statements to the effect that the economy should be reconstructed and restructured in such a way as to function primarily for the needs of the republic.

Comrades, this is not serious. Isolation is the antithesis of modern trends of economic development, and it is rejected by world practice, for small countries as well as large. It is necessary to unite, to integrate. It is necessary to promote the division of labor. Obviously, division of labor should be as effective and expedient as possible so as to have an impact on reducing the costs of deliveries, as well as on raw materials problems and labor problems. This is all correct. But there is no escaping from problems of integration, from problems of determining one's optimal place in the all-union division of labor. Our economists and political economists must take a more active stance on these issues and explain them so as to prevent the appearance of futile illusions and even naive things.

Language and cultural problems. I fully agree with the comrades on this, and I have said many times that these are most sensitive issues resolution of which requires the utmost attention. And we must proceed from our basic tenets, which reflect the essence of the Leninist approach. We can argue about quotations and the interpretation of quotations, but the essence is that there can be no administrative pressure on this issue. Complete satisfaction of people's linguistic, spiritual and cultural requirements is our policy. Matters must be resolved in practice accordingly.

People have been speaking of declaring the republic's national language its state language. We have had this experience in the Transcaucasian republics. There is, of course, nothing unacceptable in it, but it must be correctly interpreted. Why do I remind you of Lenin's attitude towards this issue? The important thing is not the letter but the spirit of this attitude. There exists the danger of coercion and administrative pressure. If it is not allowed to happen, as it has not been allowed to happen in Georgia and the other Caucasian republics, then it is quite possible that no harm can come from such

a resolution of the problem. It is important not to lose sight of the essence of the matter, as well as of the need to follow the overall direction of our policy in this respect.

Legal science. I have spoken about, and commented on, the draft amendments to the Constitution and the new election law probably twenty times in the most different situations, from talks with scientists, executives of legal services and public order agencies, to meetings and talks in the streets. I must say that I have not heard a single argument that would support the idea that the drafts which have now been submitted for discussion in any way contradict with or deviate from the spirit and the letter of the 19th conference decisions. There are none. This is a myth. All the issues raised in the draft deal with the structure of state agencies—introduction of a Congress of People's Deputies, changes in the status and operation of the Supreme Soviet, changes in the functions of the Supreme Soviet presidium, introduction of the position of Supreme Soviet chairman—are exactly in accordance with the decisions of the 19th party conference. To say nothing of the election processes, democratization of the election process and functioning of new agencies of government. For some reason no one mentions this in the discussions, documents or adopted resolutions. But it's all there, what was discussed at the party conference: elections in multiple-mandate districts, including, as a rule, two or more candidates on the ballot, raising the status of deputies, making the Supreme Soviet a permanently functioning constitutional, democratic elective agency, and its supervision of the functioning of executive agencies. That is, all the democratic rules discussed at the conference and dealing with this area of questions have been fully embodied there.

The only exception is the election of people's judges. This question was even discussed yesterday in Yekabpils.

At the conference it was stated and recorded that judges must be elected at a higher level in order to assure that they are independent of the Soviets at the level of which they function. Our legislators found it necessary to change the approach to this question and suggest a different formula: election of people's judges by the Soviet at the level at which they function. The reasoning is quite simple: we cannot proceed from previous notions of the role of the Soviets. If the Soviets are to be fully empowered bodies set up completely on a democratic basis, with deputies controlled by the people, then, it is claimed, there is no reason for not entrusting them with the election of courts and judges.

I, for one, consider—and I have said as much—that this is an unjustified retreat from the conference decisions. We still have to make sure that the Soviets are indeed fully empowered bodies and then, perhaps, return to this question. That is the only retreat from the decisions of the 19th conference. There are no other exceptions.

It is hard to explain the reason for such an intense outcry in the three Baltic republics. It seems suspicious that this reaction surfaced just a few days after the publication of the two drafts, before any explanations or commentaries. People didn't have time to study and discuss all aspects, but the first resolutions already began to appear.

Initially everything was presented and perceived as though we were speaking of a new Constitution. But we are not discussing a draft of a new Constitution. All we are talking about are amendments to sections of the Constitution dealing with questions of the structure of new government bodies, the highest bodies of our government, and the election process. That is all. No other issues have been raised as yet; that is yet to come, including questions of the national-state system, division of rights and prerogatives between the Union and the republics, and so forth.

This seems to be clearing up now, especially since publication of the report on the Politburo meeting and the Central Committee decision on preparing for a plenum on interethnic relations. So, it is said, does this mean that the Constitution will have to be revised several times and amendments made several times? Yes, we will have to do that. Such is the period we are living in. Such is the perestroika process, that we will have to return several times to constitutional amendments on various issues, which will be presented for national debate as those problems develop and are identified. This is a major job, a serious job. It may go on for a whole year, but with regard to the republics it should be completed prior to the elections to the republican Supreme Soviets, which are due this fall. But there is no getting away from this. Such is the time we are living in, a tempestuous time associated with the appearance of ever new problems and the need to resolve them. Lumping them together in one heap, you know, is unthinkable.

More, I must say that by the end of this process there will, probably, arise the need for a general revision of the Constitution. Because many general provisions in it have also become obsolete, starting with the 1977 preamble. But such is life, and we'll have to do it.

Is this an indication of a kind of disrespect for our Constitution? No. It is simply an insistent requirement, precisely because we respect it and regard it as the Basic Law of our life. We will have to go back and make amendments as subsequent questions of legislative activity are elaborated. Indeed, I must say, the Constitution has been amended rather frequently, even during the stagnation period. This is a common process of legislative activity. That is why we elect our supreme bodies of government, authoritative bodies charged with constitutional activity, for them to work and work, and I see nothing exceptional about this. It is said that time is short. But these questions were discussed before. Moreover, other questions are so to say closing in on us, so we can't afford to drag our feet.

Our historical science. Many questions have been asked, especially in the streets, by young people, about the events of 1939, 1940, the war. Historical truth must be restored completely and appropriate archival materials pertaining to all process must be analyzed. This work is being intensively pursued at the center.

But what attracts attention is that this work has been conducted not by historians and experts but on a purely emotional level. A revision of historical events and of some important assessments is beginning for the Union and for the republic. But when you start discussing things you find that your interlocutors are totally ignorant. Our historians must join these processes somehow more actively. They should join in such a way so as not to just sweepingly revise fundamental assessments of our history. They must speak out about the distortions and mistakes which were made. But they should not allow the objective natural content of the historical process to be thrown out under the banner of criticism of the deviations of Stalinist methods from legality.

In this regard our historians and historical science have an exceptionally great and responsible role to play. It seems to me that they should do more to get out of the "trenches" and join this process, this struggle. As for archive materials, measures will be taken, at least at the center. You know that currently the CPSU Central Committee is undertaking a new publication which will contain much more information about current activities of the Central Committee and the Politburo and which will regularly publish archive materials pertaining to our party's history and materials from the personal archives of public figures of different periods.

In conclusion I would like to respond to statements made here regarding the republican leadership, central committee, government, and other agencies. I have listened to those statements throughout the last few days. They were very insistent, and they somehow supercharged the atmosphere. Some people apparently thought there was some kind of danger, which they seemed to associate with my arrival. I assure you that the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee has the same positive attitude, complete confidence and hope that your leaders will be able to handle affairs in this difficult situation in such a way as to enhance the role of the republican party organization and Latvian communists, to have a greater impact on the development of the socio-political situation in the right direction. That is, in a direction which supports all the useful initiatives of the people and the youth that are in line with perestroika while at the same time actively opposing negative, extremist manifestations. They have been mentioned, and they exist.

That is the spirit in which we shall be dealing with the leadership of the republican communist party's central committee: to continue to do everything for perestroika to advance steadily in your republic for the benefit of our socialist country.

As V. A. Medvedev was leaving the high-rise building of the Latvian Academy of Sciences he went over to a group of representatives of informal organizations. He said: I am unable to talk with you now, but you should listen to the speeches at the party-economic aktiv. The comrades will be speaking, and I will be dealing in detail with all issues.

[Voice]: May a new Constitution be adopted next year?

[Medvedev]: It is quite possible. This question will arise after a while.

[Voice]: Who will work on it?

[Medvedev]: We will work on it together. All together. We'll discuss it all together and work on it. There are many issues in it which have to be resolved. We'll work for a whole year on various issues connected with the Constitution.

[Voice]: Will there be representatives from the republic?

[Medvedev]: I met with your comrades. There is every opportunity to discuss it all in detail in Moscow. All amendments, all proposals. It will all be done.

[Voice]: Our only wish is to be masters in our own land.

[Medvedev]: That is a very fine wish. To be responsible for one's own affairs, to tackle them oneself, to be more active. That is in line with our concept of democratization.

[Voice]: And decentralization...

[Medvedev]: By all means. We will go along that road. True, these questions have as yet not been resolved in the proposed drafts, but everything will be done. Read the decision on preparations for the plenum on relations among nationalities. It states the issues on which we must work. This work will be carried out in detail with the participation of the republics. We will be taking the road of decentralization and democratization, true, with the preservation of central authority. That cannot be done away with.

[Voice]: May it not happen that first an amendment to the Constitution will be passed, then the plenum will be held, and in fact it will just burst like a bubble.

[Medvedev]: Amendments to the Constitution are irrelevant to the questions to be discussed by the plenum. It is a first step, a first stage. We are not adopting a new Constitution, there is no draft of a new Constitution. There are amendments. Read our papers for past years. Amendments to the Constitution are introduced regularly, even every year.

[Voice]: You replied on television that migration was purely fortuitous...

[Medvedev]: That isn't what I said. I said it was not premeditated. I also said that people shouldn't be blamed for this.

[Voice]: The issue is survival of a nation.

[Medvedev]: We must see how to resolve these issues in the future. We discussed this in detail with Yan Yanovich Vagris and other leaders. Incidentally, I was often told, "We support the leadership of the republic." As if we don't support them. We also support them. Let them gather strength. It depends on them. And there will be constitutional guarantees of the rights of republics. They are currently being formulated.

[Voice]: Give them more rights and they'll be able to do more.

[Medvedev]: They will be given so many rights that God give that everyone takes advantage of them. You now what happened with factories? And with collective farms in many cases? They were given rights, but now they say they don't need those rights, because they have to answer for them. One must answer for one's deeds.

[Voice]: I have a big request. Help me understand. What is "Interfront"? Who heads it?

[Medvedev]: Find out for yourself. Why should we interfere from above? Settle your own scores. Find common ground, but the important thing is not to create discord on ethnic problems.

### Latvian Popular Front's Creation, Future Policy Direction Examined

18000270a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA  
in Russian 6 Dec 88 p 6

[Article by SOVETSKAYA KULTURA special correspondents E. Govorushko and A. Kamenev: "The 'Front's' Line: From Confrontation to Consolidation"]

[Text] Riga-Moscow—Several weeks have passed since those days in early October, but it is only now that we are writing this material. Hasty evaluations can be dangerous and time was needed to interpret everything that had been seen and heard. The situation that had developed is much too unusual. For a long we did not notice that in the interethnic relations, in addition to indisputable achievements, there also proved to be a large number of distortions, and that the concepts themselves—the national, the interethnic, the sovereign—had begun to lose their primordial meaning. The time has come to look openly at those problems and to see them as they are. It is finally time to analyze the causes of today's situations, which, stating it outright, are aggravated ones. The Latvian Popular Front ■LPF■ has been created. What caused its birth? What course is its line following, and where is that line leading? Those are the problems to which the following notes are devoted.

"After the 19th All-Union Party Conference," Albert Kauls, chairman of the famous Adazhi agrofirma, and a person who is well-known not only in this republic but also throughout the country, said at the LPF congress, "the impression was formed that that the republic's party organization had gone underground. In Moscow, in the CPSU Central Committee, intensive work was under way to fulfill the programs that had been presented by the conference. But we were in the midst of a lull. Every day the party committee secretary would go to Riga, and then report that there were no news. It was then, in August, that we called a meeting of empowered representatives and decided: if we do not take the situation into our own hands, *perestroika* in the republic will choke to death in long expectations and word-mongering. We need actions. And that is how the base organization of the Popular Front was born, and how support groups sprang up in the brigades, on the agricultural plots, and in the shops. Almost a thousand persons united. They share a single opinion: we cannot wait any longer..."

It is possible that, with regard to the republic's party organization that had allegedly gone underground, this is quite a harsh statement, but the fact remains: after the 19th Party Congress a lull had actually occurred, and it was even noted in the newspapers. But people were waiting for an upsurge of work, they were waiting for radical changes... So, while the party agencies in the outlying areas were thinking things over and over, they themselves began.

The generator of the movement was the creative and scientific intelligentsia—famous writers and poets, artists, and leading scientists—and the point of departure was the united plenum of the creative unions which had been held last summer. What happened there can be considered, without any stipulations, a political discussion. The artists, writers, actors, directors, and art critics at that time seemed to forget their own professional problems. From the narrow circle of that plenum, the discussion engulfed the entire republic. Things that only one or two days previously could be said only within an extremely narrow circle began to be said at public squares, in parks, on the television screen, and on the pages of newspapers and magazines.

For 38 days—or, rather, for 38 days and nights—the Latvian Writers Union, and especially the republic's Artists Union, did not engage in any creative or cultural work, but instead prepared the congress.

"We have heard about the people's pains and aspirations," Yanis Peters, one of the leaders of the committee, chairman of the board of the Latvian Writers Union and member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia, said later on. "But something that proved to be stronger than the pains and the aspirations was the nation's firm resolve to act concretely and to straighten their backs once again after a long period of administrative pressure. But even today there are people who, even from high rostrums, advise us to engage in painting and to write

books, and to keep out of politics. But we shall return to the white sheet of paper and to the clean brush as soon as we feel that the workers find soothing for their pains and their thirst in the soviets of people's deputies, in the party committees, and at the administrative levels of the executive power, rather than in the creative unions. Why, then, are you cautious ones not reproaching those writers who went into the war and volunteered to go to the front to fight? So don't reproach us..."

One of the figurative meanings of the word "front" itself is treated as the unification of social forces for actions in a certain direction. True, we do not even allow ourselves to think that the country's domestic-policy life is also a front. The very beginning of *perestroika* demonstrated that this process would be no easy victory march. Because *perestroika* is the most real front, a front that requires the unification of all the social forces in order to bring to an end the job that has been begun. *Perestroika* began in accordance with the will of the party—or, rather, of its best advanced forces. It began at the top. But many have also said that without "revolution from the bottom" *perestroika* would immediately choke to death. Properly speaking, it was on this wave that the Latvian Popular Front was born.

"The nation supports the party line," Professor E. Melkisis, doctor of legal sciences, reflects aloud. "But there are things to doubt: there have been a lot of words, but not too many deeds. A restructuring of the political system is under way, but, for the time being, things have come to a standstill in the economy. It is no secret that the reforms that are only being planned are sometimes frankly sabotaged in the press, or we have heard from various rostrums outright appeals for the preservation of socialism, and statements to the effect that we are allegedly calling for capitalism. Yes, *perestroika* began at the top, but it also needs support from the bottom. The masses must be drawn into practical activity. This, then, is becoming one of the tasks of the Popular Front, which must concentrate the nation's initiative in order for *perestroika* to proceed more rapidly and more decisively and for it to affect all levels of management, all spheres of life. The inhibiting mechanism exists and it is still very strong. And this must be taken into consideration. One of the chief methods of the Popular Front is *glasnost*, *glasnost*, and more *glasnost*. So that the nation itself can make a judgment about everything that is being done in the name of the nation. So that the nation itself can choose and appoint its leaders—whether it be on the kolkhoz, in the rayon, or in the republic as a whole. Then the bureaucrats will look at things differently, because *glasnost* is a very strong weapon..."

Consequently, the Popular Front is being created in order to assure that *perestroika* proceeds in a radical and consistent manner, but if the activity rate of the masses is increased, will there be large changes? In principle, yes. But if we do not close our eyes to the existing gap between the apparatus and the masses, it becomes clear that the Popular Front has been called upon to be the

link between the ideals proclaimed by the party and the popular masses. And there is something else: the Popular Front must become one of the forms of direct democracy, of attracting the nation to the resolution of social and state affairs. That is the explanation that was given to us by people who during those days became political figures and suddenly (but was it really so suddenly?) felt their tremendous responsibility for *perestroika* in the republic.

This is, so to speak, the background against which the ideas of the Popular Front were born. It also had its other nuances, and there were extremely picturesque. To a considerable degree they were practically the basic premises for the creation of this Popular Front: the priority there is given, without a doubt, to the national question, and all the other questions are viewed through its prism. The complicated ecological situation?—the national environment will perish. The demographic problems are being resolved poorly?—the nation will perish. Things are not going well with the economy?—the republic does not have its independence. The sphere of language use is decreasing?—it will perish...

What else is being discussed? Here are the basic problems: the restoration of the historical truth and accurate evaluations of the events of 1939-1940; the unconditional rehabilitation of tens of thousands of Latvians who had been repressed in 1941-1949; the cessation of the bringing in of manpower into the republic from other parts of the country; republic-level cost accountability and economic independence; the priority of the national language and the declaration of that language as the state language for the republic. These are the basic ones. There are several others that are not as global, but that are no less important: the return from the "underground" of the national holiday—Ligo, the day of the summer solstice; the official recognition of the national flag—red-white-and-red—as a cultural-historical symbol; the transfer to the church of the Domskiy Cathedral, which currently houses a concert hall, and the church can coexist calmly with the philharmonic. Other questions that arise are the introduction of Latvian money, the rebirth of national military formations, and the representation of Latvia in international organizations. All these problems are closely intertwined with other ones. These are ecological and social questions, these are problems of genuine sovereignty of the people, this is the striving to get rid of incompetent decisions made by central departments, decisions that do not take the local conditions into consideration.

Are we really to believe that the republic's government did not hear those discussions? Did that government really withdraw from the resolution of questions that are so unusual, but that have risen to full height? No, it heard and it decided. It had already decided a lot. But in a rather shy manner. And so it turned out way that the government seemed to be acting under the pressure exerted by the rallies.

Literally three or four days before the Popular Front congress, there was a plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia [LaCP]: the administrators in the republic were replaced. Together with other members of the Central Committee Buro, they participated in session during all the days when the congress was at work. And it must be admitted that it was very unusual to see them not in the presidium, but in the auditorium, and, during the breaks, in the vestibules, and there was none of the customary and careful checking of passes at the entrances, and they also entered not through the mysterious "official entrance," but together with everyone else, presenting guest tickets.

Incidentally, much that happened at that congress was very unusual. Later on, at the republic's MVD, we would be told that during those days the situation in Latvia was considerably calmer, and that even the number of incidents concerning traffic and transportation that were registered was considerably smaller: there was live broadcasting of the sessions of the Constituent Congress of the Latvian Popular Front. On the first day, from 0900 hours to 0130 hours; and on the second day, from 0700 hours, when a solemn service began in Domskiy Cathedral, to 0300 hours, when the press conference ended. And on the third day, when there was an almost three-hour-long press conference with the republic's administrators and the Popular Front. It must be admitted that we could not recall another event that had attracted so fixedly the attention of the republic's population of more than 2.5 million persons. And things could not have been otherwise: people had started to speak openly and loudly about painful situations.

Yes, Latvia had achieved a relatively high level of production, but no integrated economic complex had formed in the republic, and there was no adequate policy of administering that complex. Many decisions pertaining to questions of the placement and development of productive forces were made without the necessary economic substantiations. And although the opportunities for extensive development had been exhausted long, long ago, new enterprises continued to be built by relying on the time-tested method of bringing in manpower. What happened as a result is known to everyone not only from the Latvian "experiment." Moscow also has been gobbling up the fruits of the "limit" that has been in existence for many years: the social infrastructure is falling behind, and the indigenous inhabitants sometimes prove to have worse everyday conditions than the newcomers. In Latvia, as in Estonia and Lithuania, these "grains" lay on a somewhat different soil—the interethnic relations became aggravated. The newcomers are reproached for not knowing the language and for not wanting to learn it, they are reproached for being disrespectful of the nation's traditions and for failing to understand its culture. These reproaches, we must admit, are not without foundation. But we must also mention something else. Even for a person who has lived in Latvia for many years it is not such an easy thing to study the Latvian language. Even the already formal

instruction in that language in schools has become considerably worse, there are no language groups or courses, there are no textbooks for adults... Be that as it may, a certain perplexity arose: aren't the interests of the non-Latvians suffering? Because, after all, there had been statements of this kind at the congress.

A very well-known performer went so far as to say that he was demanding for Latvians "living space"—that is the role that he has assumed for himself. His conscience will have to deal with that feat of virtuosity. But we might note that actually one of the most complicated aspects of the national question is migration.

"The Popular Front must consider this question completely," public-affairs commentator Yanis Shkapars said at one of the press conferences. "it is necessary to seek paths to assure that one nation does not build its happiness at the expense of another. We are living under a single roof and we must find a model to assure that people of all nationalities feel that they are identically comfortable, otherwise the national question will not be resolved. We must all seek this model together—Latvians, Ukrainians, Russians, Jews, Belorussians. There is no alternative to the consolidation of the Latvian and the Russian-speaking population, and another other path will inevitably lead us down a blind alley with undesirable results."

Well, then, is this Latvian Popular Front a party or a social movement? No, the Latvian Popular Front is not a party. This was emphasized both in the charter and in the program which were adopted by the congress after stormy discussions; the People's Front constructs its work on the basis of the resolutions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. This would seem to establish firmly the leading role of the party. But, in addition, as many delegates feel, today we have by no means exhausted the opportunities for socialist pluralism within the confines of a multiparty system. And probably with the restoration in the party of the Leninist norms and principles of open discussions, there will no longer be a need for alternative movements. More than 30 percent of the participants in the Popular Front are Communists. That ratio was also observed in the representation at the congress. In the documents adopted by the congress, it is stated that the movement will operate within the confines of the Constitution, where the leading role of the party has been firmly established. But the LPF program states that the Front does not consider it to be democratic for any political organization to have the monopoly right to administer the state or social life. True, at the concluding press conference, Daynis Ivans, a 33-year-old journalist and delegate to the 19th Party Conference, who had been unanimously elected as chairman of the LPF Duma, said outright:

"We do not have any differences of opinion in the strategy that has been defined by the party. We do have differences of opinion in the tactics that have been

chosen by certain party committees. We offer our assistance to any deputy, we offer our findings, our expert evaluations, our recommendations..."

As we can see, there are many, many problems. Including some that are very complicated and sometimes unexpected.

For several months people in Latvia have been actively asking the question of republic-level cost accountability, which not only must nullify the *diktat* of the central departments, but also confirm economic independence and, with a consideration of the nationwide interests, define the priorities in the development of the branches of the national-economic complex and construct its own economic policy. However, the state interests have dropped out of the program documents. There has been simply a protruding of the republic's interests. And isn't it for this reason that the approval of republic-level cost accountability in Latvia is viewed as the first step toward the carrying out of national and state sovereignty. The extremists see its possibility only in Latvia's secession from the USSR. That is how the journalists from THE GUARDIAN posed their questions at one of the press conferences. Daynis Ivans, chairman of the LPF Duma, answered succinctly: "The carrying out of national and state sovereignty is a return to the Leninist principles according to which the Soviet Union is constructed as a federation of sovereign republics.

"A federation, but not a confederation, which, all things considered, would be nicer for a few people. Possibly this is from the lack of understanding that a confederation is a step backward."

"I am convinced," poet Viktor Avotinsh told us, "that it is necessary to proceed from the conditions not of 1940, but of 1988. And it is necessary to think not about a turning back. It is necessary to think improving life, about improving democracy in the overall context of sovereign Soviet republics. I think that extremism is no ally here."

The situation can probably not be stated any more accurately. But one cannot fail to be disturbed by the fact that in not too infrequent statements one can discern very clearly the attempts to turn the entire movement in an obviously nationalistic direction. We have had more than enough extremism. And not only in the slogan that is proposed by a few people—"Soviets without Communists"—or in the demands of "living space for Latvians." There have also been direct demands concerning Latvia's secession from the USSR. And all of this was met by the applause not only of the crowd in the gallery. Many speakers left the podium to the accompaniment of a standing ovation. We shall note conceal the fact that at times the audience went into simply a euphoric state, and the congress dropped to the level of a noisy rally. What does this mean? It can, of course, be explained as the cost of democracy. One can also say that, as a result of their long silence, some people have lost their sense of reality.

Speaking at the congress, Yanis Vagris, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Latvia, said that this congress was a harsh lesson in democracy, when it was necessary to ask for authorization only from one's own conscience, and the stenographic record of the congress recorded the entire range of subjective opinions. But the collective opinion was expressed in the documents that were adopted. One also heard poorly thought-out statements and, Ya. Vagris said, we cannot fail to call attention to them, although this is nothing else but foaming at the mouth. The most important thing is to carry out a sober and calm analysis and to conduct an honest and open dialogue.

This was also mentioned in the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee that was recently enacted—the resolution concerning the preparation for the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, entitled "Improving the Interethnic Relations in the USSR": "It is necessary to take dynamic actions and to remove the acute questions that are complicating the situation, especially in the social sphere, the development of national culture, language... We must go more boldly into the labor collectives and must speak openly with people and defend the party's course. Resting upon the strength of conviction and the authority of the law, we must oppose all attempts to channel the natural national feelings down the destruction path of nationalism, or to use the expansion of democracy and *glasnost* for antidemocratic purposes. We must prevent the discreditation of our common international gains!" This was also mentioned at meetings that V. A. Medvedev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had during his stay in Latvia.

The Latvian Popular Front actually is still in the stage of inception. At the Constituent Congress, delegates from various groups were present, and there are currently a large number of them in the republic. The Front is nonhomogeneous and is not simple. The same situation prevails for the speeches made by the congress delegates, in which at times the emotions prevailed over constructivism and justified criticism was flailed as being unfounded. There were healthy ideas, but also a large number of unintelligent, unacceptable ones. And at that congress they did not receive the proper rebuff. Factually speaking, nothing was stated to oppose open demagoguery. We shall make no secret of the fact that the congress, the excessive emotions, and at times the frank extremism simply frightened people, and caused—to put it directly—unrest. Literally the next day, in certain collectives, appeals began to issued, calling for the unification of the Russian-speaking population, and for the creation of an International Front as an alternative to the Popular Front. Its initiators feel that many of the statements made at the LPF congress infringe upon the rights and heartfelt interests of the nonindigenous population. True, the LPF program does not reject the cooperation among the various nations living in the republic, but rather takes into consideration their interests and their aspirations toward the preservation of their self-awareness. But how will that program be fulfilled?



In his recent interview, which was published by the republic's party newspapers, Yanis Vagris, First Secretary of the LaCP Central Committee, characterized this process as follows:

"Both the Popular Front and the International Front must be viewed as unique forms of the manifestation of the growing political and social participation of the masses. The buro of the LaCP Central Committee has expressed in the published resolution its attitude to the Popular Front. For the time being, the International Front is in the formative stage and does not have any program documents. After they appear, the appropriate evaluation will be made. Everything that serves socialism, democracy, and the renovation of society must be supported. Any form of extremism must be rebuffed... At the same time we cannot fail to be disturbed by the fact that the adherents of the International Front include people who occupy extremist position, who attempt to speak to their opponents in the language of *diktat*, who express a negative attitude to certain problems that touch upon the national interests of Latvians... The Popular Front and the International Front have the opportunities to assure that they can approach the forum of the nations of Latvia with a common platform of joint actions, without discontinuing the discussions with regard to questions that require a further joint search."

It has been decided to hold the forum of the peoples of Latvia this year. In order not to lose any time, it has been decided to give the responsibility of organizing it to the Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet. Anatoliy Gorbunov, chairman of the Presidium, is currently conducting negotiations with the leaders of various associations and organizations and with leaders of trade unions, the Komsomol, the church, and the creative unions.

Yes, it is not confrontation that we need. We need consolidation. But for this purpose the republic's party organization should not take a wait-and-see attitude. Instead, it should get more actively involved in the processes of the formation of social movements. And if the vast army of staff ideologists and prograndists were to proceed more broadly and more boldly toward meetings both with the Popular Front and with the International Front that is in its stage of inception, if convincing words could be found to "deflate" the extremists, and if facts could be stated in opposition to their phrases, there would presumably be no grounds for fears. And the Russian-speaking population would scarcely feel the need to create an alternative International Front.

But here are the figures: the delegates to that congress proved to include 94 percent of Latvians, 3 percent of Russians, and 3 percent of persons of other nationalities. Approximately the same ratio exists in the movement itself. It would seem that there is just one reason for this: the representatives of the other nationalities have seen in the Popular Front only a unification of Latvians for the purpose of resolving purely national problems and they have occupied a wait-and-see position. But the doors of the LPF have been opened for all. And if this public

movement poses as its task the complete acceleration of the processes of *perestroyka* in the republic, how, then, can certain inhabitants remain aloof from it?

Incidentally, the essence of the anxiety felt by the Russian-speaking population is not so much in the program documents of the LPF, as in the repeated declarations and appeals made by certain of its leaders, in the wild outburst of "everyday nationalism," in the interpretation of the concept "citizenship," etc.

But let us return to where we began. Writing about the public movement that has been born—the Latvian Popular Front—was no simple matter. But one thing became clear: the front's *perestroyka* line must run through consolidation. The dialogue must be continued. Dialogue, rather than confrontation. In the LPF, it would seem, everything will not be smooth or unanimous. The Duma that was elected by the congress is currently facing complicated questions—it is one matter to adopt a program, but a complicated different matter to implement it. This requires first of all the learning of how to differentiate between the immediate moods and the real historic interests of the nation, and how to see that it is by no means always that they coincide. That is why all the decisions and actions of the Popular Front must be extraordinarily responsible—they will determine the fate of *perestroyka* and democracy not only in Latvia.

Once again we leaf through the documents that were adopted by the congress. In the program it is clearly stated that "the activities of the Latvian Popular Front are based on the principles set forth in the resolutions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference," and that "The LPF supports the radical reform of the political system that was proposed by the 19th All-Union Party Conference, a reform that is aimed at the achievement of a real conformity of the Soviet state system to the concept of the nationwide state that is proclaimed in the Constitution." We must follow the program. But how? The resolution adopted by the congress, entitled "Supporting the CPSU Course That is Aimed at Renovation," contains the unambiguous statement: "The LPF congress deems it necessary to emphasize that the implementation of the goals and tasks of the LPF depends upon the complete and consistent carrying out of *perestroyka*. Therefore it appeals to all divisions, groups, and participants of the LPF to take decisive and consistent steps to support the course aimed at renovation that has been proclaimed by the CPSU Central Committee—to support it in one's working collective and social organization, in every city and rayon, throughout Latvia." Supporting it means not sabotaging it, but actually supporting it.

However, in the practical situation one sometimes sees exactly the opposite. Certain activists and leaders of the LPF have begun making rather categorical statements and appeals concerning the rejection of the adoption of legislative bills to amend the USSR Constitution that allegedly contradict the decisions of the 19th Party Conference. They have begun collecting signatures on

these appeals. The LPF Duma has disseminated a resolution containing an unambiguous declaration concerning the unacceptability of the proposed bills and an appeal to limit ourselves to a provisional statute governing elections only to the USSR Supreme Soviet. Pressure upon the deputies to USSR Supreme Soviet from Latvian SSR has also manifested itself: if they vote for the enactment of these bills, the voters will recall them in a rather short period of time. An appeal has also been issued for "mass manifestations of protests." Somehow, none of this is in accordance with the documents adopted by the congress itself, and all of this attests to only one thing: it would seem that a few people have lost their sense of reality. Their position is similar to the strivings of certain groupings for national isolation. This course will only delay the reforms that have been begun. And democratic reforms cannot be carried out by anti-democratic methods.

At the session of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet itself, a protest was lodged with regard to the improper actions of certain members of the LPF Duma. On the part of the Popular Front, certain accusations were made. Thereupon those present considered the incident to be exhausted. But might not that incident be repeated?

The recent discussion of the legislative bills proceeded actively in our republic. Almost 14,000 letters containing recommendations and comments were received. The most valid ones were summarized and sent to the Presidium of USSR Supreme Soviet. Not all of them were included in the draft version that was submitted for discussion at the session of the country's Supreme Soviet. But even that version, in the course of the session's operation, was amended, refined, and changed. As M. S. Gorbachev said in his closing speech, "all the details, all the concrete features of the political reform, cannot be predicted easily now. Yesterday and the day before yesterday, the deputies stated correctly that it is scarcely probable that, at our first attempt, we will achieve ideal documents that are absolutely perfect in all respects... And if experience proves the need to make adjustments in organizing elections, the representation of public organization, the operation of the houses or the deputies, or any other factors—there obviously will be an opportunity to do that." Using that opportunity, it is necessary to remember that it is always common sense that wins, not simply emotions alone.

**LaSSR Supsov Commission Head Interviewed on State Language Decree**  
*18000256 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian*  
4 Nov 88 p 4

[Interview with Anna Yanovna Blinkena, chairwoman of a special commission on language established by the LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, doctor of philosophical sciences: "Language—Life of the People"]

[Text] Each language represents the life of the people who speak it. For this reason it is only natural that the relationship to one's native language, and to the problems

of its development and functioning, should be charged with vested interest, anxiety, intransigence, and at times passion. A sensitive barometer—letters to the editors—indicates with the utmost precision that this interest rose sharply following passage of the decree of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet regarding the status of Latvian as official state language.

It gives us satisfaction at the outset to note that not a single letter has been received contesting the necessity for further development of the Latvian language. Readers are unanimous in endorsing its continued use in all spheres of republic activity. But many readers—and this must also be honestly acknowledged—express concern that the decree may, in effect, lead to discrimination against the use of the Russian language. Will it? And if so, how will appropriate legislation be worked out, taking into consideration the interests and rights of all the nationalities residing in the republic?

The unanimity of readers may also be seen in the fact that they recognize the priority status of the indigenous people's interests—interests, however, objectively conditioned and founded upon lawful and democratic principles. The issue of the state language is, of course, not only, and not so much, one regarding what language should be used to write documents, print signs, or make purchases. First and foremost, it is an issue of how to go on living, whether in cooperation and concord for the good of our common homeland, Latvia, or in a state of alienation and with ill-will for one another. All right-minded people, of course, support the first alternative, but for its realization we need a sanction for public discourse—we need a law—capable of protecting everyone in the republic without giving grounds for offense. But how may we best accomplish this?

We asked Anna Yanovna Blinkena, doctor of philosophical sciences and chairwoman of the special commission appointed by the LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to respond to this and several other questions of concern to our readers.

■Correspondent■ Many newspaper readers, judging by their letters, have the impression that the so-called "Latvian language problem" has arisen only recently. Why was it not so critical, or didn't it seem so, previously? As we know, there has never been any restriction by anyone on the use of Latvian in the republic or on its development throughout the years of Soviet power.

■A. Blinkena■ It is true that in our republic, as in the country as a whole, bilingualism has always been the practice as well as the declared policy. In practice, things in Latvia have evolved in such a way that in many areas, with the exception perhaps of the arts, and of cultural and educational activities, Latvian and Russian bilingualism has been in effect. While no one has forbidden the use of Latvian, it is also true that very little has been done to foster its introduction everywhere. As a result, in trade, public services, as in clerical work—and this means in area of administration—the use of Latvian has

become extremely restricted. There are many reasons for this: the change in national policy following the well-known July plenum of the Latvian CP Central Committee, and the disproportionate growth of the non-indigenous population automatically resulting from ill-thought-out departmental policies. To be honest about it, the teaching of Latvian in the Russian schools was poorly provided for. Note that for the teaching of Russian, more hours were allotted; there was a teaching bonus; and there were superior textbooks and teaching aids. As of this year, the "most-favored" status has been given to the Latvian language as well. But that is only this year.

In other words, a situation developed in recent years when Latvians found it necessary to turn more and more to the medium of international communication, the Russian language, and less to their native tongue. Naturally, under such conditions, the language has developed slowly and has started to become, as it were, superfluous.

■**Correspondent**■ Concern, of course, for the fate of one's own language is understandable, and readers wholeheartedly acknowledge this. What is more, many of them, as you can see from the letters, approve giving Latvian the status of state language. Nevertheless, they cite the fact that the Supreme Soviet has by decree assured the comprehensive development and study of the Latvian language, guaranteeing its use in state bodies, and in enterprises, institutions and organizations in the fields of education, science, technology, culture, health and public utilities, as well as in other areas, including clerical and business correspondence. But for those who know only Russian, there is no such guarantee provided.

■**A. Blinkena**■ Probably, this will create a certain uneasiness for a section of the population. But in the same decree it is written: "Provision is made for citizens to speak in Latvian or Russian, or draw up documents, as they choose, in state bodies, institutions, and organizations. For federal discourse, the Russian language will be used."

■**Correspondent**■ People are disturbed by the absence of the word "guarantee" and by the reference to the use of Russian only for federal discourse. Will it really not be used for international discourse within the republic?

■**A. Blinkena**■ As I understand the situation, guarantees will be provided in the Law Amending the Constitution (Principals of Law) of the Latvian SSR and in the legislative act dealing with the use of Latvian and other languages. Our commission has even issued instructions that these documents be drawn up. With respect to the second part of the question, the answer to my mind is completely clear. Of course the Russian language will be the medium of international discourse within the republic as well. It is a natural need and necessity for us. The position given in the decree is made a compulsory

requirement for the reason that international discourse may be conducted in other languages as well; for example, in Polish among Poles, Lithuanians, and Belorussians living in Latvia.

■**Correspondent**■ Tell us in more detail, if you will, about the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium's commission and its composition.

■**A. Blinkena**■ The commission, established 26 October, consists of 24 persons. It includes representatives of different nationalities, the various social organizations, and labor collectives, together with specialists in linguistics and law, and, of course, deputies. For example, the Russian public is represented by Vladimir Zharkov, secretary of the Daugavpils party gorkom and LaSSR Supreme Soviet deputy; Aleksandr Bulayev, general director of the Alfa Production Association; Vladimir Steshenko, journalist, chairman of the Baltic Slav Society; Vladlen Dozortsev, editor of the newspaper DAUGAVA; and others. Participating in its work are scholars of the Language and Literature Institute of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences, the Latvian State University, the Līepaya Pedagogical Institute, and the Pedagogical Institute of the Ministry of Public Education.

We are required to draw up and submit in draft form for public discussion before 10 December 1988 a Law Amending the Constitution and legislative act on the use of Latvian and other languages.

■**Correspondent**■ We have received a number of personal and institutional letters, particularly from labor collectives in the Alfa Production Association, The Riga Electric Machine Engineering Plant, and the Riga headquarters of the Trawler Fleet, as well as other organizations, proposing that Latvian and Russian be jointly recognized as state languages. This is also the position taken by Interfront and the Salang Club of international war veterans. As you know, Finland, Switzerland, and other countries have experience in the use of such a dual language status. How do you feel about such a proposal?

■**A. Blinkena**■ For the standpoint of legal—I might even say formal—democracy, it is fine. But in actual practice it might well turn out to be the same sort of declaration with respect to national language as the proclaimed equality of languages in effect until the present time. Since in Latvia, especially in Riga, there is a lower percentage of Latvians than that of the remaining nationalities [combined], the function of Latvian would be involuntarily curtailed, which, I repeat, could lead to its extinction.

Here, I would like to cite the words of B. I. Lenin on the functions of the national languages. In the 1920's he wrote: "It is necessary to introduce the strictest rules regarding the use of national languages in the non-Russian-speaking republics that enter into our Union and monitor these rules with particular care. There is no doubt that under the pretext of the unity of the railroad workers, under the pretext of the the unity of the

financial services, and so on, a mass of abuses will penetrate our present system that are peculiarly Russian in character. To combat these abuses there must be a special ingenuity, not to speak of sincerity, on the part of those who wage this struggle. What is needed is a detailed code of rules that only those nationals who live in a given republic can successfully manage to devise."

It is precisely such a code of rules that we want to devise, not to infringe upon the rights of other peoples, and certainly not to demean them or their language, but solely in order to guarantee the preservation, development, and successful functioning of the Latvian language—once again, I want to stress—equally with other languages.

■**Correspondent**■ Nevertheless, the functioning of real bilingualism must in some way be strengthened in terms of legislation. Otherwise, you will agree, abuses are possible. Let us say, a demand is made that only one language is to be used—readers cite a case such as this with apprehension. In the lawful state that we are building, and that we uphold, moral aspirations must be backed by legal protection, not simply proclaimed.

■**A. Blinkena**■ Of course, that is so. But in no case can we fail to take into account the great force of education. I have in mind the attitude towards a "foreign" language within the family, in school, and generally in the context of daily life. An atmosphere of being kindly and respectfully disposed to a foreign language, without any prodding is sure to awaken a desire to learn it. And if there is active dislike? This is also bound to happen, isn't it? Then no laws can be of any help.

■**Correspondent**■ Undoubtedly, education is essential. I would also agree that cases of not wanting to teach the language of one's neighbor occur. But this is an extreme case. Our mail and, I believe, yours indicates something else: People want to become familiar with the Latvian language, masses of people, but they often do not have the opportunity. They complain about the complexity of grammar in part of the self-teaching textbook of B. Bekser and V. Yurik, and about the absence of dictionaries and phrase books. There are not enough courses, and not enough teachers in many of the schools. Yet even last year there was talk at the Latvian CP Central Committee plenum about developing the base of supplies and taking other measures to promote the teaching and learning of Latvian in pre-school facilities for children, in the schools, teacher-training institutions, VUZ's, and labor collectives. Alas, progress is slow. Is it right under these circumstances to raise the question of the professional utility of a knowledge of Latvian? Virtually every letter that we receive reveals a note of concern about this subject, and we have no reason to suspect that these people are lazy or disrespectful of the Latvian language.

■**A. Blinkena**■ No doubt a certain amount of the blame for what has happened is ours. We have trained too few teachers, published too few dictionaries, and we have not

conducted classes by television. But let us be open about it. Until very recently the desire to broaden the teaching of Latvian or the area of its use was often interpreted, or, at least, might be interpreted, as an expression of nationalism. I can recall how my own extremely cautious efforts on the scientific level to raise the issue of the necessity of combining Latvian-Russian bilingualism with Russian-Latvian bilingualism were brought to a halt either as a result of the superior wisdom of higher-ranking male scholars or simply by holding their noses.

But you are right, of course. We cannot go on with our lives while looking back at the past. Right now, when there are other opportunities, we must make use of them in every way we can. I am in a position to say that university scholars are in the process of preparing a radically new self-teaching textbook for publication. The demand for phrase books will gradually be met. If printing facilities permit, without doubt even further editions of dictionaries will be made available. The training of teachers of the Latvian language is being increased, and so are the number of hours of instruction. Bonus payments for teaching this subject are being introduced. Praiseworthy is the initiative of groups and organizations that have found it possible to provide material incentives to acquire a knowledge of two languages and pay for courses given to their workers.

The lessons broadcast by television on the program "Let Us Learn Together" have become a regular occurrence and more interesting in my judgment. Slowly but surely, the number of assembly halls with simultaneous language translation is growing. The subtitled of Latvian television broadcasts is, I believe, on the horizon. This, by the way, could be a help in language instruction. What could be better than to hear the text and be able to read the translation?

Once again I want to reassure newspaper readers that no one is going to require of them that they speak Latvian from tomorrow on. Sufficient time will be given. But to show our good will, and to strive for this end, is in my view incumbent upon all who desire the prosperous well-being of our common home, Soviet Latvia.

#### **LiSSR Plenum Removes First Secretary, Procedures Detailed**

*18000278 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian  
27 Oct 88 pp 1-2*

[ELTA report: "Debates at the 14th Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum, 20 October 1988"]

[Text] As already reported, the 14th Plenum of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee was held recently, and discussed an organizational question. Today we offer a report on the debates at the plenum.

The plenum was opened by Lithuanian CP Central Committee First Secretary R. Songayla. He reported that, of the 145 members of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, 128 were present at the plenum; of the 62

candidate members of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee 61 were present; and of the 43 members of the Lithuanian CP Auditing Commission, 34 were present. In addition there was a group of first secretaries of the party gorkoms and raykoms, and responsible officials of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee apparatus, who are not members of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee.

Elected to the presidium of the plenum by the Buro of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee were V.S. Babichev, deputy chief of the Organizational-Party Work Department at the CPSU Central Committee, and Ye.N. Trofimov, chief of the Belorussian and Baltic Republics Section of this department. An organizational question was on the agenda.

The floor was offered to V.S. Babichev. He informed the plenum that the CPSU Central Committee had received Songayla's request to be relieved of the responsibility of Lithuanian CP Central Committee first secretary and membership in the Buro of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, in connection with his retirement.

Babichev reported that the request was discussed at the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Buro and at the CPSU Central Committee. It was decided to honor the request.

The plenum voted by open ballot and adopted the decision to relieve Songayla from his responsibilities as first secretary and member of the Buro of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee in connection with his retirement.

Babichev reported further that there is a proposal before the Buro of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, which convened a meeting of the first secretaries of city and rayon party committees on the eve of the plenum; and also at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, to elect A. Brazauskas first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, and relieve him of the duties of secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee.

The floor was turned over to K. Zaletskas, first secretary of the Vilnius Gorkom, Lithuanian CP. Analyzing the work of the Central Committee and First Secretary Songayla in the period of perestroika, Zaletskas noted that, as members of the Buro and candidate members of the Central Committee Buro, the first secretaries were not always of active assistance to Comrade Songayla when it was necessary to work out a clear-cut collective program of actions for the Central Committee to implement the requirements of the resolutions of the 19th CPSU Conference, or to address critical remarks to the first secretary. "I admit," said Zaletskas, "that the Vilnius party gorkoms, the raykoms, and I personally, were unable to orient in a timely manner to the situation, which was more complex than in other party organizations. We are especially disturbed by the aggravation of international relations in our multinational city. We shall do everything to affirm an atmosphere of unanimity and respect for one another."

Speaking of the events of 28 September on Gediminas Square, he stressed that this incident significantly aggravated the situation in the city, and dealt a blow to the prestige of the party officials. And, in the given situation, there was neither a clear-cut strategy, nor foresight on possible consequences.

Zaletskas nominated A. Brazauskas to be elected Lithuanian CP Central Committee first secretary.

"The republic is experiencing a very complicated period," said Kaunas Party Gorkom First Secretary R. Rimaytis. "And in the party Central Committee it is not only the first secretary who is to blame for this situation. One would think that the members of the Central Committee Buro above all must assume a considerable amount of the blame for this. Evidently at a certain point they failed to notice the vacuum which was being formed in our political life. The vacuum was filled by a movement, an unofficial one, which in the course of several months has won enormous recognition and prestige. Truly the guilt of the Buro and the secretaries is great, in that we were unable to work out a strategic program for implementing the tasks posed by the 19th Party Conference. But Sajudis did. Its program, with the exception of certain parts and points, is an extremely constructive one, and is stirring up the people, the cities and the republic. Hundreds of thousands—millions, in the opinion of writer V. Petkyavichyus—are supporting it. We must not fail to take this into account."

Touching upon certain questions on development of democracy, Rimaytis noted that it is undemocratic when important documents are presented for discussion two weeks before they are to be adopted. This pertains not only to the documents recently presented for public discussion by the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, but also to documents from the CPSU Central Committee, including the Theses of the 19th Party Conference.

Rimaytis supported the nomination of A. Brazauskas for election to the post of Lithuanian CP Central Committee first secretary.

"The republic's communists will survive the situation which has come to pass," said Vice President of the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences A. Zhukauskas. "We respect Comrade Ringaudas Songayla for his high culture, his tact, and his knowledge of the republic. However, the Buro has not shown to the Central Committee first secretary sufficient resolve and responsible independence in resolving the most important questions."

"We are aware of the fact that recently the influx of all sorts of commissions and brigades in the republic, which after spending a few days with us, are already issuing instructions. There have also been more telephone calls

"from above" to our secretaries and republic administrators, with categorical instructions. Their execution has more than once brought about negative consequences.

"Hopefully, the new first secretary and the Buro will not be subjected to any kind of pressure, so that all resolutions, as befits the masters of the republic, would be adopted independently and in consideration of the interests of the people.

"As happens more often than not, just as at the present, the principal reason for all the disagreements is—the economy. Although meat production is growing, its sale is not increasing, and the stores stand empty. Although we produce 'Shilyalisy,' they are practically not sold in the republic at all. Pressure was applied—to produce as much as possible; build as much as possible; send as much as possible to the national budget.

"The Soviet Union is a federation of 15 republics. Every republic, it goes without saying, must deny itself something and made a certain contribution to the common cause. However, the first secretary and other republic leaders should also firmly defend and protect the interests of the people of the republic; for there is no one else. And the people must see this."

Later on, the speaker brought into focus the problems of the country's economy, noting that quite often billions, a portion of which comes from Lithuania, are cast to the winds.

In concluding, Zhukauskas approved the nomination of Brazauskas for election as Central Committee first secretary.

"I think that in this complicated period for the Lithuanian people and for the Communist Party of Lithuania, the Central Committee of our party and its leaders, the first and second secretaries, committed two strategic errors," said A. Zhalis, Klaypeda gorispolkom chairman. "First of all, when the people went out into the streets and went to grandiose meetings where they exorcised their conscience and the honor of our people, we did not see a first secretary among them.

"The bitter events of 28 September touched the hearts and emotions of many people. Throwing troops against the people—is out of the question. As we understand, these actions were sanctioned by none other than the secretaries. Therefore a change in the leadership of the Central Committee is required.

"I approve the proposition that the party organization of our republic and its central committee be led by A. Brazauskas. I think that he is a person who, in this complex period, possesses sufficient decisiveness and responsibility to take up the solution of the important economic questions and the political questions as well.

"And there is yet another question. Both Communists and non-party members are asking, why has it been the practice for many decades already that the second secretary of the party Central Committee is sent from Moscow, and is not elected by the communists of the republic party organization. One can make the most serious conclusions, and I am in full agreement with them—that such an act expresses an enormous lack of trust in the communists of Lithuania. I am not saying that the secretaries of the party Central Committee must always be only Lithuanians. Here we are not talking about Comrade N. Mitkin as a communist or as a person in general, but about party principles of electing the leading cadres of the republic party organization. One would think that it would not be necessary for a non-Lithuanian to always be second secretary of the party Central Committee."

Lithuanian SSR Finance Minister R. Sikorskis has the floor. He decisively supported the proposal on the candidature of Algirdas Brazauskas for the post of first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. The speaker added that Brazauskas is well-versed in economic questions, knows the aktiv of the republic, and the responsible officials of enterprises and economic organizations. Therefore, his experience, his decisive and at the same time democratic nature, and other businesslike qualities, will promote acceleration of perestroyka in the republic.

"Three years of perestroyka have passed, and matters are not improving in the country's economy," said P. Noreyka, director of the Lithuanian GRES [State Regional Electric Power Plant] imeni V.I. Lenin. "The farther we go, the worse things get in terms of material supply. It goes without saying, that nothing can come of nothing. The measures which are not being implemented, measures such as the Law on the Enterprise, khozraschet and others, in essence have not changed a thing, and have not released the people's creative initiative. The entire system stands as before. The chief hindrance to the economy is centralism. The Buro of the Central Committee, even with a new make-up, will not be able to change this system without the support of the public.

"For three years the General Secretary has indefatigably called upon us to get off the mark. Finally a movement of the people began. The people are thinking, making suggestions, making demands, committing errors; and they are learning from the mistakes, but the movement is going to the aid of our party Central Committee. It is going on, and here and there is going around the representatives of the party and Soviet Power, who are temporizing. Many experienced leaders know that they have been punished for initiative. The slow movement can also be justified by the fact that prior to the latest Central Committee Plenum it was not known how perestroyka would develop further. Now there are no longer any doubts.

"This process, it goes without saying, is complex and difficult. In order for the party to retain the leadership of the restructuring of society, it is vitally necessary that party leaders at all levels be competent, decisive, bold, and honest people, and that they always speak the truth.

"Comrade Brazauskas is just such a man. I have no doubt that not only all communists, but the non-party members of Lithuania as well, will support Comrade Brazauskas in his work."

The floor was given to Lithuanian SSR Gosplan Chairman **B. Zaykauskas**. "Life has posed so many new problems, that the Communist Party of Lithuania, and the members of the party Central Committee assembled here, have been unable to find an answer to all of them on a timely basis," said Zaykauskas. "I would say that under these circumstances, a certain re-arrangement of our ranks is natural. The activeness of the masses is on a grandiose scale, and it is not to our credit that we were not as active. I think that the proposed candidature of Comrade Brazauskas for the post of Lithuanian CP Central Committee first secretary deserves universal approval. He inherently takes an active position and supports all that is new. I think that all the scientists and production innovators in the republic would support this. What is of value in his activities is the fact that, although very busy with current affairs, he has not forgotten the priority for the future. In his activities, today's problems have not been a barrier to questions of strategy. I would also like to take notice of Brazauskas' ability to work with people, and to resolve questions in a corporate manner. Therefore I would like to express my confidence that the secretary fully deserves the trust place in him.

"The people know, love and respect Comrade Brazauskas. I think that this will be a worthy candidature," said Shirvintskiy Raykom Lithuanian CP First Secretary **V. Kornienko**. "However, the fact that this question has come up less than a year since P. Grishkyavichus passed away and Comrade Songayla was elected is obviously the fault of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Buro and the secretaries as well, who apparently did not support and assist him as they should have. One must also address a few words to the CPSU Central Committee and to certain union-level organizations concerning the fact that the solution of many questions has often been subjected to regulation and dragged out; whereas, the republic could have resolved them independently, without any coordination, and sooner. This, of course, has also hindered and has probably also had an influence on the fact that we have an organizational question today. There are problems of an economic and political nature. And it turns out that there is a certain incongruity: whereas the republic holds first place in the Union in meat production, the stores are—empty. If you take our rayon, we produce 480 kg of meat and almost two tons of milk per citizen; but in the market allocations, we sell 34 kg of meat per citizen of the rayon. As far as I know, the

same abnormal situation exists in other rayons in the republic as well. If these questions are not resolved in the near future, the people will express their deep dissatisfaction.

"Nor can one remain silent about how the question of the republic's national flag was resolved. Opinions were heard that we do not need two flags; that one flag should be made both the national and the state flag. One should not play around with such matters.

"The appeals which the rayons make to the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet or the Council of Ministers, originate with the people; and they must be resolved in an expeditious manner."

Kornienko went on to express the desire that the republic's leaders appear more often on television and radio, and that they would more actively support the positive initiatives of Sajudis. He also spoke of problems of furnishing food to war veterans.

**S. Shimkus**, rector of the Vilnius Higher Party School, noted that the members of the Central Committee must shoulder the entire responsibility for the socio-political situation. "The situation is actually not unique. We are still forged in the mold, the standard, and even the fear implanted by the Stalin era, and firmly implanted by the administrative apparatus of bureaucratism. It should be acknowledged that control over events has been lost. Our leadership has always looked toward the center, for what quite often less-qualified administrators might say. Glasnost in the party and among the public, we must admit, has turned out to be a complete surprise to us. Therefore, after establishing a commission or a group from the members of the Central Committee, we should work out a detailed plan for analysis of the socio-political situation and program of action."

The speaker went on to note that those who took part in the political meetings organized by Sajudis understand what that power is like. There are many contradictions in the movement, and other movements that have attached themselves to it are purely anti-Soviet and reactionary, to whom the ideal of socialism is foreign. Also affiliated are careerists and adventurists. Therefore, in working out a program of action, a significant portion of the professors and instructors at the Higher Party School could render assistance. Having approved the proposal to honor the request of R. Songayla to retire on pension, Shimkus noted the great contribution of the leader of the Central Committee in the development of our countryside, and the level which it is now achieving. "I believe," the speaker stressed, "that we must express our gratitude to Ringaudas Songayla for his great work in sectors of the agro-industrial complex."

Speaking of the events of 28 September, Shimkus noted that the use of force was a gross error, and made the crisis in the republic worse.

The speaker approved the proposal to discuss in the near future the question of Lithuanian CP Central Committee Second Secretary N. Mitkin, and expressed his opinion on strengthening ideological work. Shimkus supported the nomination of Brazauskas in the election for Central Committee first secretary.

**K. Ashmonas**, an assembly worker at the Baltiya Ship-Building Plant in Klaypeda stressed that, "It's a pity that Shimkus made such a speech too late. Obviously the professors, instructors, and others should have expressed their opinions before now; after all, that is why the higher party school exists."

In the speaker's opinion, certain staff officials are elected too long to the Central Committee Buro. Extraordinary elections should be held, without delay, and the members of the Central Committee and the Central Committee Buro should also be "restructured." There should be more workers in the Buro, from several cities, in order that they might exchange opinions. "Just take a look," the speaker continued, "at how Sajudis is operating today, and what its policies are like. We have our own position; but why do we remain silent; why can we not say anything on the questions which have been raised—and perhaps even fight about certain questions; or we may even agree with certain of them. I wholeheartedly support the proposal Comrade Zhalis made today about the second secretary. It is necessary to put an end to such practices, in which they send orders from above on whom we are to elect in the republic and how to do it. I think that our national cadres also know how to work; and they would, without a doubt, not do any worse."

In conclusion, Ashmonas stressed the necessity to be in step with the times, and the need for everyone to have his own position and a clear-cut, completely thought-out platform.

The floor was given to Chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium **V. Astrauskas**. The speaker expressed the hope that proper, principled decisions would be taken, which would rally the republic party organization and would permit it to get out of the situation in which it finds itself at present. "We the members of the Central Committee Buro accept a considerable amount of the blame for the situation which has evolved. Apparently at a certain point we were not entirely principled and demanding to one another, and we did not completely resolve those questions which should have been resolved. I think that our work lacked persistence, decisiveness, and completeness. At the Central Committee Buro we used to criticize Songayla as first secretary. I have known Comrade Songayla for a long time, and I respect him. He's a fine man and a good specialist. He has done a lot for the good of the republic. However, in this critical situation he did not display the political qualities which a Central Committee first secretary should possess." The speaker went on to express his doubt, whether it was expedient to rush to a resolution on the question of the second secretary. "Today I do not want to defend Comrade Mitkin, nor do I want to

speak out against the comrades who have spoken here today; but such hasty decisions, in my view, are not entirely justified," said he. "We at the Central Committee Buro are of one mind with respect to the candidature of Comrade Algirdas Brazauskas for the post of first secretary. He is a genuinely energetic and decisive person. I think that he possesses all the qualities for this complex period, to rally both the Central Committee Buro, the Central Committee and the party aktiv of the republic."

**V. Sakalauskas**, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers: "I completely support the proposal to relieve Comrade Songayla of his responsibilities as first secretary in connection with his retirement. I especially support the proposal to elect Comrade Brazauskas first secretary. A few words about 28 September: Today it has been said from this rostrum that there were certain contradictory reports about the events which took place. The conclusion of the commission was published in full in the newspaper GIMTASIS KRASHTAS. Those who read and compared this with the conclusion of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers might notice that there is a certain difference between them. It was noted in the conclusion of the commission that Comrade V. Gerzhonas was acquainted with the plan of the measures envisioned for 28 September. He informed Comrades Mitkin and Songayla of this. A conference was held on this question at the Central Committee. However, the plan was not discussed in detail. It was decided to take all measures to ensure order. I also took part in this conference; Comrade V. Klikunene and other comrades took part as well. The second point: We admitted that we made a mistake by not publishing in the press a report about the ban on the meeting. At the conference it was proposed to do this. But certain comrades said that this was not necessary; by doing so we would only arouse further interest and even more people would gather. Therefore I think that in the given situation Comrade Songayla should have taken a firm position; the more so, since he too spoke out for publication of such information. It is stated in the conclusions of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers, that the party and Soviet organs of the city and the republic were notified of the ban on the meeting. And that was the case. The Council of Ministers did not agree with the decision to deploy troops. There was difference of opinion in the commission itself. For example, the Internal Affairs organs believe that they acted properly. In order to gain an understanding of the situation, the republic procurator appealed to Moscow. It soon became clear whether the internal organs had acted properly."

The floor was given to Lithuanian CP Central Committee Secretary **S. Gedraytis**: "I have been working as secretary for nine months now," said he. "During this time I have become familiar with many rayons and with work at the apparat. I must say that in many instances I have not been satisfied with my work. I can see quite a few cadres at the apparat who carry out the obligations entrusted to them in a careless, inefficient manner. I



must say that both in the Secretariat and at the Buro, certain complex questions of great importance to the republic were solved with difficulty. Today an organizational plenum was convened, and I think there was no alternative. We all agree that the prestige and the avant garde role of the party has been severely battered. Our task is to restore them. We all believe that Comrade Brazauskas will be able to bring the republic party organization and the republic out of this complex situation. Today," the speaker continued, "I must say that one of our main tasks is to rally around the CPSU Central Committee. The situation in the country is also difficult. But we know how much the General Secretary is doing on these problems. I believe that implementing the line of the CPSU Central Committee in our republic is also very important. And today we should not be hasty on the question of Second Secretary N. Mitkin.

"I would like to say a word not as a pensioner, but as a member of the Central Committee," appealed special pensioner I. Yanuytis. "Today, as the question of the first secretary is being resolved, we must not fail to speak about the obsolete cadre policy that exists in our party. Only a year has passed and we are replacing the first secretary. Just as unanimously, with thunderous applause, as we did a year ago. And after all, Comrade Songayla is a fine man. A confirmed party member, he has done a great deal for the republic, especially for the development of the agro-industrial complex, which was already mentioned here. However, under the new conditions, Comrade Songayla, apparently, really does not have enough additional parameters. Thank God, as they say, that there is a Comrade Brazauskas in the front ranks of our Central Committee. I completely support the candidature of Comrade Brazauskas; he is known by the party organization and the broad public of Lithuania." Yanuytis went on to speak of the processes in the republic's social life. "I, like many of my comrades who fought at the front, cannot look calmly upon the negative things, the irresponsible political statements of certain people from various unofficial associations who are provoking the masses.

"For the situation which has been created, which we are all in together, the entire Buro of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee must bear responsibility along with the first secretary, and especially Second Secretary Mitkin. The party organizations are adopting resolutions on the inaction and the incompetence of the second secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, but nothing is being done. Is it possible that this information is not reaching the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee at all?"

The speaker proposed that the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum vote on the proposition—to request that the CPSU Central Committee Politburo recall Mitkin from the post of Lithuanian CP Central Committee second secretary on the grounds that he lacks initiative and has not brought any pressure to bear on implementing party policy in restructuring the republic.

"I would like to say a few words about L. Shepetis, a very pleasant person with whom I have worked for many years. In my view Comrade Shepetis is tired. He is 60 years old. Why do we not pension him with honor also? You see, a sense of confusion is felt with respect to ideological questions. Unbelievable things have happened. A conflict has arisen between the Central Committee and the editors of TIESY with respect to the candidature of an editor. The newspaper," in the speaker's opinion, "has become an organ of not only the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, and the Council of Ministers, but of Sajudis as well."

I. Yanuytis expressed the opinion that it would not be expedient to convene an extraordinary congress or conference. The questions which have arisen can be solved at the plenum. "We propose," he said in conclusion, "that the participants of the future plenum and the members of the Central Committee will unanimously support the new first secretary if he introduces an additional proposal on the future replacement of the entire staff of the Buro with more active people."

The floor was given to Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences' Vice President V. Statulyavichyus. He said, "We used to talk about how to enlist the public in the administration of our state, and we used to say that our young people are passive. Today the public is already taking part in administration, and the young people are active; and now we are beginning to be wary and afraid. They say that we need to hold fewer meetings, and work more. I am completely in agreement with this. However, we must resolve the principal problems, and then overcome those obstacles which allow us neither to work well, nor to live well. I know that the movement is also making mistakes. But there are communists in it too. Many of the people I know. These people have good intentions, and they are not at all making an attempt against Soviet rule, as some people think. It goes without saying that there are hotheads, who are making mistakes. And have we really not made any mistakes in the course of 70 years? Today, it seems to me, it is not enough for the first secretary to be a fine, honorable man; it is not even enough to be intelligent. One must not be afraid to talk with the crowd; one need not fear to speak out from the rostrum. I completely support the candidature of A. Brazauskas. This is a person who truly understands science, and for this they respect him at the Academy of Sciences. I know Comrade Songayla extremely well as a very upright, fine person. Apparently one of the mistakes of the first secretary, is that he listened to the second secretary too much."

Statulyavichyus supported the opinion of the previous speakers about the second secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee. He noted that Mitkin has not sufficiently delved into the socio-political situation which has evolved in Lithuania. He proposes resolving the question of second secretary immediately, without delay.

"We are presently accusing Sajudis of taking the initiative away from us. But let us stop and think, esteemed comrades, whether we ourselves are not guilty of this," said V. Kashauskene, director of the Institute on Party History at the Lithuanian CP Central Committee. It is all because we are late; and we should not be late. Obviously, today we should not delay with the second secretary either, since we will look strange if we do not satisfy the request of the manufacturers, the creative organizations and the scientific collectives. You see, in fact we too applaud this proposal, and that means that this auditorium supports it as well."

In speaking about the ideological work of the party, the speaker stressed that the criticism addressed to Lithuanian CP Central Committee Secretary Shepetis was too severe. "In my view," said she, "he is the only person in the present Buro who still managed to preserve the policy of the party Central Committee in the sense that both Sajudis and other people believed that one could still resolve these questions at the Central Committee. After all, certain departments of the Central Committee are adhering to extremely conservative positions. Just take the article by Yu. Yermalavichyus, which thundered against the entire republic. After all, she was under the orders of the propaganda and agitation department of the Central Committee. And I would like to call attention to the fact that the party Central Committee and the Buro did not express their attitude toward this article, since PRAVDA had done so with the article by N. Andreyeva. This is a very important question.

"Not having clarified and not having grasped the past, we cannot speak about the future either. Comrade Shepetis was able to protect our intelligentsia and our scholars; he met with them, and entered in discussions with them. He even found a common language with the members of Sajudis.

"'Saudis' is a democratic movement, a social movement. Lenin, at a time of such sharp turns in history, taught that the party must always see the positive principles in such movements, and must constantly rely on them.

"I support the candidature of Comrade Brazauskas. According to the opinion of him which has evolved in Lithuania, he is a man who will lend his weight to the support of the republic's sovereignty."

"The situation being discussed today is no less important for us also," said Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee First Secretary A. Matsaytis. "First of all I would like to say to Comrade Brazauskas: It seems to me that you must understand that today both the young people and other people as well are awaiting your decision about Comrade Mitkin. I personally have nothing against the Lithuanian CP Central Committee second secretary. But if this decision is not taken, I believe it will be very difficult to speak with the people. And therefore I fully support Shimkuys' proposal." The speaker believes that today a certain amount of pressure will be applied here on Brazauskas concerning this question.

"A second question—on Comrade Shepetis. I would like to disagree with the remarks addressed at Comrade Shepetis, that he is doing a poor job in orienting the press: Not at all. I too take part in the sessions of the Buro and the secretariats. From the sidelines it is sometimes easier to see how the decisions are taken. I will frankly tell you that he was, I think, the only person who supported many of the decisions of the Komsomols, and frequently came to our aid. Perhaps that is why we have not lost our very important contacts today. Democracy, and the appearance of various opinions in the press—are these letting go of the reins? Comrade M.S. Gorbachev has frequently spoken about the importance of glasnost. And Comrade Shepetis has done a great deal at meetings with the creative intelligentsiya and with the young people. I am happy," said Matsaytis, "for Comrade Brazauskas. I have managed to meet with the young people many times. Young people used to say that they can see in him a first secretary of the Central Committee. Therefore, today I can say that young people genuinely approve this decision."

"What do I think of myself personally? It is hard to talk about oneself personally," said Lithuanian CP Central Committee Second Secretary N.A. Mitkin. I have worked honestly and I continue to do so; and I can honestly look people in the eye. I have not done any exceptional things whatsoever which would harm the party, and I do not plan to do so. Many of the comrades sitting here have known me for quite some time; we have met with them a lot; we have worked and have solved problems. To this day—and I have been in party work for a long time—I have always, worked honestly, in all places. And that is true of the given situation. I accept the criticism of the comrades; I acknowledge that, obviously, I have made mistakes in some places; everything must be thoroughly analyzed, and the appropriate conclusions must be drawn. I understand the manner in which the communists formulated the question on the status of the second secretary and, if you will, I share this formulation. Therefore, I would not like, strictly speaking, to speak further on this question.

"As far as I personally am concerned, that is for you to decide. Whatever you decide, that is the way it will be. But perhaps, nevertheless, as certain others have said, let us put off deciding the question today. Let them report to the CPSU Central Committee. As for my request to depart, it will be done; I shall do it myself. But in considering the entire situation which presently exists in the republic, and the complexity of the tasks which the party organizations must solve, and considering what lies ahead of us, I would nonetheless ask the members of the Central Committee to weigh all this, and to determine whether this would be advantageous to the Communist Party, and whether it would serve the good of the cause? In the final analysis, we are not presently talking about me. We are talking about the situation which has come to pass in the republic, and for which both the Buro, and I, and all of us, bear responsibility. And so, let us give this some thought.

"I believe deeply in perestroika; and I do not wish to indulge in self-praise here, but this—is the direction of my life," said Lithuanian CP Central Committee Second Secretary L. Shepetis. It is another matter that I, as a worker in ideology and culture have, evidently, experienced some confusion. The more so since as secretary for ideological questions I have of late continually found myself between the devil and the deep blue sea. I have frequently told the first secretaries, both at the Buro and in other places, that we should act out of our convictions, and not from bureaucratic motives. I am talking about the fact that an ideology specialist, and evidently not only in our own republic but in every organization, finds himself between the devil and the deep blue sea. If you're in front of an audience of intellectuals, they criticize the fact that there is too little democracy, too little glasnost, that we are still printing articles which smell of dogmatism, and so on. You stand there, you listen, and you turn red. You find yourself in front of another audience—and here they tell you that there is too much of all those things; here they say that everything should be as it was before, when it was actually more quiet. Such a note was heard here at the plenum as well, but I would like to say that this is natural, for this is that very complex stage of perestroika to which we have now come, of which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke at his meeting with workers of the press, which I too managed to attend. Right now it is not as important how, what and where they sometimes write—as it is for every publication to support perestroika; for every publication to support the renewal of society; for every word to support the realization of the policy of the 19th Party Conference, and the renaissance of society and the nation.

"Here is what I would like to say: It is, of course, offensive to hear that in one or another respect you are supposed to be weak; but I do not feel that I am, and that's all there is to it.

"And now, about the candidature of Brazauskas. We, the Buro, have unanimously nominated him, and support him. We nominated him, knowing him, and we are happy that this candidature is supported by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. I think that this will help us consolidate our position, and follow a clear-cut general policy for implementing perestroika, and it will help overcome the difficulties which the Buro has encountered."

"What is hindering perestroika in the country at present? Bureaucratic centralism, which is holding on very tightly, is a very strong hindrance," said Yu. Pozhela, president of the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences. "And above all in the party. We are all calling for initiative, and we are calling for eliminating the obstacles which hinder perestroika and glasnost. But at the Central Committee, inasmuch as we are not now up for election, or re-election, it is as if we sit there calmly, above criticism—although everyone is thinking to himself, it's true, we do need greater initiative. I have

nothing against Nikolay Andreyevich Mitkin personally," the speaker went on. "The fact of the matter is, that he has been co-opted from the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee. And this feature creates a special position among all of us in the Central Committee. The 19th Party Conference issued the challenge: 'Comrades, perestroika will not get off the mark, if we ourselves do not take action.' And why is it, that all of us the Central Committee understand that we must become more active, and then we say here, 'Let's put off the question?' This has already been said many times at various levels: 'Let's put it off, the CPSU Central Committee will make the decision.' In my opinion we should not put off this question. We elected him according to the Rules, and we must also resolve the question right here, at our plenum, today. I think that we are winning, politically," said Pozhela, "because we truly believe in our party organization; we believe in our cadres, and we do not need special mentors."

Yu. Antanaytis, secretary of the Lithuanian republic Trade Union Council, expressed his dissatisfaction with the way the representatives of the CPSU Central Committee reported on relieving Songayla from his duties as Lithuanian CP Central Committee first secretary, and with the way the new candidature for this post was proposed. He went on to say that he firmly supports the candidature of A. Brazauskas—one of the people the trade unions respect most. In his speech on the question about the second secretary, which is under discussion, Antanaytis proposed not to put off the decision on this question, and to decide it right away. But, he noted, in examining this question, we must take into consideration both the opinion of Sajudis and public opinion.

And then, as reported, the election took place. By secret ballot, Algirdas Brazauskas was elected first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee.

Later on, R. Songayla spoke at the plenum.

"Out of my 36 years of work experience, 23 were spent in party work," said he. "I began as secretary of a party organization, the party organ of the central committee at the academy; then I worked with a group of central committee inspectors in Kaunasskiy Rayon; later, from my post of first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, I went to the Central Committee and was elected a secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, where I was given the responsibility of organizing agricultural work and acting as a sponsor to it. Here I worked for 19 years. After that I worked at the Council of Ministers for five years, and for two years at the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet; hence, for the last 10 months I have been first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee. In actual fact, not everything was done on my part. Today it was properly noted that under conditions of perestroika it may have been possible to better mobilize our party organization for solving the great tasks which have been set before every communist and every party organization.

"Having been involved in party and soviet work, I have always experienced the help of the leaders of the gorkoms, the party raykoms, and their executive committees; for which I am extremely grateful. I am grateful to the members of the Buro and the secretaries of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, who have done a great deal for more successful resolution of problems, although we have not managed to carry them all out. The great, important tasks posed at the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th Party Conference must be resolved better. I sincerely wish Comrade Algirdas Brazauskas great successes in this responsible work. I express the hope that all the questions which have been put before the party and everyone else, that all the organs—party, soviet and economic—would march in step, and that they would boldly tell the party that those areas of neglect which had occurred, have been overcome. And I, with all that is within me, will always be devoted to the party; I shall always strive to walk with the party, and shall try to uphold the honored calling of a communist."

Lithuanian CP Central Committee First Secretary A. Brazauskas has the floor. He sincerely thanked the audience for their warm words and for their trust in resolving the question of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee first secretary. "It was truly an extraordinarily high honor for me, a person who for a significant part of his life was not a politician, nor was he a professional party worker. I managed to work more in the sphere of production, and in various sectors of the republic's economy; this is a specific matter.

"It is true that 11 years of work as a central committee secretary taught me a great deal. And the years have taught me a lot, especially those with whom I succeeded in working at the Buro; those with whom I worked and met with, while carrying out other duties. A number of questions, complex and less complex, arose. And we solved them together, supporting one another.

"It goes without saying that neither I, nor anyone else in this hall, could have conferred on themselves all those successes which our glorious republic has achieved under the leadership of the Communist Party of Lithuania and its Central Committee. We have always understood one another, and have always found a common language, even though differences of opinion have occurred. This can be attributed to adherence to principle and to civic and party loyalty. Truly a great deal has changed in my personal life—In the last 24 hours I managed to visit with Politburo member Comrade G.P. Razumovskiy, speak with him about our cadres, our party organization and the mood in Lithuania; about the very complex socio-political situation which has come to pass; on the role of our Central Committee and its Buro; and about the Secretariat and the first secretary. In the conversation about Comrade Songayla it was noted that for many years he has worked conscientiously, as befits a party member, at responsible positions. We also spoke about Comrade Shepetis, and about the tasks for our propaganda media. I said, and I believe the members of the

Buro would agree, that we have not yet done everything necessary for our propaganda and agitation media to operate in the manner which the party requires. And I do not want to criticize. I personally must also draw conclusions. We are faced with working a great deal harder, and we must become politicians. These stormy 3-4 months which we experienced last summer have taught us a great deal. We, unfortunately, have also learned a great deal from our mistakes; and it would be better if they had been fewer. And we must tell our people of the fact that we have made mistakes.

"Today I had occasion to meet with CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Comrades Razumovskiy and Chebrikov were also present. In the conversation which took place prior to the politburo session, Comrade Gorbachev spoke warmly of our republic, which he had visited eight years ago, and asked me to express his best wishes to the all the Lithuanian people. He also asked me to express the same to our central committee plenum. I shall also do this in my speech, which I am to make at the constituent assembly of Sajudis. Incidentally, this will be a crucial moment for me as first secretary.

"In my view, we must work out a clear-cut tactical and strategic policy. The situation sometimes demands the kind of decisions who go beyond the bounds of previously-envisaged programs. The first secretaries spoke the truth today, that the Central Committee adopts one program today, and a week or two later, another. In actuality, this was dictated by life. And so it was with the tricolored national flag. You remember full well the very beginning, when you conducted us to the conference. It was then that the first flags appeared. That was a time, when I, rising to the rostrum, said that while these flags are flying I would not speak. I started to speak, and once again the flags appeared. And when we upon returning arrived at the gigantic meeting in Vingis Park, there was an entire sea of these flags. And it was up to me, as a central committee secretary, in accordance with the buro, to say something else. And you see, in all two weeks had passed. You can imagine what the dynamic of development of all the political and social events was like. We must adopt clear-cut, concrete decisions and resolutions. About everything of which I am speaking, it goes without saying, both the bitter experience, and the future, which for us is not entirely clear. But I promise you that we, the members of the Buro and the Secretariat, shall always strive to meet in conference as often as possible. We shall strive to visit the collectives more often and to be in the thick of things. In such a complex situation, we must communicate more with those collectives from which this movement originates: with the professors and with the student youth. In order not to lose any time, and in order to achieve the highest coefficient of useful actions and the best possible results. We must think carefully about this.

"Today a great many questions arose concerning the material sphere, and supplying the public with food

products. Obviously, we must take extraordinary measures. A few days ago a conversation with the first secretaries took place on this subject.

"I understand, as we all do, the concern of the members of the Central Committee and the raykom and gorkom first secretaries. The question is, of course, a complex one. If the question of the first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee had become critical, then naturally the question of the second secretary did as well; for the second has definite functions, very close to all of these problems which have sprung up in our republic. After all, life is life—there's no getting around it. And the Central Committee must react as well. We can not remain silent; and we cannot pigeonhole all these letters, all these resolutions by the primary party organizations, and all the various appeals, and forget about them. For no one will permit us to do so.

"But here is what I want you to think about. Look at how things are shaping up for the five minutes in which I have been first secretary. Thank you once again. You must still find a person to replace me and nominate him to the Central Committee for election.

"And now about the crucial question which was raised about Comrade Mitkin. You know the status of the second secretary. Whether you are happy about it or not—it exists. This position is a nomenklatura of the Politburo. I agree that this question must be resolved. But we must take counsel about the procedure for resolving this question. A motion has been made for the 14th Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum to adopt the following resolution:

"To instruct the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Buro to table until the next Central Committee Plenum the question of Lithuanian CP Central Committee Second Secretary N.A. Mitkin."

Voting for this resolution were 123 members of the Central Committee; against, two; abstaining, three.

With this, the 14th Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum completed its work.

### **Vilnius Prisoners 'Provoke' Riot in Hard Labor Prison**

18090010 *Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 11 Dec 88 p 3*

18090010[Text] The Lithuanian SSR Procurator's Office announces that on the night of 9 December riots were provoked by a group of prisoners at the Lithuanian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs hard labor prison in Vilnius.

The prisoners previously had primarily negative reports written about them; they had prior convictions and had disobeyed the prison administration.

Measures were taken to eliminate the incident. There have been no casualties; minor material damage was caused to the institution.

The organs of the Procurator's Office are investigating the incident.

### **Rumors of Chemical Explosions Spread in UkSSR**

18000379 [Editorial Report] Kiev RABOCHAYA GAZETA in Russian on 13 November 1988 carries on page 4 a 200-word report which refutes rumors circulating in Kiev and other cities that there was an explosion at a chemical plant in the city of Uman [Cherkassy Oblast] which endangered human lives. Reached by telephone, the Chairman of the Uman City Ispolkom Council of Peoples' Deputies G.A. Povzun categorically denied that an explosion had occurred in Uman. He stated that no chemical enterprise is even operating in the city. There is only a factory there which produces vitamins.

Another report immediately following states that rumors have also been spreading in Rovno about a "health threatening" catastrophe at a chemical enterprise there. V.A. Chayka, deputy chairman of the Rovno oblistpolkom stated that he had not heard of an accident in the city. At the newspaper reporter's request, Chayka contacted the director of the Azot production association which is located near the oblast center. The director affirmed that no accident had occurred and that the enterprise was operating normally.

M.M. Sharlaya, chief state sanitary inspector for Rovno Oblast, stated that "there is no cause for panic." He added that about two months ago unfounded rumors were circulating that the radiation situation in the region had worsened.

An editorial note at the bottom of the two reports reads: "Only one question remains. Who is spreading such rumors? What is the purpose?"

### **BSSR Commission Chief Defends Militia at Minsk Demonstration**

18000316 *Minsk SELSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 4 Dec 88 p 4*

[Interview by BELTA Correspondent A. Palchevskiy with BSSR Supreme Soviet Deputy N.I. Roshia under the "Returning to the Printed Word" rubric: "The Elements are Always Destructive"]

[Text] The conclusions of the commission of the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium published in the press in mid-November, and the decree of the Presidium, "On the Results of Study of the Circumstances, Associated with the Ban on the Holding of and the Halting of the Meeting in the City of Minsk on 30 October 1988," it seemed, should have dotted all the "i's" in the situation which evolved. However, subsequent articles on this topic in certain publications, to include national publications, have

given rise to a new wave of puzzling questions. In fact, they have cast doubt upon both the conclusions of the commission, and the decree of the republic Supreme Soviet presidium. In connection with this, BELTA Correspondent A. Palchevskiy appealed to Belsovprof ■Belorussian Trade Union Council■ Secretary N.I. Rosha, a deputy of the BSSR Supreme Soviet, who supervised the work of the commission, and asked him to return once again to these events.

**[Palchevskiy] Nikolay Ivanovich, for what reason did the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium commission conduct an investigation, and were all the circumstances studied?**

[Rosha] The membership of the commission had been determined in early November, and it went to work immediately. The chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium gave us only one instruction: "Look into everything with complete objectivity, and devote special attention to disclosing even the smallest violation of the existing laws." Therefore, we began with an examination of the motivation of the organizers of the meeting, as well as that of the ispolkoms of the Soviets which refused them permission to hold it. The results were laid out in detail in the press. I want to stress just once more one detail which in my view is important: There was no permission whatsoever for holding the meeting, as several authors confirm, nor was any mentioned among its organizers and "Martirolog," which was created after the receipt of the applications. The commission unambiguously stated, that the ispolkoms had not taken advantage of the right offered to them to propose another time and place for conducting the measures, and to inform its initiators of it. That is so. But the official refusal had been handed to the declarants, and by law they had to serve it.

Next the commission set about interrogating those who took part in the meeting, and representatives of the Internal Affairs organs. Moreover, it was not we, but the citizens themselves, who told us with whom we should meet next. All the comrades named were invited and were able to speak out on the essence of the matter. The atmosphere of the meetings was calm and constructive.

On 10 November the conclusions of the commission were prepared and presented for examination to the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Each proposal and even individual words were discussed by members of the commission, and only when there was unanimous approval was the point accepted.

**[Palchevskiy] This document contains assertions to the effect that the unsanctioned meeting had goals which differed from those which the initiators had indicated in their applications. What served as proof of this for you?**

[Rosha] According to the norms generally accepted in the country, and not only by us, the organizers of any mass measure, including meetings, are obliged to indicate the time, place, and purpose of holding it; they must indicate the texts of the visual aids (placards, slogans);

and they must indicate the approximate number of participants. The authorities responsible for law and order are obliged to ascertain that these matters are observed, and if violated are to take measures to halt the proceedings.

The documents cited were placed at the disposal of the commission. But they also received those which were used on 30 October near the cemetery on Moscow Shosse. The latter had nothing in common with the instructions in the applications for the meeting nor with the observance of the funeral of "Dzyada." The texts of the pamphlets were of a provocatory nature. This was acknowledged by the citizens themselves when they were interrogated by the commission. In addition, as we were informed by the BSSR MVD that in response to the appeals by the militia officials to disperse, since holding the meeting had been authorized, insulting remarks were hurled from the crowd, and the public order protection organs were cursed.

**[Palchevskiy] And how did the commission rate the conduct of the militia?**

[Rosha] I'll begin with the fact that we asked the initiators of conducting the meeting a completely understandable question: Why did they, knowing about the ban on the measures, not try to put it off for another time, and why did they not inform the citizens of the decision of the local authorities, and why did they not take measures which would preclude the possibility of excesses? Judging from their answers, they had lost control over the development of events. Those questioned rejected any association whatever with those who had spread invitations and summons around the city, that they were volunteers in this matter, nor was the number of people known who might respond to these anonymous advertisements.

Under these circumstances the public order preservation organs undertook the appropriate steps. The number of militia personnel was, in our view, excessive; but I repeat, this was dictated by the ambiguity of the situation.

The militiamen who took part in the action to stop the meeting did not resort to special means. Their efforts were directed at forestalling worse problems should panic erupt or as a result of possible provocations. After all, there were children there too! Numerous instances can be cited, and not only from abroad, of a mass pileup of people for entirely innocent reasons (at sports matches, holidays), which have caused casualties. And in the case under examination any incident in the crowd might have caused a chain reaction. And then all the verbal appeals of the militia, as well as those taking part in the meeting themselves, would have been futile. And a disaster could have happened, which could hardly have been to the credit of the authorities, had they not taken all measures to forestall it.

As already noted in the conclusions of the commission and the decree of the Presidium, the republic procuracy did not find any of the militia actions to be in violation of the law.

**[Palchevskiy] You had mentioned special means. What were they? Billy clubs? Gas? Detachments of troops?**

[Roshia] The commission investigated these aspects very scrupulously. Certain witnesses questioned said that billy clubs were used. But when we asked them to give us the facts in greater detail, who used them and who was struck, and where are the traces of the blows—there were no eye-witnesses. Only one participant in the events of 30 October said that a policeman had pushed her with something like a stick. Moreover, we were subsequently unable to get any concrete corroboration of this from her.

In general, as it was brought out, there were no militiamen in the zone where the meeting was held, equipped with special means; however, in the place where the law-enforcement forces were concentrated, in the area of Kalinovskiy St., there were subunits which had them. Vehicles with water cannons were standing there. People going to the cemetery saw them of course, and rumors and suppositions have the quality of growing with the passing of time into "verified details." And now about the soldiers which allegedly were there. There were none. There were officials from the staff of the city UVD and from the MVD, who wear an officer's uniform similar to a military uniform, but this has nothing to do with troops whatsoever.

**[Palchevskiy] And what about the "people in civilian clothes" mentioned by the eye-witnesses?**

[Roshia] Druzhiniki had been invited to assist the militia.

**[Palchevskiy] You haven't said anything about gas, Nikolay Ivanovich...**

[Roshia] I can only repeat what I've said, although here I could cite certain details. Certain of those with whom we spoke asserted that they had experienced the effects of some kind of aerosol from small canisters. But no one could clearly describe even the markings on these little canisters, and could not provide an intelligible answer to the question, why they did not try to get medical attention or complain to the procuracy.

Moreover, in addition to our commission, there was one in Minsk from the Procuracy and the USSR MVD. It had established that no gas canisters had been issued on that day. A count was made, all documents were checked, and all canisters were weighed on special scales. Not a single gram of gas had been expended.

**[Palchevskiy] Do your conclusions coincide with those made by the Moscow commission?**

[Roshia] Yes they do. As far as the tone of disbelief in your question is concerned, I will say the following: There were natives of Minsk taking part in the work of the commission from Moscow—deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet and local soviets; prestigious people, and people invested with great authority. Thus, there is no reason to speak of attempts to save the "honor of the uniform" here.

**[Palchevskiy] Did anyone come to you with any kind of statements after the conclusions of the commission and the decree of the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium was published, with regard to the meeting in Minsk on 30 October?**

[Roshia] No. There were neither any statements, nor were there any telephone calls.

**[Palchevskiy] And what about those publications which appeared after the official ones?**

[Roshia] Once again, no.

**[Palchevskiy] In the latest articles about the meeting which did not take place, accent is placed on the Kuropaty, who are now famous throughout the land. What can you say in this regard?**

[Roshia] Strictly speaking, the question has no direct relation to the work of the commission, since the Kuropaty were not mentioned in the applications for permission to hold the meeting. Its organizers had planned to carry out their measures right in the city. It was later that several hundred people had gone out onto the ring road, where, by the way, speeches were made and poetry read...

But as far as our common pain is concerned—the illegal repressions of the 1930's and 1940's—as a member of the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and a communist, I can say the following. We must completely restore the scene of the terrible tragedy of all the peoples of our country, the Belorussians as well, and return the good name to all those people who had been disgraced. This is now being done in the republic by commissions for rehabilitation of those who suffered innocently, and above all, by a commission of the Belorussian CP Central Committee Buro. A specially-created government commission is working on the Kuropaty, and the republic procuracy has completed its investigation. As far as I know, their conclusions and a summary of the materials will soon be transferred to the republic government for the purpose of taking the final decisions.

**[Palchevskiy] And one final question. Nikolay Ivanovich, what sort of conclusions have you come to about the future, having taken part in the work of the commission?**

[Roshia] I think that it is fitting to recall our proposals in this connection. Among them are the necessity for a calmer reaction on the part of the local Soviets, when

matters concern new forms of development of democracy, and display of public activeness. Here, the maximum amount of democracy and glasnost is needed. On the other hand, the slogan, "Learn Democracy" is a timely one for many newly-formed social formations as

well; and a serious approach and objectivity are required of the mass information media. The elements are always destructive, no matter how they appear—natural cataclysms, the deeds of people, even their words. But now we badly need to build, and not to destroy.



22161

59

NTIS  
ATTN: PROCESS 103  
BEVERLY FARRADAY  
5285 PORT ROYAL RD  
SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

#### SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTS may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTS and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTS and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTS or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTS and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTS and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.