

JPRS-UPA-89-018
21 MARCH 1989



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980126 171

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

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-018

CONTENTS

21 MARCH 1989

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Preparations Under Way for Nationalities Plenum [AGITATOR No 24, Dec 88]	1
TuSSSR CP, Supreme Soviet Members Discuss Nationality Relations [Ye. Khodzhayev, et al.; TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA, 8 Dec 88]	2
PRAVDA Continues Criticism of Alma-Ata Obkom [PRAVDA, 17 Oct 88]	6
Pavlodar First Secretary, Others on Obkom Shortcomings [KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 26 Oct 88]	7
Serious Shortcomings Noted in KAZAKHSTAN KOMMUNISI [PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN KAZAKHSTANA No 10, Oct 88]	14
Kazakh CP Lugovskiy Raykom Expels Several Members [M. Isbayev; PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN KAZAKHSTANA No 10, Oct 88]	15
Biographical Information on New Kazakh Obkom, Ispolkom, Gorkom First Secretaries [PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN KAZAKHSTANA No 10, Oct 88]	18
Lithuania's City, Rayon Party Elections Reported [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 1, 13, 21 Nov 88]	19

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Trotsky's Death, Relations with Stalin Examined [N. Vasetskiy; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 1, 4 Jan 89]	23
BSSR Forced Collectivization, Purges, Famine Detailed [N. Kuznetsov; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 25 Dec 88]	29
Work of BSSR CP CC Commission on Stalinist Repressions Described [N.I. Dementey; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 15 Dec 88]	36
Conference to Examine History of Moldavian Collectivization [A. Tkhorov; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 3 Feb 89]	39
Stalinist Repressions in Ashkhabad Come to Light in Book [A. Churiyev; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 21 Nov 88]	41

CULTURE

Playwright Shatrov Airs Views on Revolution, Stalin [M. Dementyeva; OGONEK No 45, 5-12 Nov 88]	42
Writer Granin Urges Return of Emigre Writers, Artists [D. Granin; IZVESTIYA, 14 Jan 89]	49
Culture Ministry Assesses Theater Experiment [B. Sergeyev; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 5 Nov 88]	52
Commentary on 1988 USSR State Prizes in Literature, Art [P. Nikolayev; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 10 Nov 88]	52
Moscow Theater Expansion Planned [I. Pisarev; IZVESTIYA, 4 Nov 88]	55
Artist Glazunov Censures Avant-Garde [V. Vernikov; IZVESTIYA, 4 Nov 88]	56
Nationalistic Views, Activities of Uzbek Writers' Union Secretary Assailed [Yu. Kruzhilin, I. Khisamov; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 15 Dec 88]	57

SOCIAL ISSUES

UzSSR: Nearly 300 Students Involved in 24 Dec Dormitory Fight	60
Alcoholism, Other Social Ills Cited [A. Artemyev; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 25 Dec 88]	60
Uzbek Buro on Causes of Youth Disorder [PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 28 Dec 88]	60
Uzbek 'Private' Taxi Drivers Warned Again of High Murder, Robbery Risk [PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 18 Dec 88]	61
Further Details of 1 Jan Afghan Cadet Riot in Tashkent [F. Ovechkin; GUDOK, 17 Jan 89]	61
AzSSR Procurator Ismailov on Corruption in Azerbaijan [E. Aliyeva; BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 20 Dec 88]	63
Single Mother Without Papers Forced To Live on Streets [N. Varsegov; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 23 Nov 88]	65

REGIONAL ISSUES

Armenian CP Buro Scores Local Officials' Performance in Political Crisis [KOMMUNIST, 6 Dec 88]	68
Armenian Media's Performance During Unrest Blasted by Party Buro [KOMMUNIST, 28 Dec 88]	69
Recent Activities, Goals of 'Transformed' Karabakh Committee Rebuked [S. Petrosyan; KOMMUNIST, 28 Dec 88]	72
Role of Karabakh Committee in Post-Earthquake Efforts Condemned [K. Akopyan; KOMMUNIST, 30 Dec 88]	74
ArSSSR: Efforts to Bring Damaged Leninakan Factories Back on Line [K. Vlasenko; KOMMUNIST, 25 Dec 88]	76
ArSSSR: Kirovakan Avtogenmash Factory Reconstruction Under Way [S. Vidgof; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 24 Jan 89]	78
Armenian Official on Compensation for Earthquake Losses [O. Davtyan; IZVESTIYA, 25 Dec 88]	79
Moldavian Official Opposes Language Initiatives, 'People's Front Movements' [V. Iovv; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 11 Dec 88]	81
Writer Advocates Raising Status of Ukrainian Language [Ye. Shmorgun; RABOCHAYA GAZETA, 5 Nov 88]	85
Development of Tajik for Contemporary Science, Arts Urged [M. Shukurov; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 14 Dec 88]	87
Political, Ecological Concerns Over Construction at Topkhana, NKAO Reviewed [Yu. Khalilov, S. Israfilov; BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 2 Dec 88]	89
Biologist Reymers on Industrial Pollution, Clean-Up Possibilities [G. Dadyants; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 4 Nov 88]	92
Azerbaijani Health Minister on Pesticide Abuse in Republic [T. Kasumov; TRUD, 25 Aug 88]	94

Preparations Under Way for Nationalities Plenum
18000408 Moscow AGITATOR in Russian
No 24, Dec 88 pp 2-3

[Unsigned article: "On Improving Relations Between Nationalities in the USSR"]

[Text] Thus the agenda has been phrased for the CPSU Central Committee plenum to be held in mid-1989. The Central Committee's resolution on preparing for it notes that it is necessary under the conditions of perestroika to raise to a new level all activities to improve the relations between nationalities and to work out effective measures for implementing Lenin's nationalities policy at the present stage. The main objective is to achieve a genuine harmony of interests among all peoples and nationalities in the country, based upon the principles of socialist internationalism, independence and responsibility, and on mutual assistance and a sense of brotherhood, assuring the further development and strengthening of our united multi-national state.

The great effort of preparing for the plenum must rely upon accumulated experience and the lessons of the past together with the pressure of present-day demands for renewal, democratization, and the creation of a lawful state.

Over the years of Soviet power, work of historical importance has been carried out towards the resolution of the nationalities issue. Impressive results have been achieved in securing the genuine equality of peoples and nationalities and in strengthening the fraternal relations between peoples through international education of the workers. These achievements are a source of legitimate pride for all Soviet peoples. Nevertheless, quite a number of problems have gradually accumulated in this area which now require resolution.

The CPSU Central Committee regards the preparations for the plenum as **a matter of special importance and urgency for the entire party**. It is therefore necessary, on the basis of political guidelines set forth by the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, to take vigorous action today to dispose of urgent matters which aggravate the situation, especially in the social sphere, pertaining to the development of national languages and cultures. It is necessary to go more boldly to the work collectives and to talk with people openly, upholding the policy of the party. Relying on the power of persuasion as well as the authority of the law, we must oppose the efforts of people to turn natural national sentiments into destructive channels of nationalism and to exploit the broadening of glasnost and democracy for anti-democratic purposes. We must not allow our common international achievements to be discredited.

Within party organizations and labor groups a nationwide discussion will take place with broad public participation. Ideological activists are called upon to take a vigorous part in this effort. It is essential to establish a creative

dialogue with the people, linking the problem of relations between nationalities with the Leninist interpretation of them in a vigorous and extensive, day-by-day discussion. It is recommended that the ideas expressed in the course of discussions be generalized, and that the specific proposals made to strengthen the international unity of our society and to further improve the relations between nationalities be given consideration. This analysis of what has been accomplished and carried out in the conduct of nationalities policy, and of the reasons for the problems and difficulties that have accumulated, will help to reveal ways of meeting the needs of the various national groups; it will be also be of assistance in taking into account the specific proposals made to strengthen both the processes of integration and the independence and responsibility of the union republics and autonomous territories in terms of economics, social and cultural development, and administration. Finally, it will serve to give expression to ideas about practical ways to improve the patriotic and international education of all segments of society, especially of youth.

The CPSU Central Committee has recognized the **necessity of preparing proposals to alter or amend existing Soviet legislation and to bring the relations between nationalities under regulatory control**. This includes such tasks as improving the Soviet socialist federation; further developing the legal status of union and autonomous republics and of autonomous oblasts and okrugs; extending legal guarantees for the purpose of meeting the national and cultural needs of Soviet citizens living outside the boundaries of their own state territories or citizens who do not have territories of their own; and increasing legal sanctions against inciting national strife and preaching racial or national exclusiveness. Plans are under way to draft a USSR Law on the Free Development and Equality of the Languages in the USSR; to prepare a new version of the Law on USSR Citizenship; and to submit proposals for making appropriate alterations in the USSR Constitution and in the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics. Alterations and additions should include the new functions of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet; they should also deal with procedures to be used in forming permanent commissions on relations between nationalities within the soviets of peoples deputies in case of necessity.

A profound scientific analysis and appraisal of the development of existing economic practices and the material basis of internationalism is to be carried out, dealing in particular with the following problems: union republics and autonomous territories within a single national economic complex of the country; the regional division of labor; the rights and duties of the republics, together with union and local organs, in improving the economic situation and in safeguarding the efficient utilization of natural resources; the genuine contribution of each union republic to the all-union economy; and the production and distribution of national income from the standpoint of the republics.

The potential and economic feasibility of converting the republics and regions to principles of economic self-sufficiency should be analyzed in depth. Ways should also be examined to develop direct ties between the union republics; of linking the greater economic independence of the union republics and the autonomous regions with responsibility for providing for the overall requirements of the country; of devising a mechanism for the formation and use of the USSR State Budget and the state budgets of the union republics as well as local budgets; and of creating effective interaction between territorial organs of administration and USSR ministries, departments, and enterprises under union jurisdiction.

Finally, with respect to providing ideological support of CPSU nationalities policy, scholars and spokesmen for art and culture are called upon to organize a broad discussion. They are also called upon to work out appropriate proposals for the development of international relations theory, for the blossoming and mutual enrichment of national cultures, and for improving operations of the mass media and creative organizations teaching patriotic and international education. A proposal to establish a scientific research center for the comprehensive study of urgent problems of relations between nationalities should also be examined.

The Soviet press, radio, and television is organizing a broad publicity campaign in preparation for the CPSU Central Committee plenum, the main contents of which depicts the experience of dealing with the nationalities issue in the USSR and cultural and economic living conditions in the Soviet republics and autonomous regions. Particular attention is being given to creating in the society an intellectual and cultural atmosphere that is capable of fostering the international unity, friendship, and fraternity of the Soviet peoples.

The party Central Committee will continue to be advised of proposals on an entire range of issues pertaining to problems of nationalities. The theses of the official report will be made public two months prior to convocation of the plenum.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Agitator", 1988

TuSSR CP, Supreme Soviet Members Discuss Nationality Relations

18300247a Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 8 Dec 88 pp 2-3

[Interview with Ye. Khodzhaev, P. Iutin, E. Khamrayev, M. Saakyan, G. Nurullayeva, M. Abayeva, A. Atayev, N. Vdovenkov, B. Karayev and I. Tkachenko, conducted by TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA correspondents V. Gordeyev, D. Bayborodina and S. Galechyan: "We Are Internationalists": "Based Upon the Force of Conviction: Problems of How to Improve Interethnic Relations Discussed During Meeting at Our Editorial Offices"]

[Text] Today the CPSU Central Committee demands that work to resolve the nationalities questions be subjected to in-depth analysis. Many problems requiring urgent attention have accumulated in this area.

We have begun to correct the distortions which arose in the area of internationalist education during the period of Stalinist repressions and the Brezhnev stagnation period; we are witnessing an upsurge in ethnic self-awareness. But we should also notice that we are lulling ourselves with the slogans of friendship and brotherhood among peoples while the concept of a unified Soviet people becomes blurred and attempts are made to withdraw into an ethnic shell.

The sore points—Kazakhstan, Nagorno-Karabakh, Sumgait, Yerevan, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—bear witness to the fact that the time has come to work patiently to resolve interethnic and socioeconomic problems, yet they are also alarming at times on account of the nationalistic, extremist turns they take. In order to avoid complications we must be able both to predict and to rectify situations.

Therefore we would like to define the principal orientations as we discuss the situation in our republic as a whole.

The participants in a discussion held at our editorial offices were: Ye. Khodzhaev, a TuSSR Supreme Soviet deputy, chairman of the Permanent Commission on Interethnic Relations, bearer of 13 military and labor orders, a candidate of philosophical sciences and editor-in-chief of the journal TURKMENSKIY KOMMUNIST; P. Iutin, a TuSSR Supreme Soviet Deputy, TuSSR CP Central Committee member, bearer of the Order of the Labor Red Banner and Order of Friendship Among Peoples and a construction brigade leader at Construction and Installation Administration #1, Ashkhabad Industrial Design and Construction Association; E. Khamrayev, a TuSSR Supreme Soviet deputy, Hero of Socialist Labor and bearer of the Order of Lenin (twice) and of the Order of the Labor Red Banner and a baker at the Ashkhabadkhleb PO; M. Saakyan, a TuSSR Supreme Soviet deputy, member of the Ashkhabad TuSSR CP Gorkom, member of the Permanent Commission on Interethnic Relations, bearer of the Order of Glory (3rd Degree) and the Order of the Labor Red Banner and head of a woodworking and lathe operators' brigade at the Ashkhabad Wood Processing Combine; G. Nurullayeva, a TuSSR Supreme Soviet deputy, member of the Permanent Commission on Interethnic Relations and instructor at Turkmen Polytechnical Institute; M. Abayeva, a candidate of philosophical sciences and leading scientist in the TuSSR Academy of Sciences Philosophy and Law Department; A. Atayev, a candidate of historical sciences and head of the Scientific Communism Department, Turkmen State University; N. Vdovenkov, deputy chairman of the TuSSR State Committee on Labor and Social Security; B. Karayev, chief of the TuSSR Komsomol Central Committee Propaganda and Mass Cultural Work Department; and I. Tkachenko, lieutenant colonel and head of the TuSSR Military Commissariat Political Department.

[Correspondent] Social policy, bilingualism, military-patriotic education, attempts at command-administrative solutions with regard to social formations, the problems of small peoples, interethnic marriages, kalym [bride price], the relationship between raw materials exports and our own needs, the dictate of the all-union ministries, performance of partnership duties... The root cause of many of these problems is our inability thus far to develop the masses' political culture to the fullest. We are making great demands on the administrative apparatus yet sometimes we ourselves are inert when it comes to restructuring. Many issues come down to nothing more than a petty settling of scores. Insults instead of dialogue, waiting for decisions from above. How can we overcome these problems?

[B. Karayev] During a folk festival in Nisa four young people carried banners and signs calling for the preservation of Nisa as a unique part of our historical heritage and in protest against the mass celebration being held within the park. The Komsomol Central Committee could not come to a unified conclusion in its consideration of this incident.

It seems to me that the matter of attitudes toward historical monuments must be viewed as a cultural matter. The question of the new world and the old world plays a major role in this respect. Previously that question was resolved one-sidedly: we are building a new world, hence we have to destroy the old one. It seems to me that this tendency persists even today. And when we have the weight of tradition on our shoulders it is difficult to create a clear-cut concept of historical values. There are many points which must still be dealt with.

[Correspondent] That is to say we are still at the stage of developing a program for the teaching of political culture?

[B. Karayev] Nowadays we talk about culture in many different connections. With regard to ecological problems we talk about ecological culture, in connection with interethnic relations we talk about a culture of interethnic relations. I am talking about an individual's general culture.

[A. Atayev] But what is the Komsomol's stance on historical monuments, and on those in Nisa in particular?

[B. Karayev] My personal opinion: we should carefully analyze the appeals those young people were making. Their slogans were essentially humane: do not trample on Nisa. On the other hand, those young people's actions...

[G. Nurullayeva] Exactly! It seems to me that all the controversy surrounding the "picketers" has nothing to do with the content of their protest, but rather with the way in which it was expressed. I would bet that those young people had repeatedly brought up the Nisa question but that no one listened to them. So they resorted to an act to which we are unaccustomed.

[B. Karayev] You know, I used to think that the conducting of festivals at historical sites ennobled people. But this year, perhaps on account of the appeals made by those young people, I was eager for the celebration to be over. And I saw that there was nothing ennobling about it. After the festival the site was littered and trampled.

[Correspondent] But perhaps it was not such a terrible thing that the festival was held in an historical place. The root of the problem probably lay elsewhere: with people's lack of culture. Here is where people need to be educated.

[Ye. Khodzhayev] It is good that young people are concerned about the fate of historical monuments. For example, those young people do not want to permit the destruction of Nisa; perhaps they feel a moral imperative to save ancient culture from destruction. And when we take a political lesson from what happened in Nisa we should not forget the most important thing: by being able to genuinely appreciate its own culture every people in our country enriches all-union culture and expands the boundaries of internationalist brotherhood and unity.

[P. Iutin] The young people were protesting against the use of an historical site for a folk festival? My point of view is this: the problem lay not with the selection of the site, but rather with the level of culture with which the event was conducted. Look around you: we see crudeness flourishing everywhere, in stores, at the movies, on public transportation. And we put up with it. This tolerance of crudeness is almost universal. In the end it gets to the point where we regard a lack of culture as something inevitable, like some sort of national trait...

Regarding attitudes toward ethnic culture. I feel that above all we should take a look at how the Turkmen language is treated in schools and VUZs. We see that it is a part of school and VUZ curricula, but do our children, who get "A's" in language, actually know it? No. Turkmen language lessons are a formality. Who is to blame for that? What is the source of this frivolous attitude toward the Turkmen language? Why does one need to have knowledge to get an "A" in physics or a foreign language, but not for Turkmen? It is at school that attitudes toward other ethnic things take shape as well. That is where we need to begin teaching people a culture of interethnic relations.

[Correspondent] The problem of specialist selection and promotion solely on the basis of job skills is closely connected to this. Here again everyone is in favor of this! But in actuality we continue to see dictates from above, the existence of a nomenklatura, and vetoes of collectives' decisions. Clan-tribal ties, protectionism, regional fraternities—do these not exist in our republic? There

are still problems today at VUZs and in cadre selection. How can we take control of this situation? The question of bilingualism has still not gotten any further than empty rhetoric. Why?

Maybe we can also attempt to evaluate the following situation: A meeting between the residents of a certain microrayon and representatives of public associations was held at Ashkhabad School #33. Turkmen was the native language of most of those attending, and only a very few of those present did not understand it. The majority requested that the meeting be conducted in Turkmen. The sponsors of the meeting attempted to use Turkmen-Russian interpretation. But the "majority" did not like that: it was too tedious. The "minority" had to leave the auditorium.

[I. Tkachenko] There is no opportunity to learn Turkmen. Many officers would like to. But there are no textbooks, no self-teaching books, no conversation manuals. When I was stationed in Uzbekistan I tried to get an Uzbek conversation manual. When I finally got it I had already been transferred to Turkmenistan...

[Correspondent] What is the current percentage of Turkmen young people at VUZs? Is the situation there improving?

[A. Atayev] In Ashkhabad the figure is 55 percent. In Chardzhou there are very few Europeans. We are working on this problem now. Formerly we faced the task of training our own, local intelligentsia. Now that its proportion has increased substantially membership in the Turkmen ethnic group should not, in my opinion, continue to be a basis for preferential VUZ admission status. I went to School #19. I sometimes see a classmate of mine, an Armenian. He was a better student, but he did not go to the university as I did. I was the one who had an advantage: my ethnic background. And that should not be.

[G. Nurullayeva] I feel that major work is being done by the TuSSR Supreme Soviet's Commission on Interethnic Relations, which was established one year ago and has jumped right into the question of how to provide normal conditions for the development of all the ethnic groups that live in our republic. Today we are working to ensure that everyone can receive instruction in his or her native language. Yet most of the Uzbeks living in Chardzhinskiy Rayon want to study in Turkmen. But we have to think about what will happen in the future. What if the children of today's Uzbeks decide they want it the other way? Therefore even today we must think about training specialists in Uzbek and opening schools there which will use Uzbek. Any way you look at this is a serious issue when 67 percent of the population is Uzbek.

Each local soviet head should take the initiative and establish contacts with the neighboring republic without waiting for instructions from higher up. The head of a local soviet cannot simply throw up his hands in despair!

[Correspondent] In seeking solutions to many problems people's enthusiasm is still being exploited, we are still seeing a cynical attitude toward labor, centralization versus self-management, petty, excessive supervision of production. Those are the problems, but what are our labor resources? What sort of internal redistribution of those resources goes on, and what is the role played by regional clan-tribal relationships in this regard?

Such matters as full glasnost concerning the distribution of national product and income are still being concealed—the things in which people are so keenly interested. We should also state here today that people cite difficulties, superstition and the influence of bourgeois ideology when they lack serious arguments.

[M. Saakyan] Unfortunately at some stage our republic party committees and soviet organs permitted flagrant violations of the principles of social justice, and this has resulted in substantial gaps in levels of cultural and social development. Today the problem of small ethnic groups has at least been outlined. But I must admit, Yemud Kodzhayevich, that the impressions I brought back from our recent trips are not encouraging. Problems remain. In the current atmosphere of glasnost and democracy they are even getting worse, including language problems.

[Ye. Khodzhayev] You know, last year the Turkmen CP Central Committee Buro specially discussed the status of the Balochi population in Mary Oblast, the Kazakh population of Deynauskiy Rayon and the German population in Serakhskiy Rayon.

Martin Saakyan is right: the ethnic situation in our region remains discouraging, though some progress is in evidence in the policy of local party committees and soviet organs. Specifically, something is being done to ensure proper representation of all ethnic groups, including small ones, in the various branches of the social and political structure and to prevent ethnic deformations in the composition of elective organs of leadership and the ranks of the CPSU.

Social and cadre-related problems are being resolved. On the basis of an agreement with the Turkmen CP Central Committee Balochis are being accepted into VUZs on a noncompetitive basis, with emphasis on the training of physicians and teachers. Nowadays if you ask any first secretary of a party committee in Turkmen-Kalinskiy, Iolotanskiy, Karakumskiy or Bayram-Aliyskiy rayon how many Balochis are studying and where he will know the answer right off the top of his head. This matter is being strictly monitored by the party.

Disputes erupt over language problems. We are no longer hushing up any problems relating to interethnic relations, no matter how acute they may be; now we submit them for broad discussion.

[M. Saakyan] Whether we like it or not, in a multiethnic state, particularly one like ours, convergence and even assimilation of peoples occurs. This is historically inevitable. Furthermore, practical politics focuses on the tendency toward the convergence and eventual blending of peoples. In fact, with open republic borders and growing self-awareness population migration, for instance, is inevitable. Incidentally, intensification of migration is one of the leading tendencies of interethnic policy in a socialist society.

For example, I was born in Nagorno-Karabakh. I went to school there and I entered the army there, only later moving to Turkmenistan, which became my second home. It is good that one of the real achievements of socialism has been giving all peoples equality in terms of legal and economic rights. And I can work in any ethnic republic that I like. My brigade is internationalist—our workers come from fifteen different peoples and ethnic groups. Our work together and the comradely atmosphere help unite us and serve as a highly important stimulus to the formation of an internationalist consciousness. A typical case: recently six fellows came from Azerbaijan and especially requested my brigade. In it we get along in a friendly way, and there are no incidents of an ethnic nature. Generally speaking I feel that the ordinary working man or woman is definitely not inclined to create tension in interethnic relations. My new coworkers, the Azerbaijanis, do not want to do that either.

Furthermore, I can say that we condemn the events which are still unfolding in Azerbaijan and Armenia. We resolutely favor an end to those events. The disorders are the work of simple people's hands, but they are being incited by the overt enemies of restructuring and by the underground Soviet millionaires, who fear inevitable exposure. Should we do their bidding? The state has done so much to promote our common development that our sacred task today is to repay our debt to it and strengthen the cause of restructuring instead of undermining the foundations of the state by causing tyranny, disorder and anarchy.

[E. Khamrayev] They say that in ethnic republics the members of small ethnic groups adapt to the customs and mores of the people among whom they live out of necessity, not out of goodwill. By doing so they have less difficulty getting an education or finding a job or simply leading their day-to-day lives. When they change passports many of them even resort to "ideological accounting," with Balochis, for instance, becoming Turkmen. But when they do so their inner ethnic discontent

merely grows more intense. We really need to take some serious lessons from the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh, so that we do not repeat the same mistakes in our interethnic policy.

Like Saakyan, I am a simple working man. I have been the head of a Komsomol youth collective for 33 years and I can tell you that ordinary working people do not need all the current fuss surrounding the nationalities question. I can also tell you that it is quite easy to provoke people to riot by exploiting their ethnic sentiments and political immaturity. Therefore today we are in particular need of purposeful, thoroughly planned ideological educational work, especially with young people. And atheistic work as well.

In our brigade we try not to forget in our educational work that it is precisely religious extremism which can give rise to all negative phenomena with ethnic overtones. For example, I gave both my daughters in marriage without kalym. And everyone in our internationalist brigade is an atheist.

[N. Vdovenkov] The reference made here today to the great significance of population migration was correct. Incidentally, migration is encouraged by innovative economic policy. A number of joint ventures functioning on a cost-accounting basis are currently being built or are already in operation in our republic. These are located in Mary and Tashauz. The conditions are as follows: we offer partners from different regions empty buildings and labor resources. They supply the joint ventures with the necessary equipment and raw materials. They get to keep 100 percent of their planned production, and everything above that goes to us. We are in favor of this kind of ties. Firstly, this is economically advantageous because it allows us to avoid negative deformations of the social infrastructure. Most importantly, it provides us with major opportunities to get the non-employed female population involved in socially beneficial labor. In connection with the recent tendency toward curtailment of carpet and weaving production a free market of labor resources has appeared again. Our republic ministries are still not prepared to resolve this problem. So outside help is a good thing. Plus we are having a political effect. A sense of the territorial oneness of the whole Soviet people develops among people employed by joint ventures.

[Ye. Khodzhayev] Yet how long is it going to be until we solve the problem of how to utilize local resources? Uzbekistan is processing the majority of the cotton it grows, whereas we process only five percent of ours. Why? We transport oil and gas to other regions, thereby losing billions of rubles that we could be using to improve our social infrastructure.

[A. Vdovenkov] This ties in with expansion of union republics' rights and greater independence for them with regard to the economy and social development. So far

the process of building our own major production facilities has been inhibited. Primarily this is due to the poor training of local cadres and a lack of production area. As a result a free market of labor resources has come into being. In this situation the establishment of joint ventures is one of our primary orientations.

Resettlement of TuSSR citizens to Amurskaya Oblast is also underway. Between 70 and 75 percent of the persons moving there remain there, including 35 percent ethnic Turkmen. In graphic terms, of every 1,500 families who move there 600 are purely Turkmen. Now all of them considered themselves Amurians and do not intend to leave that area. True, they do have one request: that their ethnic roots not be cut off. They need Turkmen-language literature, green tea and cotton oil, without which the plov [Turkmen ethnic dish] is just not quite the same...

As for interethnic relations, everyone there lives together amicably. A typical case: persons moving from Turkmenistan, regardless of their ethnicity, request that they not be divided up into separate settlements but instead allowed to live all together. As they say, that speaks for itself...

[E. Khamrayev] I would like to return to the matter of employment in our republic. This situation in which we are subsisting virtually entirely on imported goods is abnormal. We can supply ourselves with the goods we need. And we do have the labor and raw materials we need to do so. This question has been brought up at higher levels. But for some reason our situation has not changed for the better.

Take our enterprise. We are in urgent need of yeast, which is such an important component in the production of bread. We get it wherever we can, in Baku or in Dushanbe, yet the planned construction of a yeast plant for our enterprise continues to be held up. Why?

[N. Vdovenkov] The question is not directed at me. I am not the chairman of our republic Gosplan. But I can tell you that the holdup in planned construction is, once again, due to our problems, to a lack of attention to the social infrastructure. Look at the conditions under which builders have to work. They lack even the most basic prerequisites for their labor, recreation and cultural development!...

[M. Abayeva] I think that I speak for everyone when I say that the timeliness of the nationalities question has been reduced to the proclamation of fraternal slogans while serious ethnic problems are simply ignored; this has resulted in deformations in interethnic relations. The revolutionary renewal of society now beginning has not only exposed sore points in our life, it has also spurred us to find solutions to current and future problems. This was precisely the thrust of the recent CPSU Central Committee resolution entitled "On Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the USSR."

We have all exchanged our opinions and arrived at the conclusion that the ethnic situation in our republic is relatively positive. But that is no reason for complacency.

Those who have spoken here today have correctly stated that the matter of free development of and equal rights with regard to the use of national languages by the peoples of the USSR are of particular importance. And the most important thing in this regard is the ability to delineate clearly between ethnic self-awareness and nationalism, between ethnic interests and those who would distort them for nationalistic ends. We must not permit our common internationalist achievements to be discredited.

Just a few words about language problems in our republic. In view of our republic's multiethnic nature it is exceptionally important that we have a language of interethnic communication (one which is accessible to all); that is indisputable. At the same time we must also take into account demands for the free development and equal use of ethnic languages.

Today many people are talking about the development of ethnic languages and even about granting them the status of official languages. It seems to me that this question should revolve around free development and also free, equal usage of the languages of all the Soviet peoples living in a given republic. Will the proclamation of one language or another as a state language foster free use of other ethnic languages within the territory of the republic in question?

During the 70 years that our state has existed we have accumulated a tremendous experience with internationalist traditions. The sociopolitical and internationalist community called the Soviet people is not just a phrase, it is our reality. Goodwill, good interethnic relations and friendship as a general phenomenon are also not just a phrase, but rather a reality.

[Ye. Khodzhayev] I would simply like to quote Vladimir Ilich Lenin: that which is genuinely national is international. One cannot say it any better. We need to preserve the image of the Soviet people, cast out everything which contradicts the essence of socialism and, of course, not forget the interests of each individual human being, so that trivial insults do not grow into a large problem. One should not offend ethnic sensibilities even in jest. That is a matter of general culture. Only then will the success of our state's internationalist policy become a reality.

PRAVDA Continues Criticism of Alma-Ata Obkom

18300146a Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 88 p 3

[Unsigned article under the rubric "Correspondent's Column: Resonance": "Tenacious Quicksands"]

[Text] This was the title of the correspondent's column (PRAVDA, 23 June) on cadre policy in Alma-Ata Oblast. M. Mendybayev, Kazakh CP obkom first secretary, informed the editors that the article had been examined at a buro meeting and deemed correct.

In fact, D. Familtsev, oblast land reclamation and water resources chief, was reprimanded by the Taldy-Kurgan Obkom for serious errors in the party guidance of the rayon's socioeconomic development when he was first secretary of the Sarkandskiy Party Raykom. A party penalty was imposed on him in May 1987.

He was recommended for his present post by the Kazakh SSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources. He was highly recommended as a specialist, handles problems correctly, and is an experienced organizer. However, as a leader and educator, D. Familtsev is not always exemplary. He is sometimes unrestrained, rude in dealing with subordinates, and inclined toward administration and the substitution of specialists. Besides this, he basically gets along well with people, to which letters being received by the party obkom attest.

The Kazakh CP Alma-Ata Obkom Buro decided to limit itself to discussion, taking this, as well as D. Familtsev's positive assertion that he will draw the appropriate conclusions from criticism, into consideration.

The attention of A. Shchekota, party obkom second secretary, was directed to existing shortcomings in upbringing work with the oblast's leading cadres.

The oblast land reclamation and water resources primary party organization was instructed to strengthen control over the administration's activity, to take effective steps to further develop the democratic principles of management, glasnost, criticism and self-criticism, and to increase the role of labor collectives in solving production and social problems in light of the requirements of the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

The obkom buro admitted that it has not displayed persistence and a principle-minded nature in implementing its own resolution regarding the inexpediency of the further employment of Kh. Omargaliyev as chairman of the republic council on tourism and excursions.

From the editors: As is obvious, the response essentially repeats the contents of the PRAVDA article. Yet, as far as the measures that were taken are concerned, they hardly attest to the oblast party committee's solid and principle-minded position. One asks oneself: can an experienced organizer get along with people if he, as a leader and educator, is not always exemplary, rude in dealing with subordinates and inclined towards administration? By the Alma-Ata Obkom's logic, he can. In this regard, Comrade Mendybayev refers to letters being received by the obkom.

Letters of a different nature have been received by PRAVDA and its correspondent's center in Alma-Ata. For example, this is what B. Rogovets, labor collective council chairman, Talgarskiy Rayon Repair and Service Association of the Oblast Land Reclamation and Water Resources, reports: "After the PRAVDA article, 'Tenacious Quicksands,' our chief, A. Sabirov put on a show

(in my absence): he ordered the party organization to call people together and held a discussion of letters defending Familtsev. Maybe Familtsev is a competent specialist. I and many others do not know this, yet they were forced to sign the letter." This requires no comment. We need only add: PRAVDA wrote about D. Familtsev's tendency to suppress criticism in the article "Dragging Things Out" on 10 May 1986.

The obkom's reaction to criticism is quite strange. It is as though it acknowledges the criticism, but matters go no further. The Kazsovprof leaders in general have not found it necessary to answer the newspaper's critical article and continue to ignore the resolutions of the rayon and oblast party committees.

Pavlodar First Secretary, Others on Obkom Shortcomings

*18300146b Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 26 Oct 88 p 2*

[KazTAG report: "The Party Committee: To Increase Exactness Towards Cadres (From the Pavlodar Party Obkom Plenum)"]

[Text] **Organizational questions were considered at the Pavlodar Party Obkom Plenum, held last Saturday. In connection with his retirement, P.I. Yerpilov was released from his duties as obkom first secretary. Yu.A. Meshcheryakov was elected party obkom first secretary. M.K. Duysembayev was elected second secretary and N.F. Krasnoselskiy became a secretary.**

Of course, the terse lines of the official report cannot convey even a part of the stressed and difficult preparatory work that preceded the plenum or the full depth and principle-minded nature of the discussion that took place there. Yet precisely this distinguished it from any similar events here in the past and made it into an unusual event in the life not only of the oblast, but also of the republic's entire party organization.

There are weighty grounds for this conclusion. Work on the selection, upbringing and placement of cadres has always been a priority area in the work of party agencies. Its role and significance have especially increased today, in the difficult and responsible period of the revolutionary renovation of society, the development of democratization and glasnost, and the universal confirmation of the ideas of restructuring. After all, the success of the changes in one or another region, city, village and in each collective, and of the course of implementing the outlined plans and transformations on the whole, depend on who holds the post of party leader and whether or not he is a true leader of the communists and of all working people.

Precisely for this reason, the plenum participants were faced, to put it bluntly, with a difficult test, since they essentially had to replenish the party obkom buro personnel. P.I. Yerpilov, in connection with reaching retirement age, appealed for release from the post of obkom first secretary, which higher party authorities deemed possible to grant. Moreover, K.N. Shakirimov, obkom second secretary, was transferred to another job and M.M. Makeyev, obkom secretary in charge of construction, declared the impossibility of further fulfilling his responsibilities due to his health.

This is how the situation took shape. However, much of that which was said at the Pavlodar plenum goes far beyond the framework of events of only a local significance.

What kind of criteria should a party leader meet today? Different answers were given to this very complex question. However, most communists, both in talks before the plenum, as well as in speeches from its rostrum, converged on the opinion that a party leader, above all, should be an individual capable of unusual and bold decisions. He should be a personal example in order to inspire people to more actively participate in restructuring.

The nominated candidates, Yu.A. Meshcheryakov, M.K. Duysembayev and N.F. Krasnoselskiy, came as no surprise to anyone. On the eve of the plenum, they had numerous meetings with party obkom members, labor collective representatives, and representatives of the oblast's populace. Even the route of these trips itself attested to the fact that the main "nerve centers" for the socioeconomic development of Pavlodarskiy Priirtysh had been chosen: the new "Dachnyy" microrayon oblast center, the "Kooperator" stores, department stores, "Kulinariya," the kolkhoz market, the "Pavlodar Tractor Plant imeni V.I. Lenin" Association, and the Yermakovskiy Cinder Block Plant.

After all, the oblast is far from first in the republic in terms of building housing and providing food products and goods of prime necessity. The Pavlodarans realize this particularly painfully. They each all that the oblast has built up a powerful industrial potential and that there are many reserves in the agroindustrial complex, but they are being used extremely poorly.

Hence, the meetings, be they with the party aktiv in party raykoms or with consumers in stores, were held with great tension. No few unpleasant things were said of the "departing" leaders, and many hopes were voiced to the candidate oblast party leaders. Of course, many were interested: what were they coming in with, what new things would they bring into the work of the oblast's staff of communists, how do they envision the further development of the oblast's socioeconomic sphere, and how will they overcome the inertia, sluggishness and dependency in solving problems long ago imminent?

Therefore, communists and non-party members everywhere listened to Yu.A. Meshcheryakov, M.K. Duysembayev and N.F. Krasnoselskiy with intensified interest and attention. Their thoughts were expressed at the party obkom plenum in a concentrated, programmatic form.

Yu.A. Meshcheryakov took the rostrum. Many were impressed, and not just by his biography. He graduated from a tekhnikum, an institute, and the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences. He has worked as a carpenter, master, manager of a trust, party raykom and gorkom secretary and, most recently, as a Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee secretary. Something else was, perhaps, even more attractive: real and tangible shifts in the areas of work entrusted to him. One eloquent feature: the candidate is one of the initiators of the republic "Zhilye-91" program, and its successful implementation is obvious to everyone.

Yu.A. Meshcheryakov:

I have defined the following plan of actions for myself: if you give me your trust, I will try to concentrate the efforts of all communists and non-party members on four main areas—providing food, housing and consumer goods and solving ecological problems. I believe that these problems are the most urgent in Pavlodar Oblast.

However, in speaking of these, we must keep in mind that our republic already has a fair amount of positive experience. For example, several groups of Pavlodarans recently visited neighboring oblasts and familiarized themselves with their solution of the food problem. It would be no exaggeration to say that residents from many regions have studied with the people of Tselinograd and Kokchetav in this area.

The same can be said for the experience accumulated in constructing housing in the republic. Many of the increases come from here, from Pavlodar Oblast. For example, the construction of sixth and ninth floors on buildings, "beyond the plan," and the involvement of those waiting in line in constructing apartments.

Unquestionably, this must all be disseminated and effectively utilized. Matters with consumer goods and ecological problems in the oblast are considerably more complex. However, we must solve them together, having rolled up our sleeves, without losing valuable time. It seems that these four areas, and I am quite sure of this, should take priority in the oblast party organization's work.

There is something else which I wanted mandatorily to say. I think that concern for people is the main thing in a communist's and party leader's work. There is not and cannot be anything trivial whatsoever in it. You see, sometimes the offense and dissatisfaction of the people have been caused by simple, even elementary, things: someone has a leaky faucet, a roof became worse, or someone did not meet with a person or was rude to

somebody. After all, it is no secret to us that for a long time the party agencies have been neglecting and are still neglecting much that relates to a person's existence and influences his mood.

In meetings with Pavlodarans, the following important element was also revealed to me: obkom secretaries do not meet often enough with the people, rarely talk to them about the most topical subjects, and poorly explain the party committee's position on one problem or another. As a result, there are waves of rumors and conjectures concerning the food, ecological, and many other problems, as well as a simply false concept of the existing state of affairs. I am certain that party leaders should not tolerate this!

A few words on collectivism in work: it should be implemented in combination with the high personal responsibility of each communist-leader for the area entrusted to him. Specific results are the first and primary criteria for work. In the final account, the party committee's authority and its ability to manage the difficult processes of renovating society depend on this.

Party obkom members K. Alin, O. Kozhanov, A. Koshevoy, Zh. Iskakov and G. Sharkov spoke in the discussion of the candidate's program. They noted that Yu.A. Meshcheryakov's plan of actions fully meets the oblast's most vital needs.

A vote was held, and Yu.A. Meshcheryakov was unanimously elected first secretary of the Pavlodar Party Obkom.

M.K. Duysembayev took the plenum rostrum. He is a fairly well-known communist and leader in Pavlodar Oblast and heads the party organization of Ekibastuz, a city of miners, power engineers and builders.

M.K. Duysembayev:

Working in Ekibastuz, I saw and realized distinctly how the economic and social areas have developed and continue to develop disproportionately even today. Of course, this does not apply just to Ekibastuz. I think it is necessary to correct the lean towards the industrial side.

Meanwhile, many reserves are not being used to develop enterprise ponds and auxiliary farms. Their sponsorship aid to rural residents must also be strengthened. I think that this is needed in order to repay the injustice formed by history: the city should pay back its debt to the countryside. This would also be of enormous support in implementing the Food Program.

N.F. Krasnoselskiy took the stand. He has much experience as an economic, soviet and party worker. Most recently, he headed the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Department for Construction and the Municipal Economy. Incidentally, he is also one of the organizers of the "Zhilye-91" program.

N.F. Krasnoselskiy:

The oblast has a large construction potential. However, it is being inadequately used. Moreover, there has been no growth in the rates of housing construction for almost 2 decades already. Panel housing construction is lagging in particular. In short, if we achieve a percentage of use of the projected capacities of construction industry enterprises up to even the average republic level, then it would be possible to additionally commission tens of thousands of square meters of housing in the oblast annually.

I realize that this problem will not be solved in an hour. We will have to exert ourselves strongly. However, there is no other solution: the main efforts should be focused on strengthening and developing the construction industry base. Then, it will be possible to successfully work to build preschool institutions, schools, hospitals and other important projects for sociocultural purposes.

The candidates' programs were heard with great attention. The voting results attest best of all as to how plenum participants felt about them: M.K. Duysembayev and N.F. Krasnoselskiy were elected for the new positions and were made obkom buro members by an absolute majority.

M.M. Makeyev, G.A. Nikiforov and K.N. Shakirimov were released as members of the Pavlodar Party Obkom Buro.

Much work faces the new buro staff. To put it directly, it is not easy work. Tremendous stress is needed in order to provide the necessary impulse in Pavlodarskiy Priirtysh to solve the problems advanced by the 19th All-Union Party Conference, and in order to repair omissions and bring the oblast to the limits appropriate to its economic potential.

In conclusion, G.V. Kolbin, Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, addressed the plenum.

To be entirely frank, he noted, the discussion that was held evokes a feeling of optimism: it provides full grounds for assuming that this plenum will be a turning point in the life of the oblast party organization and in its multi-faceted work to implement the tasks of restructuring.

This optimism relates not only to solving important organizational problems, although the considerable replenishment of the obkom buro staff in itself, unquestionably, raises the party committee's practical and political potential and infuses fresh spirit into its, to put it bluntly, somewhat stagnant atmosphere. In my opinion, the main thing is the fact that during the plenum they

managed to discuss the most urgent, most principle-minded problems facing the entire party and the people today, and to specifically apply the directives of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference under local conditions.

This is no unsubstantiated claim. After all, if the entire essence of the speeches heard from the plenum rostrum today were combined into one, you would end up with nothing other than a qualitatively new political plan of actions for the oblast party committee, incorporating a whole series of bold, unusual approaches, able to radically alter the state of affairs in the region's multisectorial economy for the better, to raise the people's standard of living, and to make a sharp change in the political and economic thinking of the masses.

It seems that the plenum's evaluation will not seem extraordinary to anyone. After all, the strategic line outlined here through combined efforts has already yielded visible, real results in many of the republic's oblasts. Our fellow countrymen, the workers of Pavlodar enterprises, party and labor veterans and the delegations that recently visited Kokchetav, Tselinograd and Taldy-Kurgan, have seen the specific results of the new approaches to solving, for instance, the food and trade organization problems, with their own eyes. They talked about their impressions both in the press, as well as at the recently held Pavlodar Party Gorkom Plenum.

Beyond a doubt, these testimonies by eyewitnesses caused the absolute majority of communists and working people in the oblast to feel not only an envy of their neighbors, but also a persistent, burning need to answer the question: how come here, in a developed industrial and agricultural region of the republic that has incomparably more resources and capabilities, the rates of restructuring are significantly lower and positive changes are virtually not being felt?

Of course, the answer is not simple. It was somewhat explained in the course of today's plenum, but the causes of the slowdown by the oblast party organization in practical work to eliminate the revealed shortcomings must be investigated in greater detail. However, the main point nonetheless is that the process of restructuring in the oblast has insufficient depth and lacks consistency and, as a consequence, has no results. Party committees at all levels have still scarcely become its true generators, yet party leaders are called upon to lead the forthcoming changes.

Somebody or another may object, having stated that there are not, so they say, even two regions absolutely identical in terms of socioeconomic level, and even more so in terms of identically trained leaders. Therefore, it is supposedly completely natural that things are going better in one oblast than in another. One could reconcile oneself to this, if the gap in socioeconomic indicators between Pavlodar and, for instance, Tselinograd oblasts was inconsequential and fluctuated around some kind of average, yet fairly high level. However, the difference is

enormous and it is easy to be convinced of this, having visually compared the shelves of food stores in the two oblast centers. How can it be tolerated for workers of one region of the republic to live as though located in entirely different natural and climatic conditions?

Yet, something else is indicative as well. The leaders of regions where matters are not working in the best way often strive to become equal with the front-rankers, not by drawing nearer to them in terms of the results of economic activity, but by eliminating any kind of gap using questionable methods. For example, such leaders try to discredit their neighbors' successes and cast a shadow on their achievements, using any means.

We encountered this tendency toward a unique leveling of the "minus" sign quite recently, at the regular meeting of the Kazakh CP Central Committee Buro members with the party obkom first secretaries. In complete seriousness, certain respected comrades proved the danger of the extensive propaganda of experience in solving the food problem in Kokchetav, Tselinograd, Kustanay and a number of other republic oblasts, their position being motivated by the fact that this information would supposedly annoy people, evoking their dissatisfaction with the state of the food supply in their own oblast center or some other settlement.

What can be said about this? For us members of the Kazakh CP Central Committee Buro, such statements have become the best proof of the correctness of the policy being implemented. It is precisely the active propaganda of the first positive results of restructuring and extensive glasnost that are of the most important help in our common work. After all, if we look at the situation from a philosophical viewpoint, man's dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs also motivates all progress. Therefore, in the period of stagnation it was no accident that imaginary successes were so persistently and loudly prophesied, while almost nothing was said about shortcomings: it was as though to avoid awakening doubt in people's minds about the correctness of the usual course of life.

To this day, however, apparently someone is being tormented with nostalgia for times irretrievably past. It is no secret that some leaders in Pavlodar Oblast did not really want the workers in the delegation to visit our neighbors in search of experience. After all, the people will look, see, think and inevitably ask themselves: are we somehow worse? How come our circumstances are not as good? Naturally, they will raise legitimate claims against their party and economic leaders.

Since this situation also occurred at the recent Pavlodar Party Gorkom Plenum, the results of which everyone both in the oblast, as well as in the republic, already well knows. Nobody, it seems, questions the correctness of the decisions made there. Today's party obkom plenum is implementing the same line, principle-minded and meeting the resolutions of the 19th All-Union Party

Conference. This cannot help but attest to the unquestionable predominance of healthy forces in the oblast party organization, able to definitively overcome the hindering influence of inertia and stagnation.

A great deal of work lies ahead, G.V. Kolbin further emphasized. Figuratively speaking, the oblast sat too long at the starting line of restructuring and has lost much of the valuable time, needed in order to build up the necessary rates of socioeconomic development. Moreover, in recent years a steady tendency to reduced the rates has been observed in industrial production. The lack of proper persistence in work to introduce the new economic mechanism has led to the fact that the production of the most important types of output—tractors, asphalt, bricks and a number of others—as compared with 1985, not only failed to increase, but declined.

A particularly large failure occurred in the tractor building association's work. In 1987, about 17,800 tractors were not supplied according to the plan, and losses amounting to over 25 million rubles, instead of the planned profit, occurred. The enterprise is also working extremely unsatisfactorily this year. In 9 months, 3,195 tractors were under-produced according to the assignment, and 18 million rubles worth of production was not delivered to consumers according to contracts. Labor discipline is dropping. In 8 months of this year, the losses of working time in the association, compared with the corresponding period of last year, have increased by 41 percent.

Matters are not in the best shape in another oblast industrial leader as well, the Pavlodar chemical plant. Production is using obsolete technologies that harm people's health. Due to the unsatisfactory solution of social and everyday problems, cadre turnover is not being reduced here. The labor resources shortage consists of more than 1,000 people.

Work to convert enterprises to multi-shift operation, as well as to raise the equipment shift coefficient, is in a state of neglect. In Pavlodar alone, one enterprise in five systematically disrupts contract deliveries, and 29.6 million rubles worth of production have not been delivered over the 9 months of this year.

Regardless of some positive results achieved in capital construction, priority areas in the oblast, the construction of housing and projects of a social purpose, are still being poorly developed. Thus, in 9 months in Pavlodar, only 75 percent of the residential buildings from the head program, instead of the 90 planned, have been put into commission. Individual home building has not been properly developed. Suffice it to say that it is not even 3 percent of the overall volume of construction. Indeed, who would undertake building himself a home, if obsolete projects not only with little living space, but also not provided with engineering networks and without any

modern conveniences whatsoever, are being proposed for people. Such an approach to this most important work only discredits the idea of individual construction itself.

The line to obtain housing is still moving slowly in the oblast. Because of poor accounting and control, certain party, soviet and economic leaders are still seriously violating the principles of social justice in distributing housing.

Obviously inadequate attention is being paid to construction projects in the social sphere. One such example is the transfer of the tractor builders' hospital into the "long-building" category. It has already been under construction for 40 months, but out of the 17 million in allocated funds, only 2.8 million rubles have been used here today.

Many such cases could be cited. However, not even these are more disturbing, than the haughty and indifferent attitude toward construction problems on the part of individual party and economic officials, particularly among the personnel of the party gorkom leadership. They have readied one stereotypical answer to any criticism aimed at them: it is no worse here, they say, than elsewhere. That is, these good-for-nothing leaders were not concerned about the people's needs, but about how they would look in the eyes of a higher agency.

They have also taken this position on the food supply problems. To be persuaded of this, it suffices to become familiar with the party gorkom plenum documents devoted to discussing the food problem. The superficial and not self-critical approach to the study of the situation in this area and to evaluating the role of gorkom buro members in work on the food supply, the effort to place all responsibility on the shoulders of the agricultural industry, and the lack of a specific plan of actions all convincingly attest to a formal attitude toward the most urgent problem of the present day. It is as if they were not concerned about the work, but about more rapidly placing a "check-mark" in the report.

They have reported and reported, but there have been and are still no products on the store shelves. Indeed, where will they come from, if one of the main points in the plenum's resolution turned out to be the gorkom's requirement... to increase the city's consumption fund for basic food products. Not seeking out their own reserves, not assisting the agricultural industry in solving the actual problem, but precisely increasing funds. One can only be surprised by the parasitism of such leaders, for whom even the 19th Party Conference resolutions on the urgent need to universally assist the countryside, to repay all debts owed to the peasants from past decades, have remained meaningless.

However, after all, there are things that need help and, above all, means with which to help. Consider, for example, the construction of hay storage facilities. In the

oblast, 20-30 percent of prepared fodder becomes useless annually due simply to the fact that the basic sheds to protect the haystacks from precipitation are lacking. There is a government resolution which makes it possible to transfer 10 percent of the capital investments of industrial enterprises for the needs of the agricultural industry. Why would the powerful industry of Pavlodar not allocate these funds for constructing hay storage facilities? Ten percent is little—let them give 15. The main thing is to solve this painful problem. In the end, it will be to their own advantage: there will be more fodder, and thus more milk for supplying the city.

There are so many unsolved problems in the processing of agricultural output. To this day, the processing enterprises of the oblast agricultural industry are not providing in sufficient quantities of sour cream, cheese, sour-milk products, small baked goods, alcohol-free beverages and mineral waters from local springs. At the same time, work on the technical re-equipment of the meat combine and the construction of a new city dairy plant is being done extremely slowly. Many meat products are of poor quality as a result of technological violations. For example, in the first half of June alone, 20 percent of the sausage products and smoked pork foods processed in the shops of the Pavlodar City Cooperative Market spoiled.

Given the joint efforts by the agricultural industry and city enterprises, the problems of the storage and canning of fruit and vegetable goods could have been solved long ago. However, there is no mutual understanding here either. There are no vegetable storage facilities in many enterprises, including in one as large as the tractor building association.

The auxiliary farms of enterprises and organizations have not been appropriately developed. Most enterprises and organizations also do not think to display initiative in acquiring unprofitable farms and providing themselves with agricultural shops. Suffice it to say that only one-tenth of the city's enterprises have auxiliary farms.

However, matters in the existing auxiliary farms, to put it bluntly, are not exemplary either. Last year, for example, only 3 kilograms of meat per resident of Pavlodar and 14 kilograms per worker at the enterprise that owned the agricultural shop were obtained at these farms. Yet, only 3-5 kilograms were obtained at giants like the tractor and oil-refining plants and the "Pavlodarpromstroy" Trust.

Whereas it has already become a question of auxiliary farms, then, if we really get down to business, the oblast's industry is completely responsible not only for considerable assistance to the agricultural industry in producing meat and milk, but also for completely eliminating the problems with grain crops. On auxiliary farm land alone, buckwheat cultivation could be organized in a quantity such that it would be possible to feed buckwheat kasha to the population of the entire oblast, and even neighboring

oblasts in addition. This is to say nothing of the colossal possibilities of enterprises in creating special industries for processing buckwheat groats. There are many other reserves, attention to which would have considerably improved the food supply. I am referring to opening a broad network of culinary and confectionery shops, both in the city as well as in the countryside, organizing bread-baking directly at the sale points, and improving the assortment of various pickled goods, marinades, etc. Take the same cabbage, that appears on the shelves here in just one form—sauerkraut. After all, it is no secret that cabbage can be prepared according to dozens of different recipes.

In short, there are possibilities, and many, that do not require any kind of extraordinary effort or large capital outlays. We just need enterprise, an ability to make unusual decisions, courage and, of course, a burning desire to meet the people's needs and demands and a genuine party-minded aspiration to assert restructuring.

Judging by the speeches heard from this rostrum today, the new party obkom buro personnel have this aspiration. It is especially gratifying that the first-priority problems of the social plan, i.e., precisely those, in terms of the degree of solution of which the working people will judge the seriousness of the coming changes, will be found at the center of its attention.

I would especially like to emphasize that under the conditions of democratization and glasnost, under the conditions of the political reform being implemented in the country, the working people's opinions of their party and state leaders is acquiring particular significance. After all, in order to hold the high post of party committee first secretary, one will have to undergo a four-fold "sieve" of party and popular voting. Only true leaders who have won authority not only among their comrades in the party, but also among the broad masses of working people, are able to do this.

This prospect worries many party officials, even the authoritative ones. Some are even frightened. It is no accident that alarming notes were heard in some speeches at the last meeting of Kazakh CP Central Committee Buro members with the party obkom first secretaries. Someone even raised the question of the need for a so-called "social defense" for party leaders.

A question arises: defense from whom? From the voters? From the people? In this case, we would have to return to those days, when only a single nomenclature post guaranteed any leader incontestable success in any election campaign with a positive outcome of 99.99 percent. Those days are gone. Today, we have only one "defense"—the genuine trust of the people, which must be won every day and every hour. Past services, whatever they may have been, do not count.

True, in this situation experience shows that individual leaders find a way to raise their own authority not through work, but through their visibility, pseudo-democratic actions and self-advertisement. It would be worthwhile for such a party leader to walk to work or ride on the public transportation and stand in line at the food store a few times—soon such a halo of democracy, which he himself will actively propagandize, will be created around him.

I beg you to understand me properly, G.V. Kolbin emphasized. I am in favor of better knowing how the people live and of being open and accessible for people. However, the possession of qualities, such as an unassuming nature, modesty and delicacy, finally, still does not exhaust the requirements made of a party leader. One could say that these are mandatory for any communist, but you will not win authority among the broad masses with these qualities alone. Restructuring is, above all, the outcome. No matter how upstanding, kind and attentive to people you may be, you will not win their trust and gratitude without real shifts in socioeconomic development. No kind of self-advertisement will help here.

This also applies to some local leaders, who quite recently convinced people that matters with the food supply in Pavlodar are no worse than with our neighbors. They were believed. Yet when, for example, it became a question of who specifically is responsible in the party obkom for solving the food problem, many just shrug their shoulders in puzzlement: we do not know, they say. True, we did manage, albeit with difficulty, to find this responsible person. He turned out to be K.N. Shakirimov, former party obkom second secretary. One can only be surprised, why nobody either in the obkom, or in the party gorkom, asked himself the elementary question: how can one work seriously to supply food for the population, if no one knows precisely who is in charge of this problem? There is your authority.

In general, it should be stated that in recent years in the oblast a unique cult of irresponsibility has been growing extensively, and not without the influence of party leaders like K.N. Shakirimov and G.A. Nikiforov, who themselves did not particularly strive to be responsible for anything and trained their subordinates in the same spirit. Consider a basic problem of work by party agencies, such as the training and upbringing of cadres. They left this most important party work to run on its own.

At the same time, consider how the Kazakh CP Central Committee Secretariat and Buro and other republic party committees structure their own cadre work. Hardly a single central committee buro meeting is held without hearing a report from one or another party or economic leader on his work to train cadre reserves, including for his own post.

This effective system has not found application in the Pavlodar Obkom either or, moreover, in the party gorkom. One can only express bewilderment regarding the fact that, let us say, an industrial giant such as the "Pavlodar Tractor Plant imeni V.I. Lenin" Association has been operating for half a year without a manager. The enormous labor collective of 23,000 people has been left essentially leaderless.

It is particularly embarrassing that such failures in cadre policy are not being given an appropriate party evaluation, but on the contrary, are being camouflaged with the much-suffering concepts of democracy and glasnost. We favor the utmost expansion and intensification of the process of democratization. We favor an ever-greater number of working people actively participating in matters of social life. However, this does not at all mean that party agencies should alienate themselves from their most important responsibilities under the conditions of restructuring—the selection and placement of cadres. In many ways, it is precisely through the fulfillment of this responsibility that the party's leading role in our society is put into practice. We must not forget this, no matter what.

There is another very important detail characterizing the style of activity of the former leaders of the obkom and Pavlodar party gorkom, in particular G.A. Nikiforov, of which I consider it necessary to inform the obkom members. Many of those present know that the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee and CPSU Central Committee have received letters signed by a significant number of party, soviet and economic officials in the oblast. They contain a request to grant former party obkom second secretary K.N. Shakirimov an even higher post, than the one he had held.

This fact would not even merit mention today, since the CPSU Statutes do not forbid communists from making their own suggestions on one or another intra-party issue, including cadre issues, in oral or written form. However, not everyone knows that G.A. Nikiforov, being the initiator and organizer of the letter, has misled or, to call things what they are, has rudely tricked his own party comrades, having asked them to sign the text of an ordinary character reference concerning K.N. Shakirimov's practical and political qualities. When all signatures had been gathered, the text was changed without the knowledge of the signatories, and the letter was sent in this form to higher party agencies.

Such a habit of irresponsibility and the nonobjective and casual evaluation of his own actions has led a communist to forgery, to a moral misdemeanor. I am sure that the proper conclusions will be drawn and that the principles of honest and open relations among communists and of strict personal responsibility for the entrusted area of work will unquestionably prevail.

Comrades, permit me, G.V. Kolbin said in conclusion, to wish you friendly and fruitful work and to express my hopes that in the near future the Pavlodar Oblast party organization will occupy a fitting place among the other fighting detachments of the Kazakh Communist Party and will make a worthy contribution to the noble work of the revolutionary renovation of our society and the work of restructuring.

Serious Shortcomings Noted in KAZAKHSTAN KOMMUNISI

18300244a Alma-Ata PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN
KAZAHKSTANA in Russian No 10, Oct 88 pp 3-5

[Resolution of the Kazakh CP Central Committee: "On the Ideological-Theoretical Level of the journal KAZAHKSTAN KOMMUNISI in Light of the CPSU Central Committee Resolution 'On the Journal KOMMUNIST'"]

[Text] The Kazakh CP Central Committee notes that a large role in the republic party organization's ideological work to implement the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the 19th All-Union Party Conference, and the CPSU Central Committee Plenums, and to profoundly interpret the new tasks arising from the practice of accelerating the republic's socioeconomic development under the conditions of restructuring, belongs to the theoretical and political journal of the Kazakh CP Central Committee, KAZAHKSTANA KOMMUNISI. The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Journal KOMMUNIST" has given new creative impulse to this publication's work. Articles are regularly published in the journal's pages under the rubrics: "Improving Socialism: Theory and Practice," "Acceleration—The Party's Strategic Course," "For a Marxist-Leninist System of Education." Many theoretical articles examine various aspects of the strategy for accelerating the republic's socioeconomic development, and the best of them noticeably aspire toward generalizing the social experience of the masses, toward propaganda of that which is advanced, and toward showing new approaches to the party's political, organizational, economic and ideological and educational work under the conditions of restructuring.

In spite of this, the journal's work has serious shortcomings. The publication's party buro and editorial board have still not fully achieved the necessary theoretical and methodological level in articles on the problems of ideological work, the theory of socialism, and restructuring. Many publications on the thematic course "Strategic Direction of the CPSU—Accelerating the Country's Socioeconomic Development" are informative in nature and suffer from the over-statement of commonly known truths. A significant share of the theoretical articles are characterized by schematic form and content, and the poverty and stereotyped nature of the authors' thinking and statements. The journal's articles do not always

profoundly study the factors in the formation and action of the obstruction mechanism in the economy and do not indicate specific ways to overcome it.

The journal has still not managed to make a sharp turn toward the ideological content of restructuring, toward the theoretical problems of the ideology of renovation. Few articles deeply explore the basic positions of the Marxist-Leninist theory of nations and ethnic relations, the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Work of the Kazakh Republic Party Organization in the International and Patriotic Upbringing of Working People," the question of ethnic-Russian bilingualism, and other aspects of ethnic and international relations. Articles on atheistic topics bear the stamp of passive enlightenment and alienation from real life and the religious situation in the republic. Historic, particularly historic-party, science is not sufficiently represented in the journal. Here, an illustrative nature in historic knowledge has also not been eliminated. The editors are not putting pluralism of opinions into practice and are not organizing sharp creative discussions on topics of an exploratory nature. They have also not overcome a certain fear of raising new topical problems.

The thematic planning of the editorial board's work needs radical improvement. Elements of over-organization have not eliminated.

The editorial board's primary party organization is displaying passivity in matters of raising the theoretical and professional knowledge of journalists and of training a cadre reserve. Presently, there is not a single specialist with a scientific degree or title among the creative personnel of the theoretical journal.

The Kazakh CP Central Committee resolves:

1. That the party buro and editorial board of KAZAHKSTAN KOMMUNISI must eliminate the noted shortcomings and omissions.

It must provide for comprehensive and profound coverage of the achievements of the party's creative thinking, contained in the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the documents of CPSU Central Committee plenums. The journal should promote the complete restoration of the Leninist concept of socialism and make its own contribution to the theoretical interpretation of key problems in restructuring and, primarily, in the democratization of all social life and the radical economic reform. The journal materials should be distinguished by a high ideological and theoretical level, connections between theory and practice, a well-argued nature, and clarity. Dogmatism and alienation from life must be overcome and the stereotypes which have formed must be rejected. The dialectical method of analyzing social reality must be constantly adhered to, discussions and a creative exchange of opinions should be organized, and the problems of the theory

of socialism and restructuring must be approached taking the new requirements into account. The journal should lead work to renovate all Kazakh social sciences.

2. The coverage of topical problems of the theory and practice of party building must be improved. Taking the lines of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the June (1988) CPSU Central Committee Plenum resolution "On Basic Directions in Restructuring the Party Apparatus" into account, proper attention should be devoted to the theoretical development of problems on clearly delimiting the functions of party and state bodies, and on ensuring the sovereignty of the soviets of people's deputies as the foundation of the socialist state and self-management in our country. The practice of party work under the new conditions and experience in reviving intra-party democracy should be carefully studied and summarized. The role of the journal's articles in forming a scientific outlook and in the ideological, moral and civic shaping of young people must be increased. The course of the forthcoming party organization reports and elections must be comprehensively covered.

3. Being guided by the June (1988) CPSU Central Committee Plenum policy that "theory has truly become the material force of restructuring," elevating economic science to the proper levels is seen as one of the journal's main tasks. The journal's theoretical developments and specific recommendations should contribute to creating an integral, effective and flexible system for the republic's economic management and should help in consistently implementing the radical economic reform, ensuring the food supply and the output of consumer goods, offering paid services to the population, implementing the "Housing-91" program, and improving health care and other areas.

4. The ideological and theoretical level of all publications, particularly materials on topical problems of ethnic and international relations, must be raised. In order to successfully fulfill tasks arising from the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Work of the Kazakh Republic Party Organization on the International and Patriotic Upbringing of Working People" and from the 19th All-Union Party Conference Resolution "On International Relations," the scientific exploration of social sciences in the republic must be stimulated, the Leninist positions and principles of ethnic policy must be persistently asserted and creatively developed, vividly and profoundly, the role of international fraternity in the fates of the Kazakh people must be vividly and profoundly shown with specific examples, and an offensive struggle must be waged against chauvinism, nationalism and seniority in economic, cultural and spiritual areas. The ways of life, customs and cultures of all peoples and nationalities settling the republic should be extensively propagandized.

5. Contribution to scientific and methodological support for the political and economic training of students should be strengthened. Theoretical advice and methodological

materials of a high ideological and theoretical level, broadly applicable in practice, should be regularly carried for propagandists and their audiences. Positive experience in political and production and economic education in labor collectives must be constantly propagandized.

6. The organization of all work by the journal's editorial board must be radically improved. An efficient system for determining the most topical themes and for forming a broad author's aktiv must be developed. The fresh scientific forces of party workers and publicists must be boldly involved in cooperation. Data from sociological studies should be used extensively. A further increase in the level of theoretical knowledge of editorial board staff employees should be achieved.

COPYRIGHT: "Partiynaya zhizn Kazakhstana", 1988

Kazakh CP Lugovskiy Raykom Expels Several Members

18300244b Alma-Ata PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN
KAZAKHSTANA in Russian No 10, Oct 88 pp 53-56

[Article by M. Isbayev, chairman, Kazakh CP Lugovskiy Raykom Party Committee, under the "Everyday Working Life of the Party Committee" rubric: "The Moral Make-Up of a Communist"]

[Text] A year or so ago, we party committee workers met to speak with a member of our raykom, B. Zhaksybayev, then chief engineer and party organization secretary at the Lugovskiy Grain Receiving Enterprise. We met to speak for... the last time. The conversation was not about the business of the primary organization, but about him himself. Zhaksybayev was expelled from the party for misdemeanors incompatible with the title of communist. In collusion with other workers at this enterprise, also communists, he stole about 9 tons of grain. He who headed the primary organization, who appealed to the collective to be honest and responsible about work, was himself a thief, it seems.

In many ways, that which occurred was possible because here they did not consider, or more correctly, did not try to consider the true nature of the person behind the oft spoken pretty words about honor and duty. Indeed, it is no surprise, because it turns out that the party organization itself has does not meet the highest criteria in moral evaluations. Concepts of the moral make-up of a CPSU member were hypertrophied. Otherwise, how can one explain the fact that the primary organization voted to leave a person who had soiled the honor and title of communist, not a rank-and-file member, but a leader on whom demand should have been doubled, within the party ranks?

What kind of authority of the primary organization can it be a question of in this situation, particularly under the present conditions of restructuring? The question is also whether it will be able to fulfill its own destiny, to be a political nucleus for the labor collective and to lead it,

acting above all through methods of persuasion, without changing anything with regard to exigency? This case has noticeably undermined the faith of the workers and the entire collective in the party organization's competence. What should the people think, if the party organization itself, an actual raykom member, steals the people's wealth, no matter be it by tons or by kilograms? To say the least, it is a stern lesson for the primary organization.

Incidentally, I note that, unfortunately, we in the raykom also failed to detect this time-server in time. After vetoing the party meeting decision that deemed it possible to leave Zhaksybayev in the CPSU, considering it liberal, we expelled him from the party.

Nonetheless, in trying to understand the causes of that which took place, one involuntarily wonders why this was possible in an organization which properly paid its dues, held meetings, and where there were no shortcomings in speeches. Actually, there were shortcomings: there was not enough honest and frank talk, without equivocation, about the communist's role in society and his responsibility for every action.

This same reason led the primary organization of the Kolkhoz imeni Dzhambul to the fact that the metastases of a double standard began to spread here, under circumstances of hypocrisy and window-dressing. Serious misdemeanors, disgracing the honor and title of communist, were committed by warehouse chief Abdildayev, who permitted a shortfall of 226 centners of grain waste products, by herdsman Kazbekov, who caused more than ten heads of cattle to perish due to neglect of his basic duties, and by chief bookkeeper Madygulov, who tried to conceal the theft of kolkhoz property. Incidentally, the raykom was also forced to change the primary organization's decision with respect to one of them as being groundlessly light.

To put it bluntly, there are more than enough similar examples of a liberal attitude toward such communists. Naturally, this has undermined the authority not only of primary organizations, but also of the party on the whole. It is no accident that a demand to raise exigency toward communists and to cleanse the party of casual people was made with particular strength at the 19th All-Union Party Conference. This means that primary organizations should seriously restructure their activity. From this viewpoint, we should re-interpret the role of party meetings, party committee conferences, the practice of hearing reports made by leaders and rank-and-file workers, and the confirmation of attestation references. We must fully revive the atmosphere of openness, criticism and self-criticism, principle-mindedness in evaluating the work and behavior of a person, collectivism in decisions, and personal responsibility for an entrusted area of work.

Unfortunately, far from all primary organizations are struggling against negative phenomena, permissiveness and the collective guarantee. This is why we assign

particular significance to the need to strengthen ties between our raykom and the lower party units, the worker's collectives—ties directly on site, in order to understand the situation there better. In order to do this, we decided to fully utilize a new, at least for us, form of work: holding raykom days at enterprises and farms.

On the second Thursday of each month, rayon committee workers—from the instructor to the first secretary—will visit the primary organizations, offering them specific assistance in solving various problems. Many will hold frank talks both with party and non-party members, face to face, in which a person will be able, without embarrassment, to share things that have been troubling him for a long time. Party committee members are carefully studying work with the reserves of people to be accepted into the party and with young communists.

This vital communication and practical exchange of opinions has contributed to raising the personal responsibility of communists, primarily those from the elected aktiv. Here are the first results. Whereas the raykom marked one-third of the party organization decisions on personal matters as too liberal and took the most severe steps on 20 of them in 1986, there was far less such forced interference last year. This attests to a growth in the political consciousness of communists and to their increasing activeness and exigency towards themselves and their comrades.

Unfortunately, it is too early to speak of the complete triumph of principle-mindedness. As before, a tendency to over-forgive is making itself known. For example, the party committee disagreed with a liberal decision by the "Vostok" Kolkhoz primary organization, which severely reprimanded CPSU member A. Shukirbayev for a misdemeanor. It was revealed that he, while working as an elementary school director, had systematically abused his official position, displaying tactlessness in dealing with collective members, and had engaged in exactions and extortion. Thus, having illegally listed the teacher Sukenova for payment of 116 rubles, he issued 66 to her and appropriated the rest. In a similar manner, he appropriated the teacher Baygelova's money. He also extorted money from other teachers on payday and abused his position in distributing workloads among the teachers.

The committee came to the conclusion to expel Shukirbayev from the CPSU and release him from his post. The raykom buro agreed with this suggestion.

A similar attitude towards communists, now former, who had tainted their honor was displayed by the party organization at the "Makbalskiy" Sovkhoz, which decided to limit itself to issuing the offending department heads T. Bakaramov and B. Baykeyev reprimands with records made in their registration files. Their guilt lay in the fact that, in collaboration, they collected money from the herdsmen in order to hush up a cattle plague which occurred because certain shepherds had

neglected their direct responsibilities. In this case, we suggested that the raykom buro consider the primary party decision too liberal and expel the communists who had compromised themselves from the party. The suggestion was adopted.

Of course, it is not easy to make these decisions. However, if the matter has gone as far as a personal examination, each such case should be a serious lesson in upbringing for the whole organization and for each communist. In thoroughly investigating a case, the committee members do not limit themselves only to studying the documents received, but carefully study the essence of the misdemeanor and analyze its causes. In order to do this, they visit on site, talk to people, elaborate on all facts and circumstances and on the course itself of the investigation of personal matters in the primary organizations and, when necessary, suggest changing the decisions which were made. Thus, in only a year, the primary party organization decisions in 14 of the 37 personal cases considered were changed for being groundless and too light. According to the examination outcomes, 19 communists were held to party accountability, five were expelled from the CPSU, party fines were levied against 14, and eight were released from work.

In constantly studying the causes of the appearance of personal cases and analyzing the misdemeanors committed by communists, we are simultaneously achieving an increase in the responsibility of primary organization secretaries and members of elected party organizations. Thus, in considering two personal cases at the Kolkhoz imeni Karl Marx, party committee secretary S. Utegenov was accused of a lack of principle. The attention of the "Makbalskiy" Sovkhoz Party Committee was directed at formalism in issuing certain recommendations for entrance into the party and at the need to strengthen the responsibility of those recommended.

Still, CPSU members often fulfill their direct duties passively and reconcile themselves to violations of discipline and statutory requirements. Individual communist leaders are creating an appearance of well-being, instead of calling things by their true names, in order to improve the microclimate in collectives. This is why we see strengthening the struggle for the pure make-up of the party member as our primary task. After all, they are communists, and in order to preserve this high trust for themselves, they should prove in their actions that they live and work by the highest standards of conscience—for them this is not a slogan, but a norm.

Over the last 3 years, our committee has conducted dozens of spot checks on the activity of primary organizations, aimed at shaping an active and lively position among communists. Being in a party organization, we mandatorily direct attention to how communists influence raising production efficiency and discipline, improving the delivery of production, implementing the "Housing-91" program, and producing consumer goods. We ran an article in the press about the results on eight

of all the points considered, which showed a direct dependence between successes in fulfilling the production plan and the contribution and personal example of party members.

We devote particular attention to ideological and upbringing work among young communists and to training the reserve of people to be accepted into the party. This is also having results. Many primary organizations have become bolder in entrusting responsible work to young people. Thus, R. Alchabayev, chief economist at the same "Vostok" Kolkhoz, was instructed upon joining the party to head the work by production subdivisions to convert to the new form of labor organization and payment and, mainly, to psychologically prepare people for this conversion.

This made it possible not only to test the man's practical and political qualities, but also to help form these qualities in the process of responsible work. Yet, the problem with organizing the conversion to the new forms of economic management lay in the fact that there were doubters in the collective. Thus, the success of that which had been planned was placed into direct interconnection with the kolkhoz workers' trust in the person who undertook to lead them. Skipping over the events, we note that they trusted R. Alchabayev, followed him, and the goal was achieved.

These are the results. In just last year, the kolkhoz entirely converted to family, brigade forms of labor organization, and this year—to full cost-accounting. Discipline was raised and absences and violations were entirely eliminated. The cost price of the output being produced was reduced. The kolkhoz exceeded the quarterly plan for the delivery of milk and meat. The plans for obtaining lambs and calves were overfulfilled. The sale of substandard cattle and milk was reduced to zero. R. Alchabayev completely believed in his own strengths and in himself. People began to respect him even more.

The party raykom buro has approved the work of the party committee and board of the "Vostok" Kolkhoz to introduce the principles of self-management in the labor collectives, on the ideological and moral upbringing of communists and the entire collective, and to develop a feeling of ownership and sense of responsibility for the final results in the kolkhoz workers. This experience was related in the rayon newspapers KOMMUNISTICHESKIY TRUD and KOMMUNISTIK ENBEK.

Or, another case: Talgat Sartayev, a tractor driver at the Kolkhoz imeni Lenin, is well-known in the rayon. A candidate CPSU member, he tries to justify high trust through his work. Sartayev, taking party instructions seriously, undertook to share his accumulated knowledge and skills in a school for leading experience. He really does have something to teach. Talgat has successfully mastered the mixed profession of combine operator, and had the highest results at the harvest, becoming the kolkhoz champion of "Harvest-87." His high moral

values are also distinctly manifest in his attitude toward work. The struggle for the winner's title does not prevent Sartayev from generously sharing his professional "secrets" with comrades in his unit, brigade and department, without fearing that someone might seize the leadership using his advice, and thus also the champion's glory and, to put it bluntly, a nice bonus. Obviously, a man is incapable of a double standard, if he can stop his own combine in the heat of the work to help a competitor repair a broken-down reaper.

It is noteworthy that a school for young communists operates in the primary organization of this kolkhoz, which also holds lessons for those who stand in the party reserve. Talks are held with them and they are given serious assignments. It is precisely here that the students begin to think seriously about the leading role of a party member in all areas of society's life, long before he joins the CPSU.

The party organization of the Lugovskiy Horse Plant is also carrying out such painstaking and goal-directed upbringing work. As a result, there are fewer communists here who permit misdemeanors incompatible with the requirements of the CPSU Statutes and the standards of communist morality.

Among the forces driving restructuring today, the main one is the communist party—the political and moral vanguard of our society. For precisely this reason, the activation of work to improve the ideological upbringing of communists, the strengthening of demand for the observance of party discipline, and the waging of an uncompromising struggle for the pure and honest make-up of the party member, are being demanded particularly of the primary party organizations.

Biographical Information on New Kazakh Obkom, Ispolkom, Gorkom First Secretaries

18300244c Alma-Ata PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN
KAZAKHSTANA in Russian No 10, Oct 88 pp 95-96

[Unattributed article: "Chronicle"]

[Text] **Viktor Ivanovich Begin** was elected second secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Guryev Obkom.

Born in 1948, he graduated from the Siberian Technological Institute and the Alma-Ata Higher Party School. He started working as an apprentice electrical repairman, and has worked as an engineer, master, senior engineer-technician, deputy chief of shops, department chief at the Karaganda Rubber Goods Plant, and as an instructor at the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Department of the Chemical Industry. Recently, he was first secretary of the Saran Party Gorkom, Karaganda Oblast.

Tatyana Pavlovna Dogadova was elected secretary of the Kazakh CP Guryev Obkom.

Born in 1946, she graduated from the Ural Institute imeni A.S. Pushkin and the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences. She has worked as a teacher, department head, Komsomol raykom and gorkom first secretary, gorispolkom deputy chairman, party gorkom secretary, chief of the administration of culture, and department head of the Kazakh CP Mangyshlak Obkom. Recently, she was secretary of the Kazakh CP Mangyshlak Obkom.

Asylbek Kasymovich Ibrayev was elected first deputy chairman, Kzyl-Orda Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies Ispolkom.

Born in 1943, he graduated from the Kazakh Polytechnical Institute. He has been a metal worker, driver, master, shop chief, chief mechanic, chief engineer and director of a plant in Kzyl-Orda. He was recently head of the Kazakh CP Kzyl-Orda Obkom Economics Department.

Viktor Dmitriyevich Kolpakov was verified as deputy chairman of the Party Control Committee, under the Kazakh CP Central Committee.

Born in 1935, he graduated from the Alma-Ata Tekhnikum for Light Industry and the Kazakh State University imeni S.M. Kirov. He has worked as a carpenter, instructor, department head of the Komsomol obkom, instructor for the Kazakh Komsomol Central Committee, Komsomol obkom second secretary, party committee secretary, instructor for the Alma-Ata Party Obkom, gorispolkom chairman, oblispolkom department head, department and administration chief of the KaSSR State Committee on Labor, and a party committee instructor under the Kazakh CP Central Committee. Most recently, he was a member of the Party Control Committee, under the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee.

Valeriy Alekseyevich Kondratenko was elected first secretary of the Kazakh CP Uralsk Gorkom.

Born in 1940, he graduated from the Kazakh Chemical and Technological Institute and studied by correspondence at the Alma-Ata Higher Party School. He was been a mine worker, lathe operator, sports school teacher, shift chief, deputy shop chief, chief engineer, plant director, and general director for a production association in the cities of Semipalatinsk and Uralsk, and as Ural Party Obkom department head. Most recently, he was first secretary of the Promyshlenniy Party Raykom in Uralsk.

Anatoliy Mikhaylovich Pyatkin was elected first secretary, Kazakh CP Guryev Gorkom.

Born in 1942, he graduated from the Grozniy Petroleum Institute and the Alma-Ata Higher Party School. He has worked as an electrical repairman, foreman, supervisor, and senior and chief engineer in construction organizations in the cities of Grozniy and Shevchenko, as an

instructor for the Mangyshlak Party Obkom, and as a party raykom second secretary. He was recently chairman of the Novouzensk City Soviet of People's Deputies Ispolkom, Guryev Oblast.

Vladimir Georgiyevich Savchenko was elected first secretary, Kazakh Communist Party Leninskiy Gorkom, Kzyl-Orda Oblast.

Born in 1940, he graduated from the Kazakh Polytechnical Institute and, by correspondence, from the Higher Party School of the CPSU Central Committee. He has been an engineer-operator, detachment head for industrial and geophysical expeditions, staff chief of the Komsomol Central Committee All-Union Shock Komsomol Construction Site in Shevchenko, and an instructor, deputy party committee secretary, secretary, and first secretary of the Shevchenko Party Gorkom. Most recently, he was second secretary of the Kazakh CP Mangyshlak Obkom.

Sultan Saytkaliyevich Saydazimov was elected secretary, Kazakh CP Guryev Obkom.

Born in 1938, he graduated from the Tashkent University for Railroad Engineers and the Higher Party School of the CPSU Central Committee. He has worked as a foreman, supervisor, Komsomol gorkom secretary, chairman of a trade union group committee at a trust, senior engineer, department chief, deputy chief engineer of a construction administration, and construction department head of the Kazakh CP Mangyshlak Obkom. Most recently, he was deputy chairman, Mangyshlak Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies Ispolkom.

Rakhmetulla Khamitovich Suyerbayev was elected secretary, Kazakh CP Ural Obkom.

Born in 1938, he graduated from the Uralsk State Pedagogical Institute, the Sverdlovsk Higher Party School and the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee, and is a candidate of historical sciences. He has been a teacher, party committee instructor, deputy director and director of a school, instructor, party office head for a party raykom, party committee secretary, rayispolkom deputy chairman, party obkom instructor, party raykom and gorkom second secretary, and a department head for the Ural Party Obkom. Most recently, he was first secretary, Kaztalovskiy Party Raykom, Ural Oblast.

Lithuania's City, Rayon Party Elections Reported
18000322 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
1, 13, 21 Nov 88 p 1

[ELTA report: "At the City and Rayon Party Conferences"]

[1 Nov 88 p 1]

[Text] **Vilnius**—At the Novovilyaskiy Rayon party conference that was held, the party committee report was given by V. Kazakov, first secretary, Novovilyaskiy Party Raykom, Vilnius.

Yu. Rusenko, Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman, participated in and gave a speech at the conference.

The elections of the new party raykom were held. At the committee's organizational plenum, of two candidates, V. Kazakov, for whom 41 of the 63 raykom members voted, was elected first secretary of the Vilnius Novovilyaskiy Party Raykom. In the elections to the raykom membership, 238 out of 403 conference delegates voted for V. Kazakov. I. Yakhimovich, for whom 375 delegates voted during elections to the committee membership, was unanimously elected second secretary at the plenum. M. Milkyavichene, for whom 321 conference delegates voted during elections to committee membership, was made secretary.

Shilale—At the rayon party conference which took place, the delegates heard and discussed the party raykom report given by I. Yagminas, first secretary, Shilalskiy Party Raykom.

R. Tsitsenas, deputy chief, Department of Organizational and Party Work, Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, participated in and spoke at the conference.

At the organizational plenum of the newly elected party raykom, I. Yagminas, for whom 268 out of 273 conference delegates voted during elections to the raykom, was elected Shilalskiy Party Raykom first secretary. O. Sharmavichyus, who had received 267 votes, was elected second secretary and R. Linkene, who had collected 238 votes, was elected secretary.

Pakruois—I. Chepulis, Pakruoyskiy Party Raykom first secretary, gave the party committee report at the party conference.

A. Dauksha, head, Department for Construction and the Municipal Economy, Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, participated in and spoke at the conference.

The elections of the new party raykom were held. At the committee organizational plenum, of two candidates, V. Zhvirblis, who had worked until this time as executive committee chairman of the rayon soviet of people's deputies, was elected party raykom first secretary. Thirty-three of the 61 raykom members voted for V. Zhvirblis. Former party raykom first secretary I. Chepulis received 28 votes at the plenum. V. Shtuykis, for whom 56 committee members voted, was made second secretary. Three candidates were placed on the ballot in the election of the party committee secretary. K. Zhvikas, who worked until this time as head of the raykom Department of Propaganda and Agitation, collected the largest number of votes, 42.

Kupishkis—The party raykom report given by S. Tamoshynas, Kupishkskiy Party Raykom first secretary, was heard and discussed at the party conference. Y. Guretskas, LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium secretary participated in and spoke at the conference.

The elections of the new party raykom were held. At the committee organizational plenum, S. Tamoshynas, for whom 36 of the 63 raykom members voted, was chosen out of two candidates as Kupishkskiy Party Raykom first secretary. During elections to the party committee membership, 173 delegates out of 341 voted for S. Tamoshynas. I. Blazhevichyus, for whom 61 raykom members and, during elections to the committee membership, 321 conference delegates voted, was elected second secretary. S. Mitskyavichyus, for whom 46 raykom members voted at the plenum, and who previously worked as chairman of the rayon people's control committee, was elected secretary out of two candidates. V. Marinskene, former raykom secretary, received 196 votes against in the elections of the new committee, and thus did not become a member.

[13 Nov 88 p 3]

Vilnius—Ya. Gagilene, first secretary, Lithuanian Communist Party Leninskiy Raykom, Vilnius, gave a report at the capital's Leninskiy Rayon party conference.

L. Shepetis, Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee secretary, spoke at and participated in the conference.

Elections of the newly chosen party raykom took place. At the committee organizational plenum, Ya. Gagilene was elected first secretary, Leninskiy Party Raykom, Vilnius.

In elections to the raykom membership, 559 out of 625 conference delegates voted for Ya. Gagilene, and 76 out of 77 raykom members voted for him at the plenum. A. Shvelnis, for whom 528 delegates voted in the elections to committee membership, and for whom 73 raykom members voted at the plenum, was elected second secretary. Out of two candidates, I. Brigman, who had worked until this time as head of the raykom Industry and Transportation Department, was made secretary. Forty-six raykom members voted for him, and 601 delegates voted for him in the elections to the committee membership.

Kaunas—At the party conference held here of the city's Pozhelskiy Party Raykom, A. Guyga, first secretary, LiSSR Communist Party Pozhelskiy Raykom, Kaunas, gave a report.

V. Ramanauskas, chairman of the board, Litpotrebo-yuz, spoke at and took part in the conference.

At the organizational plenum of the newly elected party raykom, A. Guyga, for whom 46 out of 76 raykom members voted, was chosen out of three candidates as

party raykom first secretary, Pozhelskiy Raykom, Kaunas. He received 253 out of 501 votes in the elections to the raykom membership.

Also out of three candidates, V. Onishchuk was elected second secretary, having received 43 votes from the raykom members, and 423 in the elections to raykom membership. V. Popovas, who had worked as head of the raykom Department of Propaganda and Agitation, was elected secretary out of two candidates. Forty-one raykom members voted for him. N. Bankauskene, former party raykom secretary, received 32 votes from raykom members at the plenum.

Kretinga—At the rayon party conference which was held, V. Kubilyus, first secretary, Lithuanian Communist Party Kretingskiy Raykom, gave the party raykom report.

V. Gerzhonas, chief, Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee department of administrative authorities, spoke at and participated in the conference.

The organizational plenum of the newly elected party raykom unanimously elected V. Kubilyus as first secretary, Kretingskiy Party Raykom. In the elections to the raykom membership, 369 out of 429 delegates voted for V. Kubilyus. B. Kasnauskis, for whom 368 delegates voted in the elections to the raykom membership, was also unanimously elected secretary.

V. Karosas, who had previously worked as chairman of the rayon people's control committee, was elected party raykom secretary out of two candidates. Forty-two out of 69 raykom members voted for him, and 325 delegates voted for him in the elections to the party raykom membership. O. Lyutkene, former committee secretary, received 207 votes against in the election to the new committee and did not become a member.

Raseynyay—At the party rayon party conference held here, the delegates discussed the report given by A. Baranauskas, first secretary, Lithuanian Communist Party Raseynski Raykom.

P. Ignotas, deputy chairman, LiSSR Council of Ministers, spoke at and participated in the conference.

Elections of the new party raykom were held. At the committee organizational plenum, A. Baranauskas, for whom 72 out of the 73 raykom members voted, was elected first secretary, Raseynski Party Raykom. In the elections to party raykom membership, he received 330 out of 404 votes.

Of two candidates, S. Dovidaytene, who had previously been secretary of this committee, was elected second secretary. At the plenum, 51 raykom members voted for

him, and 322 conference delegates voted for him in the elections to raykom membership. G. Pakutka, former party raykom second secretary, received 217 votes against in the elections to the new committee and did not become a member.

I. Tamoshaytis, who had worked until this time as head of the rayon Department for National Education, was elected raykom secretary, also out of two candidates. At the plenum, 46 raykom members voted for him, and in the elections to party raykom membership, 391 conference delegates.

The rayon party conference was broadcast on local radio.

Shvenchenis—Delegates to the party raykom conference heard and discussed the report given by K. Yuralovich, first secretary, Shvenchenskiy Party Raykom.

V. Yankauskas, head, Economics Department, Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, participated in and gave a speech at the conference.

At the organizational plenum of the newly elected party raykom, K. Yuralovich, for whom 338 delegates out of 358 voted during the elections to committee membership, was unanimously elected first secretary, Shvenchenskiy Party Raykom. There were four candidates on the ballot for the election of the raykom second secretary. N. Sukov, who had worked until this time as director of the "Zheymyan" Sovkhoz received the largest number of votes—37 out of 65. In the elections to raykom membership, 356 delegates voted for him. L. Chuvalov, former party raykom second secretary, retired. G. Daynite, for whom 53 raykom members and, in the elections to committee membership, 269 conference delegates voted, was elected party raykom secretary out of two candidates.

Kapsukas—A report was given by Yu. Zhebrauskas, first secretary, Kapsukskiy Party Gorkom, at the city party conference held here.

Yu. Paletskis, head, Department of Culture, Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, participated in and gave a speech at the conference.

The elections of the new party gorkom were held. At the committee organizational plenum, A. Rimas, who had been chairman of the rayon agroindustrial association until this time, was unanimously elected first secretary, Kapsukskiy Party Gorkom. In the elections to gorkom membership, 449 out of 463 conference delegates voted for A. Rimas. Yu. Zhebrauskas, former party gorkom first secretary, transferred to another job. He was made head of the Agricultural Department of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

Out of two candidates, R. Adomavichyus, who was previously head of the committee's Department of Propaganda and Agitation, was elected second secretary.

Fifty-eight out of 69 gorkom members voted for him, and 407 delegates voted for him in the elections to committee membership. G. Kozayev, former party gorkom second secretary, received 356 votes against in the elections to the new committee and thus did not become a member.

V. Norvayshene, for whom 356 conference delegates voted, was unanimously elected party gorkom secretary.

Vilnius—I. Mikhalkovich, first secretary, Vilnius Party Raykom, gave the party committee report at the rayon party conference held here.

V. Yemelyanov, editor of SOVETSKAYA LITVA, spoke and participated in the conference's work.

At the organizational plenum of the newly chosen committee, I. Mikhalkovich, for whom 72 of the 73 raykom members voted, was elected first secretary, Vilnius Party Raykom. In the elections to the new committee membership, 358 out of 378 delegates voted for him.

Z. Yech, for whom 350 delegates voted in the elections to raykom membership, was unanimously elected party raykom second secretary. R. Svideravichene was also unanimously elected secretary at the plenum. During elections to the committee, 322 conference delegates voted for him.

[21 Nov 88 p 2]

Kaunas—V. Nortkus, first secretary, Lithuanian Communist Party Panyamunskiy Raykom, Kaunas, spoke at the party conference of the Panyamunskiy Party Raykom, Kaunas.

L. Maksimovas, chairman, Lithuanian Republic Trade Union Council, spoke at and participated in the conference.

Elections of the newly chosen party raykom were held. V. Nortkus was unanimously elected first secretary of the Panyamunskiy Party Raykom, Kaunas, at the committee organizational plenum. In the elections to raykom membership, 470 out of 461 conference delegates voted for V. Nortkus. G. Krivosheyevs, for whom 59 out of 63 raykom members and, in the elections to the committee, 430 delegates voted, was elected second secretary. A. Sokene was elected party raykom secretary. At the plenum, 53 raykom members and, in the elections to the committee, 416 delegates, voted for him.

Ignalina—At the party raykom conference, delegates heard and discussed the report given by G. Masyulis, first secretary, Ignalinskiy Party Raykom.

Yu. Rusenko, deputy chairman, LiSSR Council of Ministers, spoke at and participated in the conference.

At the organizational plenum of the newly elected party raykom, G. Masyulis, for whom 71 of the 72 raykom members and, in the elections to the committee, 317 out of 339 delegates voted, was elected party raykom first secretary, Ignalinskiy Party Raykom. A. Shvirinas was elected second secretary out of two candidates. Forty-three members of the new committee and, in the elections to the raykom, 184 delegates voted for him. S. Shurova was unanimously elected party raykom secretary. In the elections to the raykom, 298 conference delegates voted for her.

Kaunas—At the Kaunasskiy Party Raykom conference held here, P. Mikyalenis, first secretary, Lithuanian Communist Party Kaunasskiy Party Raykom, gave a report.

A. Shlezhevichyus, deputy head, Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Agricultural Department, spoke at and participated in the conference.

At the organizational plenum, P. Mikyalenis, for whom 456 out of 481 delegates voted in the elections to the raykom membership, was unanimously elected first secretary, Kaunasskiy Party Raykom. A. Merfenok, for whom 76 of the 77 raykom members and, in the elections to the committee membership, 292 conference delegates voted, was elected second secretary. Of three candidates, I. Emdrekhtas, who had been head of the rayon Department of National Education, was elected secretary. At the plenum, 43 raykom members voted for him, and 468 delegates voted for him in the elections to the committee membership. V. Daunis, former party raykom secretary, was not included on the ballot as a candidate for the elections of the new committee.

Rokishkis—V. Asachev, first secretary, Rokishskiy Party Raykom, gave a report at the rayon party conference.

S. Lisauskas, LiSSR Minister of Internal Affairs, spoke at and participated in the conference.

At the organizational plenum of the newly elected party raykom, V. Asachev, for whom 69 of the 70 raykom members and, in elections to committee membership, 349 out of 449 delegates voted, was elected first secretary, Rokishskiy Party Raykom. Of two candidates, V.

Yarushauskas, who was previously head of this committee's organizational department, was elected party raykom second secretary. At the plenum, 41 raykom members voted for him, and in the elections to the committee membership, 400 conference delegates voted for him. B. Puluykis, former second secretary, collected 29 votes from raykom members at the plenum. Out of three candidates, Ya. Amoseyeva, for whom 38 raykom members and, in the elections to committee membership, 349 conference delegates voted, was elected party raykom secretary.

Shirvintos—At the rayon party conference held here, V. Korniyenko, first secretary, Shirvintskiy Party Raykom, gave a report.

M. Sadovskiy, head of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Department of Foreign Relations, spoke at and participated in the conference.

Elections to the newly elected party raykom were held. At the committee organizational plenum, V. Korniyenko was unanimously elected first secretary, Shirvintskiy Party Raykom. In the elections to raykom membership, 339 of the 365 conference delegates voted for V. Korniyenko. A. Dargis, for whom 61 of the 62 raykom members and, in the elections to committee membership, 289 delegates voted, was elected second secretary. L. Klejevskene was elected party raykom secretary. Thirty-eight raykom members voted for her at the plenum and, in the elections to committee membership, 222 conference delegates voted for her.

Shyaulyay—At the rayon party conference held here, V. Skripkauskas, first secretary, Shyaulyayskiy Rayon Party Committee, gave a report.

S. Yasis, deputy head of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Department of Organizational and Party Work, spoke at and participated in the conference.

At the organizational plenum of the newly elected party raykom, V. Skripkauskas, for whom 64 of the 65 raykom members and, in elections to the committee, 393 out of 405 delegates voted, was elected first secretary, Shyaulyayskiy Party Raykom. A. Neverauskas, for whom 64 raykom members also voted and, in the elections to committee membership, 376 conference delegates voted, was elected second secretary. S. Abakayte was elected party raykom secretary. At the plenum, 57 raykom members voted for her, and in the elections to committee membership, 230 delegates voted for her.

Trotsky's Death, Relations with Stalin Examined
*18300299 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in
Russian No 1, 4 Jan 89 p 13*

[Article by N. Vasetskiy, doctor of historical sciences: "Elimination: Who Killed Trotsky and Why? Testimony and Different Versions of the Story in Different Years"]

[Text] "Death of an International Spy"—this was the title of the PRAVDA editorial on 24 August 1940. It said: "The news of Trotsky's death was delivered by telegraph. According to reports in American newspapers, Trotsky, who had been living in Mexico for the last few years, has been assassinated." This was followed by the name and political affiliation of the assassin—Jacques Mortain Vandendreich, "one of Trotsky's followers and closest associates." The paper then printed a brief account of the dead man's political biography and a description of his career: "The name of the man who was laid in his grave is spoken with contempt and revulsion by laborers throughout the world. For many years, this man fought against the cause of the working class and its vanguard—the Bolshevik Party. The dominant classes in the capitalist countries have lost a loyal servant. Foreign intelligence agencies have lost a loyal agent of many years' standing, an organizer of assassinations who would stoop to anything to attain his counterrevolutionary goals.... Trotsky was trapped in his own web after he reached the lowest level of human degradation."

The article ended with the official version of the assassination: "He was killed by his own supporters. He was eliminated by the same terrorists whom he had taught the underhanded methods of murder, treachery, and evil acts against the working class and the Nation of Soviets. Trotsky, who organized the villainous assassinations of Kirov, Kuybyshev, and M. Gorkiy, became the victim of his own intrigues, treachery, disloyalty, and villainy."

As we can see, the article and the account of the assassination were wholly in line with the spirit of that time. Since that time virtually no one has tried to revive this account of Trotsky's death or this assessment of his actions in the 1930's for a long time. There is good reason for this. The prevailing point of view then was the one formulated by Stalin, in accordance with which Trotskyism ceased to be a "communist faction" in the communist movement and became "the vanguard of the counterrevolutionary bourgeoisie." This was the reason for the renunciation of the methods of ideological debate in the struggle against Trotskyism.

But let us take a step backward. We will try to recreate the final scenes of the tragedy, which took place 4 days before the publication of the PRAVDA article. In fact, the analysis of the phenomenon of Trotskyism and of Trotsky should probably be conducted in the nature of political investigation, and the assassination itself is only the first phase.

Beginning at the End

On 20 August 1940 N.I. Sedova (Trotsky's second wife) saw her husband with a young man in the garden of their villa in Coyoacan at around six in the evening. The young man had first come to their home 3 months earlier, on the ill-starred day of 24 May, when a group of people dressed as Mexican army officers and policemen had tried to assassinate her husband.

The memory of that terrible event made Sedova shudder. She could remember the sound of the gunfire: More than 300 bullets had been fired at the walls of their rooms and several grenades had been thrown through their windows. She had suffered a few minor burns. Trotsky and his grandson suffered minor wounds.

The famous painter and monument builder David Alfaro Siqueiros claimed responsibility for the assassination attempt. It is indicative that when he learned the attempt had failed, he angrily exclaimed: "What a waste!"

In contrast to the attempt by the Siqueiros group, the act on that sultry August evening was undertaken by only one assassin. He was in no hurry, and each move he made was carefully planned. In this respect, he was amazingly similar to Rodion Raskolnikov, the hero of Dostoyevskiy's immortal novel.

Like his literary counterpart, the real murderer planned the attack carefully. According to the notations of Trotsky's secretary in the register of the villa's visitors, he was there 12 times. The notations also calculated the total amount of time he had spent in the building—4 hours and 27 minutes.

Like Raskolnikov, who visited his victim on the eve of the crime, Trotsky's murderer saw him just 12 days before the assassination. Furthermore, the length of this appointment probably set a record—around an hour. Besides this, it was the first time they had been alone.

Later Sedova realized that this meeting was probably something like a dress rehearsal for the assassination. She noticed that the usually calm and unruffled young man was obviously nervous that day. In spite of the heat, he was carrying a raincoat. He was probably already carrying the alpenstock. (Remember the loop in Raskolnikov's coat where he fastened the axe!)

The young man had ostensibly come to ask Trotsky to edit an article criticizing American Trotskyists M. Schachtman and J. Bernheim for deviating from the "movement." In the office the would-be assassin stood behind the master of the villa as he read the manuscript. Trotsky did not like this, and he mentioned this to his wife that same evening. In general, he was quite suspicious of the entire episode involving the article and the visit, but he did not take any precautions.

Then came the final act. The alpenstock was driven so far into the back of his head that the dent in his skull measured almost 7 centimeters. Trotsky remained conscious for a few hours, however, and even exchanged some words with his wife and his secretary. The physician who came to the villa said the wound was "not serious." Nevertheless, the wounded man was immediately hospitalized.

On the morning of 21 August Trotsky said that he felt better and he even asked to see some French economic statistics. After this, however, his condition deteriorated sharply. All of the attempts of surgeon G. Baza and his five assistants to save the patient were in vain. One of the last things the dying man said was: "I believe in the triumph of the Fourth International. Forward march!" Trotsky died at 19:25.

The Assassin

He was not Jacques Mortain Vandendreich, as PRAVDA said, but a man carrying the passport of Canadian citizen Frank Jackson. He was also known as Jacques Mornard, a Belgian subject who had come to Mexico from the United States as a tourist in October 1939.

During the investigation it was learned that all of these names and nationalities were false. The assassin was Ramon del Rio Mercader from Spain.

He was born in Barcelona on 7 February 1913. His family was quite wealthy, and he was one of five children. Mercader's parents separated soon after his birth, and his mother moved to Paris with all of the children.

Ramon's biography was typical of the people of his social circle—he was educated in the lycee and then served in the army. In 1935, after he had moved back to Spain, he was a member of the youth movement. He was arrested but was soon released by the new government of the Popular Front.

Mercader met Sylvia Agelova-Maslova, an American citizen of Russian descent, in Paris in summer 1939. She was a confirmed Trotskyist and an ardent admirer of Trotsky himself. Agelova was one of the speakers at the constituent conference of the Fourth International (in Paris in September 1938).

This homely woman who was not used to attracting the attention of men and was several years older than Mercader fell head over heels in love with him. She introduced him to her cousin, who was also greatly impressed by his impeccable manners. The cousin was also a supporter of the Trotskyist movement and she worked for Trotsky's secretariat in Coyoacan. Through the cousin, Mercader gained the trust of the Rosmer couple, Alfred and Marguerite, who had been close

friends of the Trotsky family and had been among the organizers of the constituent conference of the Fourth International. They were the ones who first took Mercader to his victim's home.

Motives for the Crime

The murderer in Dostoyevskiy's novel not only wanted to become a millionaire but also wanted to prove to everyone, especially himself, that he had the right to be a Napoleon. What were the motives governing Trotsky's murderer?

When agents of the secret police, headed by General Sanchez Salazar, arrived at the scene of the crime, they found several pages of typewritten text in the pocket of Mercader's raincoat. They were signed by the murderer and dated 20 August 1940. The trial records refer to this text as the "Jackson-Mornard letter."

The murderer's motives were explained in detail in the letter. They can be summarized as three main reasons: Mercader's disillusionment with Trotsky as the "great proletarian revolutionary"; Mercader's objections to Trotsky's attempts to recruit him and send him to the USSR to commit acts of terrorism and sabotage; Trotsky's objections to Mercader's marriage to Agelova. There was an obvious attempt to put all of the blame for the assassination on Mercader by portraying him as a lone assassin who had committed the crime for personal reasons as well as politico-ideological ones. In my opinion, this version was not supported by any convincing arguments. Mercader's testimony with regard to each of these reasons was confused, and he contradicted his own statements and known facts.

For example, his main argument to support his disillusionment with Trotsky as a revolutionary was the response he received when he asked where the money had come from for the construction and maintenance of the villa in Coyoacan. When Mercader was arrested, he alluded to Trotsky's dependence on American imperialism, but at the trial in 1943 he insisted that Trotsky was pro-German. The reason for this was quite transparent: In 1940 Soviet-German relations were governed by the non-aggression pact and it was possible to malign American imperialism without fear. Three years later the situation had changed radically—the United States was already the USSR's ally, while Germany was at war with the USSR.

The details of the attempts to recruit Mercader and send him to the USSR did not make sense either. In his words, Trotsky planned to send Ramon to the Soviet Union through Shanghai and Manchuria. Mercader told the police: "Our immediate objective was the moral dissolution of the Red Army soldiers and the organization of several acts of sabotage at military plants and other enterprises."

These were extremely serious missions. They would not have been entrusted to the first man who came along, so to speak. Trotsky had known Mercader only 3 months, and he did not even trust him. According to the villa visitors' book, in all the time that they knew each other they spent no more than an hour alone. What could they have agreed upon in that hour? But even if we assume that Trotsky had decided to send Mercader to the USSR, why would he have to send him through China? After all, the "agent" did not know the language or the people, and his European origin would naturally have attracted attention.

Finally, the references to Trotsky as the main obstacle in the way of Mercader's marriage to Agelova do not sound very persuasive either. Although Trotsky knew her, he saw her only rarely. For example, in the first 8 months of 1940 she visited the villa in Coyoacan twice at the most.

All of the researchers in the West who attempted an in-depth analysis of the real instigators of Trotsky's assassination arrived at a unanimous conclusion—Stalin.

This point of view was supported by some in our country also. Stalin's involvement in Trotsky's assassination is treated as a self-evident fact, for instance, in M. Shatrov's play "Farther..., farther..., farther!" The man directly responsible for executing Stalin's will—Beriya, who received a promotion after Trotsky's death—is also named in D. Volkogonov's article "The Demon of the Revolution."

Just as in the case of Kirov's murder, however, there is not enough documented evidence for a final verdict. It is even difficult to say whether there is any evidence at all. For this reason—for at least the hundredth time!—we will have to rely on indirect evidence and arguments. The first person who attempted to present them was Trotsky himself, when he was still alive.

The Diaries

Even among Trotsky's associates and biographers, not many know that he kept a diary three times in his life. The first time was in Switzerland at the beginning of World War I. He kept a diary again in 1916 in Spain, where he went after he was deported from France for pro-German propaganda. Finally, he made isolated entries at the height of the inner party struggle of 1926-1927 and then in 1933-1935 and closer to 1937.

Trotsky's World War I diary has not been published. His entries of later years, along with his letters and other papers kept in the Trotsky archives at Harvard University's Hutton Library (Boston), were published in 1986 by the American Hermitage publishing firm in a work edited by Yu.G. Felshtinskiy, with a foreword by A.A. Avtorkhanov.

My first reaction to this publication was the conviction that it was "not the original." It was more probable that his papers had been edited posthumously, as in the case of, for example, the book "Stalin." After a careful reading of the text, however, I concluded that this time it was the original.

I was convinced of this primarily by two features. The first was the striking delusions of grandeur which Trotsky could not escape even in notes that were supposedly not intended to be read by strangers. Here are some typical examples. The entry for 25 March 1935 says: "If Lenin and I had not been in St. Petersburg, there would have been no October Revolution...." After reading "The Life of the Archpriest Avvakum," Trotsky comments on his strong will and his fortitude in battle, but he says it in such a way as to suggest that his own will and fortitude are stronger than the archpriest's.

The second feature is his tendency to write lengthy descriptions of nature, the weather, and the fishing and hunting trips which he did not give up even at the most crucial times in his political career. "The fishing and hunting are good here too, so I can return your kind invitation," Trotsky wrote from Alma-Ata in February 1928 in response to I.N. Smirnov's (his former bodyguard) invitation to visit him in Novobayazet. Obviously, Trotsky's fishing and hunting stories do not compare in any way to the stories of Aksakov-pere, but they supplement the account of his thoughts and feelings, which could hardly be fabricated.

According to Trotsky's diary entries, Stalin first considered the possibility of his assassination back in 1924 and 1925. On 18 February 1935 he wrote: "Zinoviyev asked me with some embarrassment: 'Do you think that Stalin never discussed your execution? He considered it and he discussed it.... Take the necessary precautions.'" On 4 April he quoted another "witness": "Kamenev told me how the three of them—Stalin, Kamenev, and Dzerzhinskiy—had a 'heart-to-heart' talk over some wine (they were united by their unconcealed struggle against me) in Zubalov (Stalin's dacha—N.V.) one evening in 1923 (or 1924?). After they had finished their wine, they began discussing sentimental topics on the balcony: something like their personal tastes and weaknesses. Stalin said: 'The greatest pleasure of all is to identify an enemy, make careful preparations, take the proper revenge, and then go to sleep.'"

Summarizing all of the facts he knew to be true, Trotsky wrote: "The motive of personal revenge was an important part of Stalin's repressive policy." Applying the formula to himself, he then divided it into the following components. First of all, "his thirst for revenge against me has not been satisfied at all." Second, the lack of satisfaction was compounded by the fact that Trotsky did not stop fighting against Stalin ("This madman is terrified of ideas because he realizes their explosive power and he knows that he is powerless against them").

Third, "Stalin would not hesitate for a minute to arrange for my assassination, but he is afraid of the political implications: He is certain to be blamed."

In Trotsky's books "My Life," "Permanent Revolution" (1930), "Stalin's School of Falsification" (1932), and "The History of the Russian Revolution" (1931-1933), where he had much to say about Stalin as a man and as a political figure, there are no allusions of the kind listed above. Is it because the books were written before 1935, before Zinovyev and Kamenev completely lost their status as social functionaries and could not deny Trotsky's statements? This is far from an idle question.

There have been some people recently, especially young people, who have read some of Trotsky's works and have then tried to portray them as the highest truth. Even many Sovietologists, however, are inclined to doubt the accuracy of Trotsky's descriptions of events and especially of historical figures, particularly those who could have influenced his own future in some way. Harvard University Professor A. Ulam, for example, has said several times that Trotsky's accounts of events are half-truths combined with attempts to ignore the facts.

There is also something else. If Stalin had seriously considered killing Trotsky back in the 1920's, he certainly would not have exiled him from the USSR. Later, one of Trotsky's close friends, I. Reiss, even remarked in this connection: "Now Stalin can at least be given credit for saving the head of the revolution."

In the 1920's the duel between Stalin and Trotsky was not as savage as it became after Kirov's murder. It was then that physical reprisals against political opponents became a common practice of the Stalin regime.

The Duel

In 1930 Trotsky was visited on Prinkipo Island by Yakov Blyumkin, who was returning to the USSR after serving overseas in India. Yes, this was the former Left Socialist Revolutionary, one of the German Ambassador Mirbach's assassins. He had been saved from the firing squad in 1918 by Trotsky, and Blyumkin then headed Trotsky's personal guard when he was people's commissar of military and naval affairs. Yakov later went to work for the Council of People's Commissars' United State Political Administration. This man, in contrast to Mercader, was trusted implicitly by Trotsky.

They spent almost 2 days in constant conversation. What did they talk about? It is hard to say. After Blyumkin returned to the USSR, however, he was arrested, and a letter from Trotsky to his supporters was discovered on his person. The letter contained this sentence: "The relentless struggle can be expected to last a long time."

There is some evidence that this was not mere bravado. In 1932 Trotsky noted: "Stalin has led us into a blind alley. We cannot get back to the road until we eliminate Stalinism.... We will have to finally carry out Lenin's last insistent piece of advice: to remove Stalin."

On 15 March 1933 Trotsky sent a letter to the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) and appealed for the "regeneration of the party." He offered the services of the "international leftist opposition," which "will be willing to give the central committee full assistance in directing the party into the channel of normal development without any upheavals or with just the slightest upheavals."

After Kirov's murder, Trotsky accurately defined the impending crisis in the party. On 30 March 1935, after he had read the latest statements about the "putrid scum of Trotskyists and Zinovyevists" in PRAVDA, he declared: "There is some kind of disorder there, and it is a major disorder: The 'disorder' exists somewhere deep within the bureaucracy itself, and probably even within the ruling clique."

Trotsky pointedly criticized the political trials in Moscow and accurately defined them as a hoax, a fiction, and a way for Stalin and his group to settle accounts with their opponents.

Because his name was invariably mentioned during these trials, Trotsky took a risky step. When he was in Norway (in 1936), he demanded that the Soviet Government request the Norwegian Government to extradite him as a "criminal." He felt that this would have given him a chance to expose Stalin in a Norwegian court. Trotsky's challenge, however, was not accepted.

Why was it that once again, just as in the 1920's, no one in the party or the communist movement paid attention to him?

Program of Political Revolution

In the 1930's many bourgeois researchers already saw Trotsky's anti-Stalinism as a sign of a "new Trotskyism." Some are convinced even today that Trotskyism is anti-Stalinism. There is no question that anti-Stalinist motives are of cardinal importance in the ideology and practice of Trotskyism, and this is not surprising. The Stalin group's failures in economic and social policy, violations of socialist laws, curtailment of intra-party democracy, and other negative actions confirmed, in Trotsky's opinion, one of the key premises of his theory of "permanent revolution"—the thesis that socialism could not be built in any single country.

Trotsky's attitude toward the authoritarian and illegal acts of the Stalin group was also unique. For example, he did not say a single sympathetic word about the victims of the famine of 1933 that was largely a result of Stalin's criminal policies.

Trotsky was actually the first to advance a thesis which could be summed up as—the bigger, the better: “The longer repression lasts, the more likely it is to produce the opposite of the anticipated result: to rouse the adversary, filling him with the energy born of desperation, instead of frightening him.”

After categorizing the repressed, he noted with concealed pleasure that the “Trotskyists” were at the top of the list: “In the last few months even the official Soviet press has reported that our comrades do their work courageously and with some success.”

It was these people, and according to Trotsky’s calculations there were several thousand of them in the USSR, that were supposed to make up the nucleus of a new, regenerated All-Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik), and its program was to be the program of political revolution.

The advancement of this idea is quite indicative. As the existing regime in the USSR grew stronger, Trotsky arrived at the conclusion that his previously proposed policy of reform, with the removal of Stalin as its central point, was already inadequate: “The Stalin issue does not exist as an independent issue. An assassination cannot change the correlation of social forces or stop the objective course of development. The removal of Stalin today would mean nothing more than his replacement by one Kaganovich or another, whom the Soviet press would quickly turn into the greatest of the great.” In “The Revolution Betrayed” (1936), a book known to many, Trotsky wrote: “The issue at hand is not the simple replacement of one team of leaders by another. The issue is a change in the very principles of cultural and economic management.... What is needed is a second revolution.”

Contemporary Trotskyists are trying to turn Trotsky’s appeals for a “second revolution” in the USSR into a prophecy. According to them, the current perestroika is the embodiment of the program of political revolution. Perestroika, however, primarily signifies the removal of all deformities and distortions from socialist principles, the revival of Lenin’s concept of socialism, and the affirmation of the high ideals of humanism. Trotsky’s program, on the other hand, was essentially nothing more than a political game. On the pretext of struggle against Stalin, Trotsky tried to replace one “ism” (Stalinism) with another “ism” equally hostile to Leninism—Trotskyism.

I feel that the main thing we should remember today is that Trotsky’s ideas and his very concept of revolution and socialism could not be an alternative to the Stalin model. And the problem was not just the concept of “permanent revolution” or Trotsky’s dream of “bringing happiness” to all mankind by establishing a worldwide socialist society. Trotsky’s belief in barracks socialism, the militarization of labor, the need for repressive machinery in the army, and a regime completely

confined to the revolution and his clearly anti-peasant views were common knowledge. The methods he proposed for the construction of a new society not only took his own theoretical postulates to absurd extremes (for instance, the merger of military districts with production units), but were also distinguished by a clear intention to establish “social justice” in exactly the same ways as Stalin suggested—repression and coercion. I think there is no point in arguing about priority (although Trotsky called Stalin a pale imitation several times). In my opinion, it is more important that the two models coincided.

Stalin’s Response

The realization of the true essence of Trotskyism seems to have provided Stalin with a perfect opportunity to prove that the Trotskyist ideology and practice had evolved into reactionary cosmopolitanism. Stalin, however, chose not to make use of this opportunity. He had no trumps, as they say. The concept of socialism he preached, with its brutal authoritarian system of administration, was fundamentally contrary to Lenin’s views on the self-management of the laboring public and the development of the initiative and creativity of the masses.

As a result, Stalin’s criticism of Trotsky and Trotskyism on the ideological level was nothing more than a “war of quotations,” name-calling, and accusations of espionage, sabotage, and subversive activity, and on the organizational level it took the form of physical reprisals against anyone suspected of Trotskyist affiliations, including reprisals against the bearer of these ideas—Trotsky himself. This goal was approached, as they say, by devious paths.

On 20 February 1932 Trotsky and the members of his family who had gone abroad with him lost their Soviet citizenship. On 7 November 1936 some of the archives Trotsky had taken out of the USSR were stolen by a group of individuals in Paris. According to the owner, what had disappeared was “85 kilograms of my papers, just mine; even the money was left untouched.” This happened a year after it was learned that Trotsky had sold some archival documents to the Amsterdam Institute of Social History, the director of which was then the Menshevik B. Nikolayevskiy.

Measures were simultaneously taken in the Soviet press to portray Trotsky’s statements about his “thousands” of supporters in the USSR and about political revolution as evidence that he had “sold out” and had gone over to the camp of anti-Soviet counterrevolution.

Stalin and his associates used these statements for new mass repressions. The same statements were used as arguments for the ideological basis of the Moscow political trials Trotsky condemned so vehemently. What is more, the more vigorously Trotsky opposed Stalin, the more unpleasant his actions seemed to the public, both in the USSR and abroad.

A political vacuum took shape around Trotsky. When he was interviewed by the American historian James in 1939, he complained: "We are few in number—intellectuals, semi-intellectuals, and some workers isolated from their own class.... We are not developing politically."

Trotsky's isolation grew even stronger when World War II started. The world public effectively lost interest in him. Under these conditions, the elimination of Trotsky became simply a matter of "technique," which had been perfected by that time.

This is what confirmed the accuracy of Trotsky's description of Stalin as an exceptionally insidious and vengeful creature. After all, by the end of the 1930's Trotsky no longer represented any kind of meaningful political entity. Locked away in his villa-fortress in Coyoacan, he lived the life of a hermit who could no longer threaten anyone with anything. Nevertheless, Stalin could not forget past insults and offenses. When he was certain that he would never need Trotsky for anything again, he apparently either made the decision himself or let his associates know that it was "time to put an end" to Trotsky.

The Finale

The first signs were already apparent in 1937. In September, I. Reiss, the NKVD official who had sympathized with Trotsky for a long time, died in Switzerland. Two months before his death, when he went over to the side of the Fourth International, Reiss sent a letter to the Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik), calling for a resolute struggle against Stalinism. He also set forth the program of this struggle: "Not a popular front, but class struggle; not committees, but intervention by workers to save the Spanish revolution.... Down with the lie about socialism in one country and back to the internationalism of Lenin!" They found Reiss on the outskirts of Lausanne. There were seven bullets in his body, five of them in his head.

At the end of 1937 Trotsky learned of another victim. Erwin Wolf, the 34-year-old Czechoslovak citizen who worked as Trotsky's private secretary, disappeared in Spain in May. He had probably gone to Spain to make the arrangements for contacts with the POUM [Partido Obrero de Unificacion Marxista], an organization which Trotsky had criticized for its activities but which was close to Trotskyist and anarchist groups in its political ideology and methods of work.

On 13 June 1938 German citizen Rudolf Klement, one of the technical secretaries of the Fourth International who had also been Trotsky's secretary from 1933 to 1935, died under mysterious circumstances in Paris.

That was also the year of the first attempt on Trotsky's own life in Mexico. A suspicious character tried to gain entry to the villa in Coyoacan in the guise of a messenger delivering a gift. The attempt was exposed, but the "messenger" got away. He left the package of explosives near the home as he ran.

At that time Trotsky realized that the circle had closed. He began to think seriously about suicide. He began each day with the statement: "They did not kill us last night. They have given us one more day."

One of the men responsible for the entire operation was NKVD Colonel Leonid Eytingon, also known under the names of Leontyev and Rabinovich.

It was Eytingon who recruited Mercader's mother, Caridad, by making her his lover, and then he used her to involve her son in the plot. In 1939 Eytingon was the "stranger" in Paris who, according to Mercader's testimony, gave him the passport in the name of the Canadian Jackson and 5,000 dollars for his trip across the ocean. He was probably also the author of the "Jackson-Mornard letter" found on Mercader's person when he was arrested. On the day Trotsky was murdered, Eytingon and Caridad were waiting for Mercader near the villa in Coyoacan to drive him away along a previously planned route. This plan failed.

They did not abandon Mercader, however, to the whims of fate. At first they hired attorneys for him and after the court sentenced him to the most severe penalty envisaged by Mexican law—20 years in prison—they did as much as they could to make it easier for Mercader to serve his sentence.

We can only make guesses about his later life. After his release in 1960, Mercader was seen in Cuba, then in Prague and Moscow, and then in Cuba again. It was here, in Havana, according to reports in the press, that Mercader died after almost a year and a half of illness in October 1978.

A man who could have cleared up much of the mystery surrounding Trotsky's murder is gone, although we cannot exclude the possibility that even he did not know all of the details of the preparations and arrangements for the crime he committed.

Trotsky lost the duel. His direct and indirect confrontations with Stalin had dramatic consequences for him. I repeat, for him. In contrast to other alternatives to the revolution, his option was distinguished in many respects, if not all, by a fundamental contradiction. I am referring to the unique psychological phenomenon historians and political scientists ascribe to the October leader who was once second only to Lenin in popularity: Trotsky always loved himself in the revolution more than he loved the revolution itself. He also lost the duel because he was strong in his aspirations to power but weak in what makes any mortal a Man of Revolution.

BSSR Forced Collectivization, Purges, Famine Detailed

18000493 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 25 Dec 88 p 2

[Article by N. Kuznetsov, doctor of history, senior scientific associate of the Institute of Party History at the Belorussian CP Central Committee: "Collectivization: Difficult Paths"]

[Text] We are continuing the publication of materials devoted to inadequately researched pages of history. Today's discussion of a number of aspects of the implementation of collectivization in Belorussia is conducted by N. V. Kuznetsov, doctor of history, senior scientific associate of the Institute of Party History at the Belorussian CP Central Committee. (The series "Pages of History" is published under the editorship of Professor R. P. Platonov, director of the Institute of Party History at the Belorussian CP Central Committee).

In 1913, the poor peasants in the Belorussian countryside accounted for 67.7 percent, the peasants of average means—for 21.3 percent. They had at their disposal 47.5 percent of the agricultural land. The first imperialist war, the intervention, and the civil war aggravated the depth of the devastation.

In Belorussia, the Leninist Decree on Land was not implemented until the beginning of the 1920's. In the course of its realization, the peasantry of the Eastern oblasts in 1921 increased its land tenure to 5,442,321 dessiatinas, which is 1,327,271 dessiatinas more than it had before the October Revolution. And nevertheless the shortage of land in Belorussia, by comparison with other regions of the country, was felt more keenly; the agrarian overpopulation of the village showed up here. The provision of land to the peasants was 41 percent lower here than the average for the USSR.

By 1920, when the battles of the Civil War came to an end and peace came, thousands of peasants were left without shelter. By comparison with the pre-war period, the sown areas decreased by 36.5 percent, and the gross grain harvests decreased by half. The agriculture of the country as a whole was also in a difficult position.

The transition to peaceful and constructive work allowed the Bolshevik Party and V. I. Lenin to analyze agricultural policy and to elaborate new directions corresponding to the tasks of the building of socialism, as well as the forms and methods of its realization. The new economic policy developed in these conditions and the transition from war communism to the NEP, from the food appropriation system to a food tax in the village better than anything else characterized the peaceful strategy of the party, which answered the basic interests of the country and all workers.

To the extent possible, the Soviet government supported the economic aspirations of the peasants. In the spring of 1921, when difficulties with seeds developed in Belorussia, the country provided 400,000 poods of oats, 20,000 poods of millet, and 10,000 poods of buckwheat.

All of this opened the way to the search for forms of collective management on the land. This was also prompted by difficulties with agricultural implements, tractive force and seeds.

At the beginning of 1919, in 13 uyezds of Belorussia there were 286 collective farms, including 175 communes, 36 artels, and 75 associations for the jointed working of the land. However, the first collective farms did not gain in strength, for they were created more on the basis of enthusiasm than on a strong economic basis. The rapid quantitative growth of collective forms of management gave many the illusion that the collectivization of small peasant farms will make it possible to make quicker strides toward socialism. Moreover, as the result of such impatience, there appeared the first cases of haste, sudden attack, and coercion. It seemed to the People's Commissariat for Agriculture that it was possible to shatter capitalism in the village and to collectivize the peasant farms in 3-4 years. This worried V. I. Lenin. He recommended to rely on the individual peasant, to see him as he is, since he will not be different in the near future. V. I. Lenin, the strategist and dialectician, saw the immaturity, the lack of preparedness of the peasants for the transition to new socio-economic relations, and the backwardness of the country for an immediate solution of the tasks of such a level of collectivization. Practice soon completely confirmed the Leninist analysis. The carelessly put-together communes began to fall apart.

Repudiating assault and onslaught in the realization of the highest forms of collectivization, V. I. Lenin the path to them leads through the most simple forms of cooperation, called upon to become the school for the education of the peasants in the spirit of collectivism and socialism.

The cooperative plan developed by V. I. Lenin was a broad complex of measures for the development of the whole spectrum of forms of cooperative societies: The creation of marketing, supply, credit, production and agricultural associations.

All villages of Belorussia supported cooperative societies. Through the development of agricultural cooperative societies, the leadership established the Union of Agricultural Cooperatives created in October 1921. The network of enterprises of all types of agricultural cooperatives grew rapidly.

Thanks to cooperative societies, the gross production of the socialist agricultural sector of Belorussia during the years 1925-1926 exceeded the pre-war level by 12.2 percent. The percentage of farms without horses decreased from 15.5 percent in 1917 to 13 percent in

1926. During the same period, the number of farms without cows diminished from 9.5 percent to 4.3 percent. The sown area exceeded the pre-war level by 18.6 percent. In the cooperative farms, the productivity was 12 percent higher on the average than in the individual peasant farms. There was an increase in the number of large cattle, horses, and sheep.

In 1925, peasants bought approximately 10 times more agricultural machines and fertilizer than in 1922. There was an increase in the purchases of manufactured goods, sugar, soap, and kerosine. The peasant developed a greater demand for meat, fat, flour, and cereals.

The results of cooperative societies were also perceptible for the country as a whole. In 1923, Soviet Russia, for the first time since the Great October, exported to the foreign market 130 million poods of high-quality wheat, the country's primordial export product.

It goes without saying, this export still did not indicate a surplus of grain, since there were 486 kilograms per capita, but at the same time the fact indicated the great potential of cooperative societies and all of its very simple forms.

The correctness of the path was also indicated by the rates of output of agricultural products in the country. From 1921 to 1928, this rate exceeded 10 percent. After the ruin of the times of the first world war and the famine period of war communism, this was an unprecedented success. How proud V. I. Lenin was of this! Speaking at the 4th Congress of the Comintern in November 1922, he said: "... In one year the peasantry not only coped with hunger, but also turned in the food tax in such an amount that already now we have obtained hundreds of millions of poods, and, what is more, almost without any compulsion. Peasant uprisings, which previously, before 1921, were, so to speak, a common phenomenon in Russia, have almost completely disappeared. The peasantry is satisfied with its present situation."

The 15th Party Congress in December 1927 stated that the experience of the past years, the last ones in particular, completely confirmed the correctness of Lenin's cooperative plan, according to which it is precisely through cooperative societies that socialist industry will lead small peasant farming along the road to socialism.

It is precisely the cooperative movement which helped in many respects to overcome the hunger and devastation after the Civil War, M. S. Gorbachev said at the 4th All-Union Congress of Kolkhoz Farmers, and promoted the improvement of the financial and monetary system, the formation, in the working man, of the feeling of being the master of production and the land, and the increase of the activeness of people in the construction of the new life. This is exactly what we need today.

However, the further development of cooperative societies was cut short, the Leninist ideas on cooperation were distorted and, in essence, discarded. Stalin transformed them into the external environment of his voluntarist, profoundly mistaken ideas of the forcible and forced collectivization of agricultural production. The foundation of their embodiment was laid in the period of the transition of the country to industrialization. This transition was realized in the extremely difficult conditions of the hostile capitalist encirclement, the refusal of the bourgeois states to grant loans and credits, and the absence, in the Country of the Soviets, of its own sufficient means for the construction of factories and plants.

The Leninist theory of industrialization was based on intra-enterprise accumulations, the strictest economy, and the monopoly of foreign trade. It was envisaged to obtain a certain part of the funds also in agriculture, to whose development V. I. Lenin devoted such great attention. An important place in the realization of the program being outlined was also allotted to the labor enthusiasm of the masses. The Leninist plan for a step-by-step, gradual transformation of the village from the simplest to the higher forms did not suit Stalin. The slow, but correct method of cooperatives, the NEP, which had yielded practical results, was resolutely discarded. In spite of a balanced and realistic analysis of the state of the country, ignoring the laws of economics and disregarding the interests of the workers, a policy was adopted that was aimed at the accelerated and forcible implementation of collectivization in its higher forms, bypassing the stages substantiated by V. I. Lenin. This was a kind of pursuit of two hares—to collectivize the village in the shortest possible time period and to take from it the means for industrialization.

The basis for such course was laid by a number of difficulties. The inadequate development of industry entailed the commodity hunger which made itself acutely felt in Belorussia in 1925. The plan for the delivery of industrial goods to the republic was fulfilled only to the extent of 84 percent. This had an effect on the growth of the overall level of prices, and it led to the gap between wholesale and retail prices. This took place in the conditions of the growth of the purchasing power of the peasant, called forth by the improvement of management on the land.

During years 1923-1926, the capacity of Belorussia's consumer market for manufactured goods expanded from 31.9 million to 68.5 million rubles, or it more than doubled. The increase of the demand for manufactured goods was favored by the good harvest of 1925, the reduction of the rate of the agricultural tax to 43 percent that was put into effect, and the increase of prices for agricultural products by 8.3 percent. The growth of the solvency of the peasantry, the increase of the profitability of the peasantry through the sale of grain and industrial crops, and seasonable work created money surpluses and increased the demand for manufactured goods.

The increase in agricultural production, however, was not so high as for Belorussia to be able to make do with its grain. In 1926 twice as much grain was delivered to the republic as in 1913. In 1927, in connection with the grain procurement difficulties in the country as a whole, when the shortage came to 128 million poods, the import of grain into Belorussia decreased to 10 million poods. The difficulties with the procurements were aggravated by unfounded rumors about the intensification of the threat of war. As a result, the grain procurement plan in the republic in May 1928 was fulfilled only to the extent of 71.5 percent. In such a situation, the reasons for the difficulties that had been created, in place of a profound and comprehensive analysis, were explained by attempts of the kulaks "to organize hunger" and "to ruin the rates of collectivization."

In such conditions, the forceful methods of influencing the peasants, which had been tested by Stalin during his trip to Siberia and in the Urals in connection with shortcomings in grain procurements, came to prevail. The refusal of the peasants to sell grain at the fixed state prices, the inflation of grain prices, and grain concealment began to be regarded as sabotage, as an attempt to plunge the country into a national economic crisis. The contradictions that arose were not analyzed as they should have been. A way out of the situation that had developed was found in the use of extreme measures against the kulaks, among which, more often than not, were included the peasants of average means who had just straightened their shoulders, and even the poor peasants.

The anti-Leninist idea of the "pumping over" of the funds from agriculture to the development of industry served for Stalin as the external frame for the accelerated and forcible spreading of kolkhozes. Extremeness, repressions, and administrative-command violence were the methods of its realization. This was to the highest degree the surplus-appropriation system of the time of "war communism," which was rejected by Lenin and the party in the new conditions of peace. The peasants of Belorussia were prohibited from removing grain to the market, those who did not carry out these instructions had their grain confiscated. Thus, in January-February 1928 alone, about 70,000 poods of grain were confiscated. One-fourth of the confiscated grain was distributed among those who did not plough and did not sow. In the procurements, wide use was made of voluntary rate-paying, in accordance with which the peasants disseminated a plan for grain deliveries among themselves. All of this lay like a heavy burden above all on the peasant of average means. The measures of forcible grain removal that were undertaken, in 1927-1928, helped to fulfill the grain procurement plan handed to the republic. 3.5 times more grain products were procured than in 1926-27.

But this was a Pyrrhic victory. The forcible methods of grain removal called forth the sharp discontent of the peasants, which expressed itself in arson and armed actions. During

1927-1929, 1,637 cases of arson and 80 armed attacks were committed in the villages of Belorussia. Responsibility for them was placed on the kulaks, among whose number they included peasants of average means who were dissatisfied with the "removal" campaign.

In Belorussia in 1927, 4.2 percent of the peasants were counted as kulaks. Their rights were limited, and they were subject to a special tax assessment. In 1927, the peasants of Belorussia counted as kulaks paid 50 percent more taxes than in 1926. Those who were obstinate and did not fulfill the specified tasks given to them were dispossessed and deported to remote regions of the country. At the beginning of the 1930's, 10-15 percent of the peasant farms were assigned for dispossession. Their property was handed over to the kolkhozes. In Belorussia, in May 1930 alone, implements and means of production valued at 11.3 rubles were expropriated from so-called kulaks, which amounted to almost half of the indivisible funds, calculated at 22 million rubles.

There is a great deal which indicates that this was a struggle not against the kulaks, but against the entire peasantry, that the danger of the kulak was intentionally blown up. Delivering a report in November 1927 before the 11th Belorussian CP Congress, the secretary of the Belorussian CP(b) Central Committee, V. G. Knorin, noted that the development the republic's agriculture proceeded along the line of the intensification not of the exploiting, but the average groups, that we can speak firmly and definitely about the isolation of the kulak and his inability to lead the village. And that is why there is not threat to our policy and to the implementation of our measures at the present moment, and one can answer to all the assertions about the danger of the kulaks that these discussions are without any serious basis.

The inclusion of the peasant of average means among the kulaks, the artificial obstacles in the path of the development of the farms, and the forcible removal of grain, frequently without leaving anything behind, gave rise to famine. In the letter of 6 June 1927 from the Chebotovichskiy Rural Soviet of Gomel Rayon it was reported that in a number of populated areas the peasants do not see bread for 2 weeks at a time, and that there are cases of death for this reason. In a letter from Orshanskiy District it was stated with alarm that the poor, numbering 35,000 farms, remained entirely without grain, that people are eating oil-cakes and vetch: High mortality is expected in the future.

These were not the only letters that called for assistance and rescue. However, that which was removed from the peasant barns was never returned.

The disregard of the market continued subsequently as well, but the removal of grain from the peasants was carried out already through the kolkhozes, for which it was planned to increase the rate of collectivization sharply.

N. N. Bukharin, A. I. Rykov, and M. P. Tomskiy came out against the voluntarist and forcible methods in the economy. At that time Stalin branded them as right deviationists. In Belorussia, the people's commissar for agriculture, D. F. Prishchepov, as well as Lobanovskiy, Zhdanovich, Yaroshchuk, Khauke, Kislyakov, Goretskiy, Smolich, and others were accused of right deviationist tendencies.

What was the essence of the so-called "Prishchepovism?" Where are its sources and roots? The chief accusation made against D. F. Prishchepov and his followers reduced itself to the spreading of separate farms in Belorussia. This label, firmly stuck on D. F. Prishchepov, unfortunately, has not been removed up to now, although its absurdity is evident.

The khutors were not anything new in Belorussia's organization of the use of land. Already in accordance with the agrarian policy of Stolypin, 55,000-60,000 khutors and holdings were created here. With regard to the real situation, the Belorussian CP(b) Central Committee Plenum (September 1924) adopted a decree on the elaboration of a new BSSR Land Code, in which it was recommended to allow the peasants freedom of choice of the forms of land use. However, the new BSSR Land Code, which was approved in February 1925 by the Presidium of the BSSR Central Executive Committee, contrary to the decree of the September Plenum, recommended only the settlement form of land use organization and rejected the khutor. Such an approach in the conditions of Belorussia was not justified and went contrary to the party line. In the decisions of the April (1925) Plenum of the RKP(b) Central Committee, the necessity of assisting the growth of such forms of land use as settlements, new villages, etc. was discussed, which are more favorable to the development of cooperative societies and the mechanization of agriculture. The Plenum demanded not to put up administrative barriers to the apportionment of peasants into holdings and khutors, strictly observing the right of freedom of choice of the forms of land use in accordance with the Land Code.

Taking this decree into consideration, the BSSR People's Commissariat for Agriculture, headed by D. F. Prishchepov, developed the "Long-Term Plan for the Development of Agriculture and Forestry of the BSSR for 1925/26-1929/30," which provided for the further creation of khutors and small settlements of the holding type. In 1925, the plan presented by the BSSR People's Commissariat for Agriculture was adopted by the Belorussian KP(b) Central Committee and the republic's Council of People's Commissars. In December of the same year, it was approved by the 9th BSSR CP Congress. D. F. Prishchepov and the apparatus of the republic People's Commissariat for Agriculture thus were the executors of party directives. All of the sins subsequently ascribed to them were nothing else than a search for a scapegoat in the conditions where Stalin and his closest entourage pursued a policy of the accelerated collectivization of peasant farms.

In accordance with the outlined plan, 129,692 peasant farms were moved to khutors and small settlements during the period 1924-1929 in Belorussia. That is was not a private campaign inspired by D. F. Prishchepov is indicated by the fact that 4.8 million rubles were allotted to and spent for the needs of the establishment of khutors and about 6 million rubles in credit were allocated.

The actions hostile to socialism ascribed to D. F. Prishchepov are completely distorted and fall apart upon the most elementary examination. For decades he was subjected to criticism for the idea expressed in 1925 that "the collective form of land use (artels, communes) is poorly cultivated among the peasantry of Belorussia. Today it is clear to everyone that the leap into the communes, by-passing the most simple forms of land use organization, not only did not turn out, but also sufficiently compromised itself. The communes not only did not become commodity producers, but could not feed themselves, for which they were subjected to severe criticism by V. I. Lenin.

The minimum and maximum forms of land use established in the republic with which D. F. Prishchepov is charged are also groundless. They were defined in 1925 by the new BSSR Land Code, which was approved by the BSSR Central Executive Committee, and were not an invention of the BSSR People's Commissariat of Agriculture and D. F. Prishchepov himself.

What determined such norms? We will find the correct answer after plunging into the remote time when, during the years 1926-1927, 800,000 peasants had at their disposal 133,100 wooden ploughs, 136,900 wooden harrows, 1,710,000 sickles and scythes. It was with regard to this "material-technical base" that the differentiation of land use norms took shape. For one farm, even the minimum norm of 6 hectares was large, for another, with agricultural implements and manpower, the maximum norm of 9-13 hectares for a family of four was not too much of a burden. The norms were not final. Depending on the soil quality and the relief, they could be changed, which was fully justified. Farms with maximum norms, which were able to attain good results, were soon included among the kulak farms, since some of them used hired labor. In so doing, it was forgotten that the hiring of manpower in conditions of the overpopulation of the village and the absence of necessary tools and seeds was legalized by Soviet power as a temporary and necessary measure. In Belorussia, in 1929, 180,000-190,000 people worked on a hired basis in agriculture and forestry.

Prishchepov and Lobanovskiy were accused of spreading kulak farms, were branded as counterrevolutionaries in the matter of the restoration of capitalism in Belorussia, as theorists of the coalescence of the Belorussian kulaks and capitalist elements with the bourgeois national-democratic element. In 1929, they, along with 28 other "right opportunists" were excluded from the party.

Among the right deviationists A. S. Slavinskiy was also included, a Bolshevik with prerevolutionary service, an active fighter for the establishment and consolidation of Soviet power in Belorussia, and a hero of the Civil War. Laughing at the absurdity of the accusations made against him, he said: "Yes, I am suffering from a right deviation. And this has been the case with me already since prerevolutionary times, when I was wounded during a workers' demonstration in the right leg. From that time I have been lame in it. And nevertheless, in spite of this right deviation of mine, I am always with the party, I strongly support its line."

What more could the old revolutionary counterpose to the demagogy, besides this bitter irony? Soon he will fall a victim to low slander and will tragically perish.

V. M. Ignatovskiy, the director of the Institute for Belorussian Culture, was also accused of right deviation, bourgeois national-democratism, and the discrediting of the collectivization of agriculture in the republic. A wrong understanding and interpretation was given to A. G. Chervyakov's slogan: "Become rich, peasant. Try to attain greater wealth, and the richer you will be, the richer will be our Soviet workers' and peasants' state." A large group of ordinary communists was accused of belonging to right-opportunist elements.

The struggle against the right deviation was accompanied by the acceleration of collectivization and an attack on the kulak on the basis of the slogan of the intensification of the class struggle in proportion to the consolidation of socialism. The sober voices that resounded at the 12th Belorussian CP(b) Congress about the necessity of the consolidation of the already existing kolkhozes and the subsequent transition to the creation of new ones drowned in demands to conduct an all-Belorussian purge of the state and economic apparatus, to destroy everything that is a hindrance in the work.

The 12th Belorussian CP(b) Congress, in conformity with the first five-year plan for the development of the national economy of Belorussia, advanced the task of collectivizing 18 percent of the sown area of the republic by the end of the five-year plan. Soon, however, entirely acceptable terms began to be revised. The rush forward began. During the spring sowing campaign of 1929, 357 kolkhozes were created in Belorussia. On 5 January 1930, the VKP(b) Central Committee adopted the decree "On the Tempo of Collectivization and State Assistance Measures for Kolkhoz Construction," in which local party and soviet organs were warned against any sort of "decreeing" of the kolkhoz movement from above, which can create the danger of replacing really socialist competition in the organization of kolkhozes by a game in collectivization." However, this identical demand was at the same time replaced by the instruction to conduct a resolute struggle against any attempts to hold back the creation of kolkhozes, which led the party and state organs into bewilderment and compelled them to act on their fear and risk.

On 3-8 January 1930, the Belorussian KP(b) Central Committee Plenum was held. Speaking before it, the secretary of the Belorussian KP(b) Central Committee, K. V. Gey, demanded the completion of 100 percent collectivization by 1931. However, soon even these deadlines were changed. In February 1930, the Belorussian KP(b) Central Committee Buro adopted the decision to collectivize, by the beginning of the spring sowing of the current year, 75-80 percent of the peasant farms. A memorandum was sent to the VKP(b) Central Committee, containing a request to include Belorussia among the regions of full collectivization of agriculture and proclaim it as a republic of 100 percent collectivization. The justification was the same: By February 1930, in 30 of the 100 rayons of the republic, 86 percent, and in 7—all 100 percent of the peasant farmsteads—were collectivized.

The hurry above called forth a race below. Organizational and political work was ignored. Hasty and mistaken instructions were given by the newspaper ZVEZDA, the organ of the Belorussian KP(b) Central Committee, indicating that "the dispossession of the kulaks is the basic means of collectivization." The itch for administration by orders and decrees, intimidation and force overwhelmed all and everything. They acted by the method "better to go to extremes, so as not to be accused of right deviation."

To accelerate collectivization, hundreds of plenipotentiaries were thrown into the villages, who, not knowing the village and the needs of the peasants, meted out still greater illegalities than the local extremists. Frequently such a zealous plenipotentiary in a telltale manner reached for his revolver and undertook to compile a list of those "wanting" to enter the kolkhoz. And then, supposedly on behalf of the peasant assembly, cheerful reports came flying into the People's Commissariat for Agriculture. From Klimovichskiy Rayon, for example, they reported that collectivization was completed, that not a single village remained uncollectivized, and that "all are in the kolkhoz, as they say, from border to border." There was not timely stop of the attempts of local leaders to again create communes, ignoring other forms of cooperation. In Gorodokskiy Rayon alone, there were 46 communes at the beginning of 1930. In January 1930, the Belorussian CP(b) Central Committee directed the People's Commissariat for Agriculture and the BSSR Kolkhoz Center to develop at once a Statute for Agricultural Artels, in which to envisage the transition from agricultural artels to communes. The mistaken directive, which was contrary to the Leninist tenets on cooperation, was abolished in April 1930. The spreading of the communes and the disregard for the agricultural artels led to the fact that everything was collectivized that was found in the peasant's farmstead. Neither cattle, nor seeds, nor tools remained.

The aspiration to 100-percent collectivization and the unhealthy competition for who will reach the finish line first was accompanied by crude deformations, violence,

and "extremeness." The vicious methods of collectivization were encouraged from above. The decree "On Measures for the Consolidation of the Socialist Reorganization of Agriculture in the Regions of One-Hundred Percent Collectivization and for the Struggle Against the Kulaks," which was adopted 1 February 1930 by the Central Executive Committee and the USSR Council of People's Commissars, stirred up the itch for administrative methods, the discovery and "unmasking" of counterrevolutionary elements. In 1930, 34,000 so-called kulak farms, or 4.2 percent of their total number, were subjected to expropriation and eviction. Already by May of this year, 15,629 farms in Belorussia were dekulakized, which came to 1.9 percent of the total number of peasant farmsteads.

Everything acquired by the peasant (cattle, simple everyday chattels, tools, dwelling and farm buildings) passed over into the ownership of kolkhozes. Before the summer of 1930, property valued at more than 400 million rubles was confiscated and handed over to the kolkhozes, which came to 23 percent of the value of the indivisible funds.

As K. V. Gey, who had put his hand to the loosening of the licentious lawlessness in the republic, acknowledged at the 13th Belorussian KP(b) Congress, 2,393 farms, or one-seventh, were dekulakized incorrectly. According to present-day figures, this figure is much greater.

All those who made an attempt to grumble were handed over to the court as counterrevolutionaries and the enemies of Soviet power. The violence produced its results. If in January 1930 20.9 percent of the peasant farmsteads entered into kolkhozes, by March of the same year—58 percent, or 457,500 peasant farms. But the republic reaped other bitter fruit. The peasants expressed dissatisfaction with Soviet power and the policy of the party, they protested against the violations of legality, and they went after rifles. . . . In 1930 alone, according to incomplete data, there were more than 500 peasant actions.

As a result of the sudden attack on the peasant, the peasant nature of the toiler of the village was destroyed. The peasant fell into a deep state of shock. Not wanting to enter into the kolkhozes, the peasants slaughtered the cattle, by which they inflicted irreparable damage to the agriculture of the republic.

In place of the conscientious, thoughtful, and enterprising master, the feeder and provider of the country, the peasant became transformed into the frightened and blind executor of someone else's bureaucratic will. V. I. Lenin saw the peasant as a civilized cooperator. Stalin, with the aid of "extremeness" and coercion, made him into an obedient and submissive screw in his administrative-command machine.

The depth and tragic element of the errors that have been permitted soon became so evident that extraordinary measures for their correction were required. A recoil of

the repressions began. However, it did not prove possible to correct the situation quickly. An outflow of peasants from the kolkhoz took place. If in March 1930 58 percent of the peasant farms in the republic were collectivized, by June of the same year this percentage diminished to 11.1 percent. However, in spite of the obviousness of the errors and the conscious crimes that were permitted, the 13th Belorussian KP(b) Congress, on the basis of the report of K. V. Gey, acknowledged the political and organizational-practical work of the the Belorussian KP(b) as correct and as entirely corresponding to the general line of the VKP(b). Such an uncritical approach to the blunders and mistakes that had been permitted laid the foundation for new ones. The congress headed for the restoration and acceleration of the creation of kolkhozes. It was planned, by January 1931, i. e., in half a year, to encompass in lower cooperation no less than 85 percent of the poor and average farms. The 16th VKP(b) Congress stated that the USSR is on the eve of the transformation from an agricultural to an industrial country. The impatience also tormented Belorussia. The Belorussian KP(b) Central Committee Bureau, on 11 September 1931, decided to complete 100 percent collectivization in the republic by spring 1932, in spite of the fact that the Belorussian VKP(b) Central Committee, in a decree of 2 August 1931 "On the Tempo of the Further Collectivization and Tasks of the Consolidation of Kolkhozes" slated the realization of this work for the years 1932-1933. On 28 September 1931, the newspaper PRAVDA reacted to the "shockworker movement" of Belorussia with the critical article "Not to Lag Behind and Not to Start Running."

In Belorussia the criticism was acknowledged, but effective measures to correct the situation were not taken. Moreover, new mistakes and extremes were permitted: As before, dwelling premises and cattle were collectivized by force, workday payments were effected in accordance with the residual principle, after fulfillment of the "first commandment"—state deliveries, after which, in a whole series of cases, nothing remained for payment. The practice of dekulakization continued. In 1932 a brigade of the Central Control Commission of the BSSR Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, which verified the state of 8,750 kolkhozes. As a result, 2,775 leading workers, labeled as kulak and anti-Soviet elements, were excluded from the collective farms.

In the spring of 1932, instead of 100-percent collectivization, the usual outflow of peasants from the kolkhozes began. In 2-3 months alone, 1,002 kolkhozes disintegrated, from which more than 55,000 peasant farms left. The reasons were the most ordinary ones. "I worked a lot and received little, they did not give me any flax at all, I am going without a shirt." The kolkhoznik Yukhnevich wrote: "I carted brick and logs for the MTS. The kolkhoz did not register labor days, and the MTS also did not give anything. We have mismanagement and sabotage. For 90 horses, there are only 20 harness sets and they were broken. In such conditions, I and the children have to perish from hunger." And here is a letter from

Timofey Poluyenka: "Things are bad in the kolkhoz. I worked for myself, I had potatoes, I had bread, and I worked 114 work-days, and I received almost nothing. I am a partisan, I fought for Soviet power, and now, if it is necessary, I will go, in spite of the fact that my wife and children are without bread. But I cannot be in the kolkhoz."

In 1933, according to the estimate of Stalin himself, no less than 25-30 million people were suffering from hunger in the country, including, it goes without saying, in Belorussia. This was the consequence of the anti-Leninist and profoundly erroneous policy of Stalin, who considered oppression, economic robbery, the physical destruction of other social forces, and the collection of the feudal tribute from the peasants as possible in the name of the class interests of the proletariat and socialism.

The repressions against the peasants intensified by the creation, in January 1933, of political departments attached to the MTS. During a year of their work, they "unmasked" and excluded from the kolkhoz 2,700 "kulak-saboteurs" and removed 1,544 workers from their jobs for "harmful activity."

The attempt to discover saboteurs and counterrevolutionary activities was realized also according to the party line. The purge of party organizations that was carried out in April 1933 was aimed at the unmasking of enemies who had penetrated the ranks of the party. By the end of the year it came to an end with the expulsion of more than 6,000 communists and 3,700 candidate members, which amounted to 15.6 and 25.7 percent of the total size of the party organization of Belorussia, without communist party members in the army.

The search, in the Belorussian CP, for spies and those having connections with them, White Guardists, Trotskyites and Zinovievites, rightists, those who had become demoralized, were in hiding, and had lost their class vigilance, continued even in the following years. The verification and the exchange of documents during 1935-1936 were aimed at this. The suspiciousness inspired by the organs of the NKVD and the connivance with them on the part of the party organs cost the Belorussian CP dearly. Almost half of the entire membership of the party organization was excluded from its ranks. From the concluding documents based on the reports of party committees on the eve of the 16th Belorussian KP(b) Congress it emanated that, of 2,506 primary party organizations, the work of 1,291 were considered to be unsatisfactory.

By the end of the second five-year plan, collectivization in Belorussia had been completed, the "kulaks" had been liquidated, and the "great change" had been accomplished. However, the further consolidation of the kolkhozes continued to be accompanied by deviations from socialist legality, highs and lows of repressions. Penalties became the norm, the exclusion of seasonal workers and their families from kolkhozes acquired a mass character,

the rights of the general meetings of kolkhoz farmers were violated, and the personal administration of the chairman prevailed, who crushed kolkhoz democracy. The frequent and unfounded replacement of the farm executives became an ordinary phenomenon. In 1936 alone, 1,500 kolkhoz chairmen were replaced in Belorussia. A wave of repressions against so-called national-democratic elements, scientists, and also writers of Belorussia, who had devoted their works to kolkhoz construction, engulfed the whole republic. Zmitrak Zhilunovich, Mikhasya Zaretskiy, Platon Golovach, Symon Boronovych, Alesya Zvonak, Mikhasya Charot, and others.

In Western Belorussia, too, after its reunification with Belorussia, collectivization was carried out with forcible means. In spite of the broad declaration of the Leninist principles of voluntariness and warnings against enthusiasm with purely administrative methods, already by 1940 430 collective farms were formed here. In June 1941, there were 1,115 kolkhozes, which combined 48,960 peasant farmsteads, in the Western oblasts of Belorussia.

The super-fast tempo of collectivization had severe consequences in these regions. From September 1940 to January 1941, the head of cattle decreased by 6.1 percent, hogs—by 26.1 percent, sheep—by 9.9, and horses—by 8.5 percent.

The extremes that had been permitted during collectivization in the Western oblasts were condemned only at the plenums of the Belorussian KP(b) held in March and May-June 1950. However, only the shortcomings lying on the surface were revealed. The acceleration of the tempo of the creation of kolkhozes and the compulsion instead of persistent organizational-political work were preserved.

As we see, the socialist transformations of the village and the collectivization of agriculture were not implemented easily and simply. As M. S. Gorbachev emphasized in his speech "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Continues" at the joint ceremonial session dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, it had historical consequences for the consolidation of the positions of socialism and "it signified the fundamental change of the whole way of life of the basic mass of the country's population on socialist foundations."

It must be said at the same time that the methods by which the collectivization of agriculture was carried out and the extremes in the realization of collectivization cannot be justified. The path of violence and brutality is not our path.

In present-day conditions, the party headed for the resurrection of the Leninist strategy and tactics of the construction of socialism and for the application of the

entire wealth of forms of cooperative activity in agricultural production. The return to the Leninist understanding of agricultural policy has called forth a fundamental restructuring of the economic interrelations in the village and requires the transformation of kolkhozes and sovkhozes into associations, kinds of associations of cooperative collectives.

The change that is being effected by the party and the renewal of the whole life of society on the basis of democratization and glasnost are opening up broad scope for the emancipation of the consciousness and the will of the man and toiler, the unchaining of its initiative, creativity, and enthusiasm. This is the only correct path.

Work of BSSR CP CC Commission on Stalinist Repressions Described

*18000514a Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 15 Dec 88 p 2*

[Interview with Nikolay Ivanovich Dementey, Belorussian CP Central Committee secretary and chairman of the Belorussian CP Central Committee Buro Commission on Additional Study of Materials Pertaining to Cases of Repression Which Occurred in the 1930's, 1940's and Early 1950's, conducted by A. Lukashuk and M. Mikhayevich: "We Are United by Memory and Truth"; interview first published in ZVYAZDA, 11 Dec 88]

[Text] A folder filled with newly-arrived mail lies on Nikolay Ivanovich Dementey's desk. With his permission we take a look at letters from people for whom the commission is the highest level of appeal on their long road in search of information concerning their relatives and friends.

"On the eve of the first elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet (in December 1937) my father, Vasily Ivanovich Katsuba, a horse trainer at the Borkovskiy Forestry Area of Rechistkiy Forest Kolkhoz in Gomel Oblast, was summoned to the kolkhoz, supposedly on official business, but never returned. My mother's attempts to find out anything at all about her husband's fate proved futile. I fought throughout the entire war and was wounded three times."

"It was in 1954 that I first learned of my father's fate when I was expelled from the CPSU on account of 'concealing my social origin and my father's sentence from the party.' He was accused of being a 'kulak,' an 'enemy of the people' and an 'agent of foreign intelligence.'"

"Following the 20th Party Congress my father was rehabilitated posthumously 'because no crime was committed.' But we have never been told where he was shot or where he is buried. I would also like to find out what specific person was to blame for his tragic fate. That

malicious slanderer, who has until now remained unexposed, should suffer at least a moral punishment. Signed: Vasily Vasilyevich Katsuba, invalid of the Great Patriotic War."

"In 1937 my father was the chairman of a village soviet in Oktyabrskiy Rayon. He was arrested and sent to Arkhangelsk Oblast, from where I received my last letter from him before the war. I have no other information concerning him. I am requesting further information concerning my father's fate. If he is alive, then where he is now, and if he is dead, then where he is buried. Signed: Mariya Zakharovna Pavlova, Saryye Dorogi."

"On 4 September 1937 our husband and father, Daniil Ivanovich Volkovich, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Soviet of People's Commissars, was summoned to Moscow and did not return. On 6 September my mother, A. M. Volkovich, was arrested, and I was expelled from the Pioneers and sent to a children's home in the city of Suzdal."

"In the city of Mosty there is a street named for D. I. Volkovich, and there is a similar street in Grodno. From time to time we go there to place flowers before the memorial plaque. Our hearts still feel the pain; we would very much like to pay our respects at the place where my father is buried. Signed: A. M. Volkovich and Ye. D. Volkovich."

[Dementey] It is sad to read letters like these, this true chronicle of the tragedies and horrors suffered by our people. There are pain and questions in every line, questions which it is often impossible to answer no matter how much we want to help a person alleviate the suffering in his or her soul. Many letters contains this request: tell me where a certain victim of repression is buried. To our great regret the commission is powerless in this respect in the majority of cases. This information is not found either in archival documents or in court records. The repression system was organized in such a way as to leave behind as little evidence as possible. Perhaps as we continue our work we will be able to raise this curtain of mystery a bit, but right now we are forced to reply, bitter as it may seem: we are sorry, but we have not been able to determine the burial place of your loved one.

[Correspondent] Nikolay Ivanovich, you just recently became head of this commission. The Belorussian CP Central Committee's report on its organization and its new membership was published a few weeks ago. Yet this commission functioned previously and probably worked on the same problems. What prompted changes in its membership?

[Dementey] The Belorussian CP Central Committee Buro analyzed the work of this commission, which was established in June of this year, and noted its fruitful efforts toward rehabilitation of innocent persons convicted during the years of Stalinist lawlessness. The

commission's experience indicates that it has to have contacts with government agencies, veterans' councils and the public and bring matters to the attention of the republic Supreme Soviet. Therefore the commission now includes, for example, V. G. Yevtukh, first deputy chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, V. A. Mikulich, deputy chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, A. Ye. Andreyev, chairman of the Belorussian republic Council of War and Labor Veterans, and other comrades. A new set of tasks has also been defined for the commission by the Belorussian CP Central Committee Buro. It will be our job to consider and submit proposals connected with preservation of the memory and burial places of victims of repression.

[Correspondent] What is your perception of public participation in this noble cause?

[Dementey] As most active. Our commission would be grateful for assistance in its search for the truth or submission of additional documents and materials which have perhaps been preserved by the victims' families and friends. Every authentic piece of evidence adds another brush stroke to our picture of our people's tragedy. We are all united by memory and truth. A tremendous amount of work lies ahead in our efforts to immortalize the memory of those who perished in the years of the personality cult. The ones who should take the initiative in this respect are public organizations, labor collectives and the Culture Fund. All proposals pertaining to the erection of a monument and designs for it will be submitted for broad public discussion and the monument itself will be built with funds from the republic budget. I must say frankly that our commission has had little experience in using this approach to problem-solving, therefore we will be happy to discuss all opinions concerning forms for our interaction with soviet and trade union organs and public organizations. I think a job can be found for anyone who wants to work—for Red Pathfinders, for veterans' councils, and for young people.

[Correspondent] The Belorussian CP Central Committee Buro has announced its intention to establish corresponding commissions in our republic's cities, oblasts and rayons as well...

[Dementey] These should, in my opinion, serve as coordinators of all work on additional study of materials about cases of repression at the local level, get the public involved in the search for information concerning those already distant events, a rather difficult task, and help the competent organs and agencies which will be assigned to investigate a given task.

[Correspondent] Which organs and agencies are those?

[Dementey] The investigation into a case is begun by procuracy and state security organs, which may turn in their work to archives, scientific institutes and experts—criminologists, medical personnel, psychologists... In

any event, this sort of work deserves more than a superficial approach. Though no one is guaranteed not to make mistakes, it is very exasperating if one case of injustice is compounded by a second one. Therefore each case should be investigated very, very painstakingly, without undue haste, but also without unnecessary delays. In the 1950's and 1960's this was the formula frequently used in the investigation of cases: close the case for lack of evidence. At that time the question considered was whether the available evidence supported the state's accusation, but this never came to the heart of the matter. For example, many persons had their convictions as members of the Industrial Party, the Trotskiy-Zinoviev bloc, etc. rescinded "for lack of evidence." That means that a doubt remained: maybe these people did do something, but there was simply no documentary evidence of it. Now we formulate the matter thus: if guilt is not proven the case is closed on the basis that no crime was committed.

[Correspondent] Will all criminal cases from the 1930's, 1940's and early 1950's be reviewed by the commission?

[Dementey] No. Just cases which are connected with legislation of that period and with so-called counterrevolutionary crimes.

[Correspondent] Our editorial office often receives requests for advice from readers asking what they must do in order to rehabilitate relatives who were unjustly convicted.

[Dementey] Previously cases were only considered upon submission of petitions by the person convicted or that person's friends or relatives. Now in accordance with the decisions of the 19th Party Conference all cases are subject to review regardless of whether citizens have submitted a petition. However, if such a request is received the case in question will be given top priority.

[Correspondent] Can you give me a specific example of that?

[Dementey] Certainly. R. A. Shklyar, a resident of Verkhnedvinsk, submitted a request to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium asking for information concerning the fate of his father, who was arrested in 1937 while serving as chairman of Slutskiy Rayispolkom. Here is what Comrade Shklyar writes: "I have contacted various authorities in regard to this matter, but everywhere I have been told that no documents have been preserved. But I do not need documents, I need the truth: was my father an enemy of the people? He joined the Red Army as a volunteer. He was a communist."

The search began. Khodarovich, a former member of the NKVD's Lyubanskiy Rayon Department, confirmed that as the Germans advanced in June 1941 he destroyed the case files on Shklyar and others on orders from his

superiors. Then the search for witnesses began. Comrades Ye. Bozhko, Ya. Dovguchits, P. Samokhvalov and O. Sapeko related how in 1938 they were present at a trial of rayon leaders. Also convicted were P. T. Kardash, rayon first secretary, P. I. Stripov, head of the rayon Land Department, and N. I. Glebovich, procurement agent. No staff member from the rayon, rayispolkom, rayon Land Department, etc. testified at the trial.

The defendants were charged with imposing excessive taxes on individual peasants with counterrevolutionary intent, in order to sow dissatisfaction among the peasantry; allegedly village soviet members acting on their orders carried out massive confiscation of peasants' property, and so on. All the defendants denied involvement in these crimes. Nevertheless Shklyar, for example, was sentenced to 20 years in a prison camp and his property was confiscated; the others were similarly harshly sentenced. True, one year later the USSR Supreme Court reviewed the case, rescinded the accusation of counterrevolutionary intent and reduced the sentences.

I would like to take this opportunity to clarify an inaccuracy in the commission's latest report. It states that the republic procuracy filed a protest with the Belorussian SSR Supreme Court with regard to these cases being closed and the defendants rehabilitated. In fact, since the case came under the jurisdiction of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Court, the republic procurator first appealed to the USSR procurator general, who then filed a protest with the national Supreme Court. I am telling you about the "mechanics" of our work for another reason as well, in order to demonstrate its complexity. In each case there is a specific means of resolution provided for under the law.

[Correspondent] All right, say that the decision to rehabilitate has been accepted by all the authorities. What happens then?

[Dementey] A resolution on the matter is sent to all interested parties: to the person who was unjustly convicted, if he is still alive, or to the friends or relatives to submitted the petition. This is perhaps the most important aspect of all. What could be more precious than a return from non-person status, restoration of truth and a person's good name?

It is sad to read letters from people on this subject. For example, Olga Mikhaylovna Zavadskaya's husband was arrested while serving in the army. We was posthumously rehabilitated in 1962. As a private he received three rubles salary each month and 19 rubles for food. Olga Mikhaylovna received 44 rubles, two months' pay. This woman writes: "If my husband had died at the front I would have received a pension for my daughter, if he had abandoned his family I would have received support payments. As it is I get 44 rubles for 25 years... I would like to know what kind of benefits I am entitled to." Many people also pose the question this way: if I had not

gone to prison I, like my peers, would have attained a high post, received awards and a good pension... Who is responsible for that? The years of lawlessness rolled like a terrible steamroller through the lives of millions of people and their loved ones. There is no amount of money that can compensate for the life of either a marshal or a private, for the wasted talents, for widows' tears... This is the system that still exists, perhaps not quite the perfect one. A rehabilitated individual receives preferential treatment with regard to housing (only that individual, I emphasize, not the members of his family). Furthermore, the victim or his relatives are paid two months' salary (calculated at today's rates). Very often sentences of that time included confiscation of property. If the case file includes an inventory, or a house, etc. still exists, then the things that can be returned are returned, and a sum of money is paid as compensation for the remainder.

I would like to emphasize one fact. The people we are talking about should not be overlooked by local authorities and the heads of enterprises. They may petition for improvement in their housing and living conditions, for a pension, for help in meeting their day-to-day needs. Much can be done in this regard by trade unions and the Komsomol, by public organizations, and by each one of us.

[Correspondent] Up until now we have talked about rehabilitation by the courts. But what if a person was a communist prior to his or her arrest...?

[Dementey] Then the case is sent to a party commission, which decides whether to restore the individual to party membership or not.

[Correspondent] What, is it possible to refuse reinstatement?

[Dementey] Yes. For example, investigation may prove that the person convicted was not a criminal, nor an "enemy of the people," nor an "agent of foreign intelligence." But perhaps there was simple abuse of an official position, or negligence. That is not punishable by the court. But the party should take action on this point in accordance with the CPSU Charter.

[Correspondent] Nikolay Ivanovich, have any executioners come under the commission's jurisdiction along with their victims? What is your attitude on publicly announcing their names and the names of informants? Our editorial office gets letters demanding that this be done...

[Dementey] An important question. Glasnost is a sharp-edged tool, and it must be used in such a way that it will not injure the innocent or do harm. The actual situation is this: as a rule denunciations are not used in criminal cases. They took place in the so-called current files, of which records were kept only for a certain length of time and have already been destroyed.

And another thing. In a court case the testimony of witnesses upon the basis of which a sentence was handed down is recorded. My mail includes demands that these witnesses' names be made public. For example, M. F. Tratsvskaya from Simferopol requests that her father, a peasant from the Gomel region who was executed by firing squad in 1937, be rehabilitated and the names of those who slandered him made public. Tratsvskiy was accused of hostility toward the authorities, and he had also expressed sympathy for Tukhachevskiy, who had been executed. But the evidence is very unspecific. One witness has now been found and questioned. He stated that he signed the protocol of his interrogation without reading it; his testimony was invalid.

M. F. Tratsvskaya's father has been rehabilitated. But it would scarcely be fair to speak of his fellow villagers' guilt in this specific case. We have no right to commit new injustices in the process of restoring justice.

Of course, we are not talking about a blanket amnesty, either. There was the following case. The Belorussian SSR Procuracy received a petition requesting that an individual sent to prison for 10 years in 1938 be rehabilitated. In the course of investigation it was revealed that he had worked as an NKVD investigator and beaten prisoners. He was himself a peasant and had been raised in a children's home. When asked why he beat people he replied: "They told me that they were enemies of the people and that it was necessary to beat a confession out of them." All of his superiors were shot, and he got 10 years. There is no reason to punish him again, but there are also no grounds for rehabilitating him. His petition was rejected.

[Correspondent] The commission's mail includes a letter from Yu. M. Suvorov, who makes this relevant comment: "On 3 November the newspapers reported that unfounded accusations against 411 persons had been rescinded, but only nine names were listed. Could the papers not find room to list all 411?" Would you comment on this remark?

[Dementey] Comrade Suvorov is definitely right. I think our direct contacts with the press should be put on a regular basis. The benefit would be mutual. This process is already occurring. Many articles have been published on public figures, scientists, writers and economic leaders; letters from people who experienced Stalinist lawlessness are being published. The Belorusskaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya Publishing House proposes to tell victims' stories in a series of publications; documentary filmmakers are also working in this direction.

There should be no blank spots in history; the victims should have their good names restored publicly. This is important not only for them and their loved ones, but also for all of us. It is important for the sake of society's moral health.

[Correspondent] Nikolay Ivanovich, excuse what is perhaps a too personal question: did anyone close to you suffer during that period?

[Dementey] Yes. Two of my father's brothers. Iosif Vasilyevich Dementey was fortunate. He only served one year in prison and was released under the 1938 All-Union CP (Bolshevik) resolution entitled "On Mistakes by Party Organizations in Expelling Communists From the Party, on a Formalistic and Bureaucratic Attitude Toward Appeals by Persons Expelled from the All-Union CP (Bolshevik) and on Measures To Eradicate These Shortcomings." The other, Nikolay Vasilyevich Dementey, graduated from a military academy and worked in Sverdlovsk Oblast. Then he was arrested and sent to a camp, where he remained from 1937 to 1947. Then he was in exile until 1954. Nevertheless he managed to return home, though as a sick, broken man.

[Correspondent] Recently the press and television have suggested that Stalin be put on trial. What are your feelings on that subject?

[Dementey] From a legal standpoint I consider a trial to be impossible, since the defendant is long since dead. But a trial by the public is another matter entirely. Incidentally, it is already underway. In the press, in movies, on television, at meetings... In these letters and in the work of our commission we can see condemnation of Stalinism as a phenomenon which was tragic, sick and incompatible with the ideals of socialism. That is important and understandable, but I nonetheless feel that the most important thing is what lessons we learn from this, what conclusions we draw. We need to consolidate all healthy forces to work for restructuring and create a stated ruled by law in which it will be impossible for past mistakes to be repeated. Each new generation should stand, in a manner of speaking, on the shoulders of the previous generation, not on its bones.

Restructuring headed up by the party is providing a guarantee of that.

Conference to Examine History of Moldavian Collectivization

18000549 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA
in Russian 3 Feb 89 p 3

[Article by A. Tkhorov: "Collectivization: Against 'Blank Spots'"]

[Text] Was there an alternative to Stalin's plan for collectivization? Was the proclaimed principle of peasants' voluntary entry to the kolkhozes actually observed in practice? What harm did the administrative-command system do to cooperation in agriculture? These and other crucial issues were at the center of the attention of participants in the regional scientific conference held in Kishinev entitled "Problems of Collectivization of Agriculture in the Western Regions of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Moldavia, and the Baltic Republics." It was

organized by the Institute of Party History under the Moldavian CP CC and the theoretical and political journal of the Moldavian CP CC, *KOMMUNIST MOLDAVIA*.

The conference was opened by the director of the Institute of Party History under the Moldavian CP Central Committee, Candidate of Historical Sciences V. D. Isak.

Those who spoke at it—leading scholars from Moscow, Vilnius, Kishinev, and Tallinn who study these problems—emphasized that collectivization of agriculture is an indispensable part of the history of the Soviet State, and particularly the regions being studied. In spite of the fact that it took place almost 2 decades later than it did in the central regions of the country, during the course of it we repeated many of the mistakes and excesses that occurred at the end of the 1920s and beginning of the 1930's. Here also it was accompanied by a drive for percentages of "complete collectivization," mass elimination of the kulak system, and resettlement. For a long time nothing was said about the problems involved in the creation of kolkhozes in these republics and frequently they were covered up by plain falsification and showy slogans and reports taken from books and periodicals of those years. It was stated at the conference that it is the duty of historical science to eliminate the "blank spots" in this difficult and ambiguous period in the life of the republics of the Soviet Baltic area, the western oblast of the Ukraine and Belorussia, and the right coastline of Moldavia, and to tell the truth about them, bitter as it may be.

Various viewpoints on such a phenomenon in the life of our country as collectivization was came into conflict during the course of the discussion. Doctor of Historical sciences V. P. Danilov, sector chief of the Institute of USSR History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, for example, thinks that Lenin's ideas of cooperation in agriculture were largely discredited by the administrative-command system that developed at the boundary between the twenties and thirties. Actually it was not collectivization itself that was to blame for the terrible famine of 1933, as certain people now assert, but the extremely rigid system of grain procurement, which was akin to the system for requisitioning grain by force during the time of "War Communism." Was there any alternative to Stalin's concept of collectivization? Yes, answers the scholar, and it found concrete expression in the ideas of Chayanov and Bukharin, but because of certain circumstances it was rejected. What happened in our country during those years was not only not inevitable, but was contraindicated from the standpoint of socialism.

A professor of the department of USSR history of the Kishinev State Pedagogical Institute imeni I. Kryange, Doctor of Historical Sciences B. K. Vizer, drew the attention of the participants in the conference to the falsification of certain aspects of the history of collectivization in Moldavia. Certain historians try to assert that

in 1947 the peasants on the right shore entered the kolkhozes because at that time a material and technical base had been created for such a step. They also think that the main factor driving them to the kolkhozes at that time was the famine that had taken many thousands of lives.

A docent in the department of CPSU history of the Tallinn Polytechnical Institute, Candidate of Historical Sciences A. I. Ruusmann, asserts that the principle of voluntariness was absolutely not observed when recruiting Estonian peasants for the kolkhozes. During those years nobody wanted to take into account the century-old way of life of the peasantry in the republic—khutor farming. Now, during the period of restructuring, this form is returning to our lives and in the future will probably become widespread along with the kolkhoz system.

A docent in the department of CPSU history of the Vilnius Higher Party School, Candidate of Historical Sciences G. S. Butkus said that the main reason for the complication of the situation during the process of collectivization in Lithuania was the political banditry. During the period of 1944-1951 nationalists and Hitler's former henchmen killed 25,000 people, mainly Soviet workers, rural activists, and peasants. This, of course, could not but aggravate the class struggle in the rural areas. His colleague and compatriot, the deputy director of the Institute of Party History under the LiSSR CP CC, Doctor of Historical Sciences K. Z. Surblis does not entirely agree with this assertion. In and of itself the political banditry, he noted, would have been eliminated by the Soviet Army as early as 1946 if the barbarian methods of collectivization had not pushed some of the peasants onto the path of cooperation with the nationalist and profascist rabble.

Collectivization in Moldavia was accompanied by mass resettlement of peasants to Siberia, said the deputy director of the Institute of Party History under the MSSR CP CC, Candidate of Historical Sciences N. F. Movilyanu. Now one can state with confidence that the figures concerning deportation from the republic of 5,000 families does not correspond to reality. According to the established lists, 13,077 families were affected by the elimination of the kulak system and resettlement, and 10,651 were actually shipped out. The reason for this divergence is the following. Literally during the night between 5 and 6 July 1949 1,292 families were removed from the registers...deceased Red Army members, disabled veterans, partisans, and military servicemen, and in 1,134 cases those who came to eliminate the kulak system simply found nobody at home—in all probability the people were warned about the "operations" that were being prepared and managed to go into hiding. But even these figures cannot be considered totally reliable since up to this point we do not have these figures for Ungenskiy Rayon and Beltsy.

Also speaking at the conference were the editor-in-chief of the journal *KOMMUNIST MOLDAVII*; Candidate of Historical Sciences B. M. Stratulat, director of the Institute of History of the MSSR Academy of Sciences; a corresponding member of the MSSR Academy of Sciences, V. I. Tsaranov; a senior scientific associate of the Institute of Party History under the Estonian CP CC; Candidate of Historical Sciences A. E. Kubya; the head of the department of MSSR History of the Kishinev State University imeni V. I. Lenin, Candidate of Historical Sciences P. A. Boyko; the deputy director of the Institute of Party History under the Moldavian CP CC, Doctor of Historical Sciences A. G. Morar; and a senior scientific associate of the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences S. A. Nikolskiy.

Stalinist Repressions in Ashkhabad Come to Light in Book

18300188 Moscow *SOVETSKAYA KULTURA*
in Russian 21 Nov 88 p 4

[Interview with writer A. Churiyev by Ye. Prikhodko, TASS correspondent, special for *SOVETSKAYA KULTURA*, from Ashkhabad: "From the Captivity of Time, the Dust of Archives"]

[Text] The subjects of this book share the same date when their lives collapsed, the year 1937. In that tragic period in the life of the country, those proven Bolsheviks, trail blazers of the new life, founders of the Turkmenian Republic shared the fate of many who were declared enemies of the people. In his essays, writer A. Churiyev recreated a number of brilliantly dramatic lives. They are collected in his book "The Memory of the Heart" published by the republic's publishing house. The second part of the book is being currently prepared for publication.

[Churiyev] However tragic or painful, we must rethink the lesson of history. Purity, honesty, deep conviction and faith are our timeless ideals. Turning to Leninist Bolsheviks helps us make those ideals shine anew, as the poet said.

One by one, I have collected the details of the lives of A. Mukhamedov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the republic's party, N. Aytakov, Chairman of the republic's TsIK [Central Executive Committee], and other innocently murdered people.

[Prikhodko] As a writer of documentary essays, what is your opinion of glasnost's achievements in this area?

[Churiyev] I have enough experience to make a comparison. In 1980, when I began my work, many topics were banned and many turns in the lives of my characters had to be mentioned with care and disguised; I had to stop myself in half-sentence. Today, the whole truth can be said. This inspires me. However, even today, despite a number of relevant resolutions, the doors of many archives open with great difficulty. The procedure for getting permission to work with archival materials is complicated by many months of bureaucratic delays. Some documents are easier to get at the CPSU Central Committee's Marxism-Leninism Institute in Moscow than at its Ashkhabad section.

[Prikhodko] What has been the response to your essays?

[Churiyev] Many people have written to me; their letters are full of pain and meditations. There are also some who dislike the fact that the truth is being told about the crimes. Here is one example. When I was working on an essay on Kh. Sakhatmuradov, an important party figure whose monument was recently unveiled in Ashkhabad, party veterans told me that when he was arrested meetings were held on orders from above at which the Bolshevik was denounced. Villainous, base people who wanted to make a career attacked other innocent people as well at those meetings. In my essay, which appeared in the weekly *EDEBIYAT YEYE SUNGAT* (LITERATURE AND ART), I listed the names of those people, supported by strong evidence. After that, I was subjected to an angry, threat-filled campaign by those who would have liked to conceal the truth. I decided that the best response to my detractors would be to set up a meeting with witnesses of those lawless events. Such meeting took place at the editorial offices.

I support noted writer Boris Oleynik who declared at the 19th All-Union Party Conference that the people must know not only the names of heroes but those as well of various stool pigeons at any level of society. By publicizing the names of those who told on people in the past we will strike a preventive blow at those who are just thinking of embarking on this dirty activity. I agree with this idea. It is also very important that a new book series has been started in our republic, called "Lives Covered with Glory" and dedicated to those whose good name has been restored by perestroika.

Playwright Shatrov Airs Views on Revolution, Stalin

18000293 Moscow OGO NEK in Russian No 45, 5-12 Nov 88 pp 14-16

[Interview with Mikhail Shatrov by Mariya Dement'yeva, time and place not specified: "The Invincibility of Truth"]

[Text] [Dement'yeva] Why do you keep on returning to interpretation of the revolution?

[Shatrov] In order to understand who we are, where we are, and whether our destination is the right one. I am convinced that the answers to these questions of today, and to many others as well, can be found in our history.

I first began to feel this way in 1956, after the 20th Party Congress. At that time I was 24 years old, and I and my contemporaries, as well as people of other generations, were tortured by the question of how what happened could have happened. Unfortunately, there was no definitive answer. I realize now that there could not be one at that time. The level of development of social thought was horrifyingly low. While lip service was paid to Lenin's methods of merciless analysis of social ills, these methods were not applied. The shock and numbness afflicting our historians and political scientists gave rise to but a single thought: "What if it all [i.e., the more liberal climate] suddenly turns out to be an illusion? What if tomorrow all this comes to an end?" I repeat: there were no definitive answers. At the same time a train of thought was set in motion—and one of its most historically important components was N.S. Khrushchev's speech at the 20th Congress. The torturous path which eventually led to the 27th Congress began, and it was Khrushchev himself who took the first and most difficult step—we must never forget this fact!

My works, the plays of my "political theater," represent nothing more than the contribution it is within my power to make to this train of thought. Over the course of 30 years I have written comparatively little: there are only seven plays in my "Drama of the Revolution" cycle: "June Sixth," "Bolsheviks," "Blue Horses on Red Grass," "This is How We'll Win," "The Peace of Brest," "Dictates of the Conscience," and "Onward, Onward, Onward." I have also written a series of four television plays, "Sketches for a Portrait," starring M. Ulyanov.

But how can all the answers have been found? Don't new questions continue to arise? Have we not gained new opportunities to increase the depth of our discussion?

For the past year and a half, I have spoken before mass audiences of workers, students, scientists, societies of "book lovers," schoolchildren, and teachers two or three times a week. This is a hard, exhausting two or three hours of work, during which I have to answer the most varied and difficult questions from the audience. I have kept thousands of the slips of paper on which these

questions were written, they are true barometers of the public mood, accurately capturing deviations, biases, nuances and still finer nuances of social awareness.

Let us consider several typical question, which were addressed to me during my last meeting on 2 October 1988 in Leningrad in the Oktyabrskiy lecture hall.

"What is your opinion of the speech made by comrade Ligachev at the 19th party conference?"

"Why, in your opinion, is perestroika being impeded so terribly, what particular strata of our society is putting up the main opposition to perestroika?"

"Is 'Stalinism' the rule or a random exception?"

"Respected comrade Shatrov! Warriors of 'Pamyat,' clad in black shirts, are sitting in this hall—doesn't this frighten you? How did we reach the point of storm troopers here in Leningrad?"

"I would like to know your feelings on the works of Avtorkhanov."

"Why focus attention on the problems of 1937 and other years in the past, when we are vastly more concerned with what is happening today? I am referring to the fact that not everything in our country is as smooth as the press portrays."

"Doesn't the words of the great A. Kuprin: 'In Russia every Jew is a born Russian literary man,' apply to you, Marshak-Shatrov?"

"We are beginning to study the history of the USSR and our primary source is your plays. In 3 years we will have to take examinations for the institute. Will you be able to bring your history of the USSR up to date before that happens?"

"You are right to say that we must study the phenomenon of Stalinism: whence, how and whither. Only instead of 'Stalinism' you should have said 'Leninism.'"

Stop. I want to talk about this in more detail. Lately, notes like the last one have stopped being isolated instances. More and more often, one encounters people who are sure that Stalin's phrase "I am nothing but a faithful student of Lenin," accurately reflects the truth of the matter. While we are arguing over whether we began to deviate from Lenin's program in 1924 or in 1929, certain people have gotten it firmly into their heads that another date is the key one and that Russia's catastrophe began on 25 October 1917.

Yes, such an attitude does exist. No matter how unpleasant it is to us, we must listen to what is being said, we must acknowledge what exists.

I am not prepared to argue here, nor to concern myself with refuting such ideas and attitudes—I have done so and will continue to do so in my plays and films. I want to direct the attention of all who think as I do, those who carry the ashes of the October Revolution, slandered, betrayed, and demolished by Stalin, in their hearts—I want to direct their attention to the serious and terrible danger consuming the souls of the people. I want all of us to stop and think deeply and seriously about the genesis of such attitudes, even before we begin to search out the facts and arguments for a reply.

Without laying any claims to be complete and all-encompassing, I want to say something about what seems to me to be the main issue.

Well, first of all, dissatisfaction with the results—for me dissatisfaction with the results of the deviation from Lenin's concept of socialism. This dissatisfaction sometimes gives rise to nostalgia for the past, which, of course, is presented in a distorted, idealized form.

Deification, idolization of Lenin.

The creation of a Christmas fairy tale, full of lies and prettification, about the revolution, idolization of the revolution.

And, thus, with our own hands we have created the most propitious possible environment for the ideological opponents of the October revolution.

Lenin's idea that there is no better way to kill a political figure than to turn him into an idol is well known. In this regard Stalin's number one victim was V.I. Lenin.

While the leader was being deified his ideological legacy was being emasculated. The method of emasculation was simple and squalid: a quote was taken out of its temporal and spatial context and raised to the ranks of truth. All the crimes of the 1930s, including the engineered famine and the official civil war against his own party and people unleashed by Stalin, and much more—all this was portrayed as proceeding under the banner of Lenin. Love, respect for Lenin was exploited constantly. This practice continued right out in the open in our country until very recently. The road the nation was following was taking it closer to the abyss, but this road was portrayed as following "Lenin's course," as L.I. Brezhnev's collected works are called.

Art too made a contribution to the idolization of Lenin. An image of Lenin came into currency that was sanctioned by Stalin and engineered by him, and that in many works, with rare exceptions, bore a closer resemblance to Stalin than to Lenin. And art participated in the use of Lenin's name to sanction and sanctify the perfidious acts which were going on everywhere. Examples? One does not have to go too far to find them. In Bukharin's trial, Vyshinskiy accused him of complicity

in the social revolutionaries' attempts to assassinate Lenin, and immediately there were film illustrations and discussions on the theme: "If you are felling a forest, chips are going to fly."

It is 1918 on the screen; Dzerzhinskiy is questioning the British intelligence officer Loccarte and asks him the traditional question: "And now tell us about your ties with Trotsky.." Thus, according to the film writers' logic, in 1918 Dzerzhinskiy already knew of Trotsky's ties to British intelligence. But the fact that he died in 1926, without telling the party anything about this, by all indications, did not disturb these writers at all.

But let us leave art for a while. The method of "citationism", which Stalin mastered so well, again returns to us in the works of certain literary men. In searching for sources, they find, let us say, a statement Lenin's made about the peasantry in the beginning of the century, and immediately, draw a straight line from that statement to Stalin's collectivization, purposely omitting everything that Lenin said afterward, and denying him the right to experimentation, and development. They find a telegram concerning ruthless suppression of the kulak uprising during the civil war and attempt to make this the theoretical basis for the terror unleashed in the 1930s. How can they do this? It is easy to understand when you remember what school we came out of...

As reactions to idolization and deification, the numerous questions which are asked, on the order of "Did Lenin ever make mistakes?," show how little and infrequently Lenin is read, since his writings show the extremely complex work of the soul and mind. They show how often people prefer interpreters, whose works, as a rule, contain the conclusion, but almost completely omit the path by which this conclusion was reached, full of searching and doubts, self-criticism and self-contradictions, and indeed everything that is characteristic of vital mental processes. All this can be found in the original Lenin.

It is understandable that people reject this slandered and distorted Lenin.

With rare exceptions, for example M. Sholokhov's "And Quiet Flows the Don," the fate of the October Revolution and the of the civil war were very similar in both the scientific and the artistic literature. Stalin's group, having usurped power in 1929, needed ideological cover. They cultivated a whole pleiad of ideological lackeys who barked at nothing: white was turned into black, and vice versa, heroes into enemies, truth into lies, etc. The culmination of this was the "Short Course," which halted the development of social consciousness for almost half a century. As a result, the history of the revolution and civil war became a saccharin idyll, a Christmas tale, in which the Reds always win. To this day, there are great many serious issues that have never been dealt with in the public mind and that thus remain unresolved! We will give only a few examples. The October Revolution—was it a conspiracy by the

Bolsheviks or a broad-based movement of the people spearheaded by the Bolsheviks? Yet thousands of dissertations have been defended by our historians, on topics such as "Preparation for and Conduct of the October Revolution," "Lenin—Leader and Organizer of the October Revolution," etc., that play right into the hands of those who claim the revolution was a Bolshevik conspiracy. Would it not be pertinent here to discuss the nature of the elemental people's movement of 1917, born of a very deep nationwide political crisis? What were the prerequisites for the October Revolution—were they economic alone, or were they primarily political? Why did the revolution not stop in February—due to the Bolsheviks or because the watchwords and demands of the February revolution were not satisfied? What were the alternative on October 25—the Bolsheviks or the Provisional Government? The bloody, Black Hundred, Fascist (to use the terms of today) coup of the generals ("second Kornilovism") or socialist revolution? Were there extremist tendencies within the Russian revolutionary movement? What were their attitudes to the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries—were they treated solely as enemies? How then should we react to Lenin's idea that an agreement, or treaty, between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries before the revolution would have saved the country from a civil war? We talk a great deal about the "Red terror" and are silent about the "White terror." We are silent about the price of the Revolution and Civil War. The issue of "October and World Revolution" has not been researched, and yet the reliance of the Bolsheviks on worldwide revolution, their prediction that it would occur was not born out. October and Thermidor—how can it be said that this problem did not exist? The intelligentsia and the revolution—doesn't this become a problem if we take off our rose-colored glasses?

No, the revolution was not a Christmas tale, it was frequently a bloody drama in which each act gave rise to a counterrevolutionary response and vice versa. And how can it be said that there were no mistakes, no irrational steps, or simply acts of stupidity? Cosmetics applied to the face of the revolution are an offense against that revolution, and, by their dishonesty, drive people away from it.

Having spent millions of man-hours teaching the Revolution in schools, high schools, and within the system of political education, we ourselves are driving interested, thinking people to search for other sources, through our silence, our simplistic portrayal of political conflict, and, to put it bluntly, through our lies.

Other sources.. The masterful interweaving of correct information that we ourselves conceal, half truths and sheer untruths.. But, why should we complain of this—after all the fact that our opponents are hostile to Lenin and the revolution—is simply a law of combat..

But what we ourselves have done cannot be accepted so calmly. The sole solution is to give the people an untouched picture of Lenin and the living portrait of the

revolution in both the scholarly and the artistic literature. The potential of these images has not been exhausted by any means. The truth of the ideas, aspirations, and moral standards they embody is the only thing that can defend the ideals that are dear to us.

Here I cannot refrain from speaking of the Russian writer A. I. Solzhenitsyn. Few of our writers have done as much as he to reject Stalinism. "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich," "Cancer Ward," "First Circle," and "Matrena's Yard" and some of his other stories—all these awakened conscience, awareness and thoughts of the public. But the paradox, from my point of view, lies in the fact that the staunch anti-Stalinism of some feeds on dedication to the ideals of the October Revolution, while the anti-Stalinism of others is fed by strong hostility to the revolution. Familiarity with a number of other works of Solzhenitsyn (certain didactic pages of "Gulag Archipelago," the story "Lenin in Zurich" which attempts to demolish Lenin, "Red Wheel," and his published speeches) have caused to draw a definite conclusion for myself: Aleksandr Izayevich Solzhenitsyn does not accept the October Revolution and Bolshevism as the [appropriate] embodiment of revolutionary thought, but is their staunch and open opponent. Giving him due credit for his contribution to saving our country from the nightmare of Stalinism, I nevertheless consider myself to be just as openly and staunchly opposed to him on this issue.

A. I. Solzhenitsyn is a complex social phenomenon, for many his name is surrounded by the halo of the anti-Stalinist tendencies of his early books, and in the emigre milieu there is far from unanimity in assessment of him. But, to me at any rate, one thing is clear: his pen must be opposed by the pen; any other weapons are unacceptable, and will lead to the opposite result, in the final analysis, to that note [saying that, we should renounce] "Leninism" instead of Stalinism."

What should be done? What shall we use as refutation? The truth. Do you find this too general an answer? In what way? Does it not seem to you that today the anti-Stalinist theme is beginning to go in circles without penetrating to the depths, and thus is beginning to lose its force? Is the publication of letters "pro" and "con" really fruitful? How many minds will we be able to change among those who do not wish to hear and see? And is the older generation really the object of our concern? I am convinced that there are some who would like to follow the example of the former procurator Shekhovtsov who brought suit against Adamovich and SOVETSKAYA KULTURA. Will we achieve any success by this route, when we receive yet another refusal to institute proceedings.. How can we go deeper and further?

But what if.....

There can be no suit against Stalin. But there is the remarkable opportunity, for which an international precedent exists, of reviving the form of the social-political hearing in our country.

On March 5, 1989, let us open, in Moscow in the Hall of Columns of the House of Unions, social political hearings on the issue of "Stalinism: Whence, How, and What Consequences?" (the title, naturally, can be improved upon significantly).

Let us find in our country 15 people with irreproachable reputations, people of conscience and thought, and invite them to the stage of the Hall of Columns and, for two or three weeks, let them hear the leading scholars from our country and abroad present their arguments and conclusions in front of us Muskovites (and through TV and the press, in front of the entire country). Let the problem of the "direct line" (between Lenin, the October Revolution, and Stalin there can only be one direct line; each was the consequence of its predecessor) be investigated thoroughly and publicly. Let those who went into battle with Stalin's name [on their lips], those who believe that in Stalin's time prices dropped and the standard of living kept improving, and certain people whose letters have been published in OGONEK, Karakozov, the afore mentioned Shekhovtsov, and others speak as witnesses for the defense.. Let us publicly hear their testimony. Let us listen to the scholars, workers, members of the intelligentsia, and peasants. This will be a school of revolution and counterrevolution. We must not pronounce verdict or sentence—the hearings themselves will illumine the problem. Remember, the quotation, from Goethe I think, "They say that the truth lies between two opposing opinions. Not so, there lies the problem." And this is indeed true. The public examination of the problem in front of the entire nation will help us understand a great deal and to renounce a thing or two. I have formulated this proposal in general terms. But I suggest that OGONEK, ZNAMYA, NOVYY MIR, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, DRUZHBA NARODOV, and all others who wish to discuss this proposal form an organizational committee and begin serious preparations. I propose that OGONEK head this undertaking.

I am convinced that the fact that such hearings are being conducted, especially in a maximally democratic way (with no one deprived of the right to have his say) would have the greatest significance for purifying our society, for repentance.

Repentance may be a word or it may be a deed. The latter is immeasurably more valuable. The first person in our party to perform repentance as a deed was Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev. At some point I am going to write about this man. The years will pass, many extremes and incongruities will become things of the past, but people, I am convinced, will always remember the man who performed the feat of civil and human heroism at the tribunal of the 20th Congress. He challenged Stalinism, he was the first. He renounced terror. And the first attempt, even if inconsistent, to return to Lenin and Leninism will always be associated with his name.

Today we are witnessing the powerful, consistent turning of the party to socialism, in Lenin's understanding of the term. As witnesses of what is occurring, there is much

that we cannot evaluate properly, everything seems to us too little, too slow, and yet the abyss separating us from yesterday is growing constantly; perhaps, not that rapidly, but, at any rate, consistently. And if you like, this is also a matter of repentance.

The idea that it is possible not to bear responsibility for everything that occurred in the country, that it is possible to hide from such responsibility is ridiculous. When they tell us that during the years of stagnation a certain person was [honorably] building socialism, while at the same time the country was rushing headlong into crisis, with rampant abuse of power, corruption, and bribetaking, and with moral decay at the very top, while a terrible danger threatened the party, then all there is left for me to do is shrug in bewilderment and ask: what kind of socialism was he building? Socialism in a single sector? And while he was building socialism in this sector, how could he keep from feeling responsibility for what happened in Moscow, Tashkent, and Baku?

Again they are playing with words, manipulating ideas. No one can absolve himself of responsibility. Of course, the extent of responsibility is different for different people, but the desire to be done with the past can impoverish all of us. And fighting energetically, and consistently for perestroika is the only way that true repentance, repentance in deeds, can be measured.

Thus, we need social and political lectures, which, through understanding, will lead us to renounce stereotypes and be purified...

[Dementyeva] But I have heard that you also have personal motives..

[Shatrov] Yes there is a personal interest. I come from a family that participated in the revolution. This is my good fortune and, for almost half a century, it was also my tragedy. The spirit of the revolution was always alive in our household, although from 1937 the household itself became an orphanage—many of its members perished. And while the first member of my family was rehabilitated in 1956, then the last, Aleksey Ivanovich Rykov, was only rehabilitated several months ago. Today there are many who are not able to imagine what it was like to be a relative of one of the leaders of the opposition during those years. Nevertheless, my mother, while she still had her freedom, nurtured in my brother and me a feeling of the greatest respect for the insulted and injured. Before every party congress, starting with the XXIst, my cousin, the daughter of Aleksey Ivanovich Rykov, wrote an appeal to the presidium of the congress concerning her father's innocence. And invariably she was refused in the crudest possible way. We had an agreement (she was almost 20 years older than I), that if she did not live long enough, I would take over that the baton and I would pass on that sacred obligation to my daughter. To tell the truth, I did not believe that I would live to see the day...

Several days ago, I heard the truth about the death of my father. We had always believed that he died in prison in 1944. And here before me is the Arkhangel'sk newspaper PRAVDA SEVERA with an article titled "Black Tornado." My father was arrested on 2 March 1937 and a month later was shot. The certificate sent from the procurator's office and affirmed by a state seal gives the date of death as 1944, in black and white. Why? Now it is clear, they "spread out" the dates of the deaths of those who were repressed among other years, so that there weren't too many in 1937.

The terrible thing for me about what I have just found out is that during that period, my mother, along with my brother and me, lived in Arkhangel'sk (my father had been building a plant there) and up until May of 1937, they kept calling her in for questioning, and in order to get her to talk they kept promising to take a package from her to my father. . But my father had been dead for a long time. He was 37, he was a Bolshevik, he took part in the revolution, in the civil war, in Arkhangel'sk he was in charge of the construction of a cellulose combine, and he gave everything he had to his work. I bow my head before my father's generation, before what they accomplished.

From this same article, I found out that my father was tortured, they broke him and he signed a confession. Can I condemn him? Never. For I don't know how I myself would behave under the same circumstances—different people have different capabilities. Thus, I could not condemn him or anyone else for something like that...

Let me read from Stalin's telegram about the permissibility of torture, made public by N.S. Khrushchev in 1956 in his report to the 20th Congress (in 1956 I was asked to read this report aloud more than once at meetings and at that time I copied this document which so upset me into my journal).

"The Central Committee of The All-Union Communist Party of the Bolsheviks(CCACP/B/) announces that since 1937 methods of physical coercion have been authorized by the CCACP(B) for use by the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs... It is well known that all bourgeois intelligence services use such methods of physical coercion against agents of the socialist proletariat and use the most disgusting forms of these methods, besides. Why should the socialist organs of state security be more humane in their treatment of the rabid agents of the bourgeoisie and the sworn enemies of the working class and collective farmers.

The CCACP(BP) considers that methods of physical coercion can, in exceptional cases, be used against known inveterate enemies of the people and in such cases should be considered an acceptable and appropriate method.

20 January 1939."

This quotation requires no comment from me.

No, I will not throw the first stone at those who were unable to withstand repeated terrible torture. But I cannot accept what they allowed to happen to them, to happen to the country and the party, and what is more that they got down on their knees before one individual lost the understanding of the party as the expression of the deepest interests and highest ideals of the people. And this also needs to be understood. How did and when did it happen that 200 million masters were compelled to stand (at attention) at the mere mention of the name of one who should have been the people's servant?

[Dementyeva] What do you think: was Stalin inevitable? Can the cult of personality be subsumed under one of the objective laws underlying the development of socialism?

[Shatrov] Stalin occupies an enormous place in the history of the twentieth century. Along with Hitler, he put his grim imprint on this century. Hitler does not surprise me. Stalin, however, a man who was in the ranks of the Communist movement and who calls into question the whole existence of this movement, is the greater criminal. The Communist movement, of course, will continue to exist. But we have still not extricated ourselves from the crisis which we endure as a result of this man's crimes.

Were we condemned to Stalinism? [i.e., was it inevitable]. I am absolutely convinced that everything which happens in history is the result of the capricious interplay of objective tendencies and subjective factors. Today we often write about the fact that there is a lawfulness and necessity about historical process that does not depend on the will or desire of historical figures, and, thus, it would follow that we were condemned to Stalinism. I think that we generally misuse the Marxist concept of the lawfulness of the historical process. Marxism applies it to wide-ranging, enormous historical phenomena. When we attempt to apply this lawfulness to some brief period of 10-20 years, the result is ridiculous. It is one thing to talk about the lawfulness of the replacement of feudalism with capitalism and another about the lawfulness of a single dictator. This is a primitive, simplistic approach. The goal of such an approach is to eliminate the culpability of Stalin and others implicated in his crimes before history. There is a wonderful quotation by the English political figure, Pitt, "Necessity is the excuse of tyrants and the religion of slaves."

Another extreme is to explain everything with reference solely to the character traits, the demonism of a single individual. But objective factors really do exist. However, Lenin considered them and understood them no worse than we do. He saw both the backwardness of Russia and the fragility of the democratic traditions in her history. And the road to socialism (the work of 1922 and '23) was for him the road of democratic development. Stalin, however, did the opposite: strengthening the antidemocratic war-communism structure. And this choice, which in no way was compelled by objective

negative factors (it could and should have been opposed!), this choice is the total responsibility of Stalin and other members of the central committee. And the fact that in 1929 Stalin succeeded in destroying his ideological opponents, does not absolve them from responsibility. Defeat does not save you from responsibility—the stakes were too high, the consequences were too tragic. The idea that only Stalin is guilty is wrong. We say “Stalin” to avoid naming several hundred other names belonging to those “higher ups” who were his followers. But these are only my preliminary ideas; the “hearings,” I hope, are yet to come.

[Dementyeva] What do you think: why were literature and art, which in Russia have always served as the conscience of the people, unable to erect a powerful barrier against Stalin’s totalitarianism?

[Shatrov] Because a barrier was erected against them first. And against those who worked during the 1920s and later. Nevertheless in spite of all barriers, they did their job: “it is not for us to foretell how our words will echo.” I felt this barrier throughout the 30 years I have worked in literature. All my political plays, the ones I call “Drama of the Revolution”: “July Sixth,” and “The Bolsheviks, and “Blue Horses” and “This is How We’ll Win,” all except the last “Onward, Onward, Onward,” were banned. Why? Because in these plays I forced my way through to real history, to the living Lenin. But the powers that be did not like this. This is the source of my almost 30 years of conflict with the former directors of the Institute of Marxism and Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee, and it is also the source of my friendship with many rank and file workers of that institute, many historians. Along with the rejection of my plays I often encountered support, especially among certain officials of the Central Committee—the roots of today lie in yesterday.

[Dementyeva] What are your predictions—what will the future fate of the October Revolution be? If you were asked to write a play about the future, what would it be like?

[Shatrov] I think that the future of the October Revolution is directly linked with and dependent on the successes of perestroika. For me they are directly related. Failure today would lead to the hegemony of the blackest forces of reaction. It is clear to me that the forces supporting the extremists of “Pamyat” want the rage and resentment of the community to be diverted from those who brought the nation to the brink of crisis onto the path of chauvinism and anti-Semitism. This has occurred more than once in history. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, recently said that at present there is still no guarantee of irreversibility. And indeed we can see clearly that this is true—there are no guarantees of irreversibility. I do not want to prognosticate. As always, everything depends on the relationship between the forces at every stage of the conflict. After 30 September, the relative strength of the forces changed significantly. I

think that the odds are in favor of renewal, of the coming of new people, and of the transformation of words into deeds. The Central Committee has set an example for us all, a very important example. And we must feel our responsibility even more profoundly. But if the progress occurring above is not supported from below, nothing will come of it. For this reason renewal is extremely important. In the party and everywhere.

But I will not write a play about the future. Let other people do that.

[Dementyeva] People here like to separate the revolution from the whole rest of our country’s history. How, in your opinion, will history fuse into a single whole.

[Shatrov] Our revolution grew out of the roots of the past, out of the incompleteness and inadequacy of many processes occurring during the XIXth century, out of the depths of our national crisis. For this reason the revolution cannot be separated from what preceded and followed it in our history. To pretend that everything began in 1917 is a mistake. Everything must be considered in its logical sequence, in the context of all that is related to it. And if we defer the solution to our problems today, that will only complicate our lives, and we will have to pay for it some time in the future. I think that failure to solve certain problems before 1917 aggravated a number of things and this is the source, in my opinion, of the excesses of the revolution, which we decry today and of which we speak with regret.

[Dementyeva] In your play “Bolsheviks” you justify terrorist activity. In “Conscience’s Dictates” one clearly hears a call for humanism. Are your views evolving?

[Shatrov] I never justified terrorist activity. I tried to explain why they had to resort to it; with what reluctance, with what burden of responsibility the Bolsheviks made this decision. In the play, Oleg Yefremov and I tried to speak seriously about the Red Terror, keeping in mind the possibility of its degeneration, as occurred in the 1930s. The play was always based on a humanist idea: how this terror is not necessary to the revolution and not appropriate to it. At the same time we know very well that if a revolution cannot defend itself, it is worthless. It becomes only the jabber of the intelligentsia. This was a terrible, forced, responsible measure which we understand in all its ramifications today and thus cannot accept. Our humanism protests against it. And it is right to do so. But even Blok warned us of the error of failing to see the grandeur of the revolution because of its grimaces.

In general, much in our lives was born out of the blood and tragedy of the civil war. Lenin understood this like no one else. It was no accident that he, in Bukharin’s words, set the goal of turning the “party of the civil war” into the party of “civil peace.” But what was actually done? It was a time of consciously “killed,” crushed opportunities..

[Dementyeva] In your view, are their prospects that your plays will live a long time? Won't interest in them disappear when historical documents are made widely available? After all, time erodes the urgency of many problems. Will your dramatic art change?

[Shatrov] My plays are not the same thing as the publication of documents. They are after all an attempt to communicate with my generation through the genre of drama.

Through my plays I participate in the political struggle, this is my primary interest—the endeavor to have my say, to express myself and the thoughts of my generation. Although I understand that beauty is eternal, I have no ambition in that regard, I do not deceive myself. The future will put everything in its proper place. It is not for us to influence its verdict. All we can do is perform our own jobs with honor.

Today certain critics are accusing me of creating a new cult to substitute for the old one. I have never attempted to do this; I try to speak of the living Lenin as I understand him and of the drama of this man. And we must treat him as he treated Marx—with the greatest respect, with love, but at the same time recognizing that there is something in him that has become outmoded, something else that requires further development, something else that has not been confirmed. In other words, we must treat him as a living process, not dogmatically. Lenin said that he would not tolerate abuse of Marx. I feel the same about Lenin. But those heights which Lenin reached and his methods of solving problems set a standard which we can only try and try again to attain. I am speaking of the moral climate that existed then in the party, and his staggering ability to bring out the best in everyone. Before 1921 he was even able to bring out Stalin's strengths—his administrative abilities, etc. (although I believe, he understood the true nature of this talent too late).

[Dementyeva] What is the happening with productions of the play "Onward, Onward, Onward"?

[Shatrov] Twelve theaters in our country have staged it and it is being produced abroad. Why didn't the Moscow Art Theater and the Bolshoy Dramatic Theater (Gorkiy Theater) stage it? As soon as it was written, the heads of both these theaters announced that they liked the play and would produce it. Then they changed their minds. Stranger things have happened in the theater. In any case, this incident had absolutely no influence on my attitude to these two outstanding figures in our theater, one of whom is a close personal friend.

[Dementyeva] A critic once said that you have monopolized the theme of Lenin? How do you react to this statement? Doesn't it bother you that you are, in essence, the only one working on this theme?

[Shatrov] As for monopoly, I can only advise the critic to look the word up in the dictionary, where he will find that "monopoly" means to deny other people their chance, to crush one's competitors, to force them into bankruptcy.

But I very much regret that I am alone in this work. Competition works to the benefit of everyone. My isolation, I think, is the result of some rather complicated factors. For the young, the key factor is the 30 years of persecution that I and my plays were subjected to. It all happened to me: attempts to expel me from the party and to publicly dishonor me, in the time of Suslov the play "This is How We'll Win!" was banned by a resolution of the Party Central Committee Secretariat. This is too much for any one person, and you will hardly find volunteers who want to experience something similar.

And during all those years the theme of Lenin continued to be developed on the permitted level; it was drama that was only going through the motions. Everything that was best in the theme was banned by the Institute of Marxism and Leninism. But what no one touched upon, nonetheless existed and caused the theme to be discredited.

For me the theme of Lenin is my life's work. And I will continue to work on it. Recently they finally allowed me into the Archives of the Institute of Marxism and Leninism, into the Stalin collection. Before this I had always based my work on what was published before 1927 here, an enormous amount of literature, and what has been published abroad. I also spoke with people, who began to talk after 1956—Ye.D. Stasovaya, G.I. Petrovskiy, L.A. Fotiyevaya, A.I. Mikoyan, Z. G. Ordzhonikidze, and N.S. Khrushchev. I want to write a play that tells the story of the death of Lenin, his last struggle. The play will be titled "Renunciation." It will be the story of 1923, told through the events occurring in Stalin's office. Lenin will not be in the play, he will remain behind the scenes. And we will know what a furious battle he fought, sick as he was, to prevent the tragic turn of events, which he alone foresaw. I want to show how many of his companions-in-arms renounced Lenin, without, perhaps, realizing what they were doing. This is a problem which is not only political, but of general human significance. Currently I am completely involved with it and full of it. Here, it seems to me, I have discovered many threads that continue into our day and into the future.

I know that my plays are perceived differently by different people. This does not bother me. I have known both the happiness of mutual understanding and the hatred of ideological or aesthetic rejection. It is not this, but something else that is important. Many years ago I made my choice and the years have convinced me that it was the right one. I can be mistaken, go off course, but I cannot lie. For the cause I serve has no use for lies. Only truth. Truth and more Truth.

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

Writer Granin Urges Return of Emigre Writers, Artists

18000503 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jan 89 p 3

[Article by Daniil Granin: "Our 'Foreign' Countrymen"]

[Text] The steady flow of visitors past the pictures, sculpture, and ceramics was broken here and there as people clustered together or the crowd thinned out; but only in one spot did it actually stop. This was in front of a display with photographs. Of course, photographs always stand out among paintings. But these were special photographs—portraits of people known to many Leningraders, portraits of young artists. Actually these artists are not so young any more; they were young in the seventies, when we all were so eager to see their exhibitions. The line would form in front of one House of Culture, then in front of another. And these were lines filled with impatient, anxious people, since the exhibitions tended to last for only a very short time—for a few days, or sometimes just a few hours—until they were prohibited and shut down. Exhibits were set up in people's homes, in garrets—but these were dangerous, they got people into trouble, you visited them at your own risk... Familiar faces, familiar names, in those days their pictures gave rise to furious disputes—Tyulpanov, Arefyev, Putilin, Nekrasov.. Two dozen artists, one more interesting than the next, appeared during those years. And then suddenly they all vanished, dropped out of sight. There were rumors that they had left the country or been exiled. Such original, brilliant talent could not be lost, but one no longer encountered their works. And now [finally] I was able to get some information [about them] from the brief notes under their photographs. It turns out that almost all of them did indeed go abroad; lists of exhibitions in various countries were even provided for some of them.

Now at this exhibition in the Leningrad Manege, we commemorated our countrymen. If not all, then at least some of them were commemorated, and a good job was done of it. They had finally gained entrance here, to the main exhibition hall of the city. Fifteen years later, some were represented by actual pictures, some by photographs but in one way or another they had gained entrance—and for this we owe a major debt of thanks to those who set up this exhibit in Leningrad's Manege.

And yet how many of them there were who left their homeland; thank god, at least, they did not vanish from the face of the earth, they did not perish, at least over there they are writing and acting. Our own loss has been the West's gain.

The exhibition in the Manege is now full of the names of new artists, new groups: "Ostrov/Island/," "Mitki," "Staryy Gorod /Old City/,"... We can take consolation from the fact that the sanctuary will not remain untenanted. But, unfortunately, no one else can take the place of a talented artist, we picture in memory the canvases of

those who are gone, who were driven away, and all at once, in the midst of the crowded exhibition, there are gaping voids, black holes, giving off the sad odor of unnecessary, painful losses.

I became personally acquainted with Oleg Aleksandrovich Tsinger long ago, through Timofeyev-Resovskiy. Now, finding myself in Paris, I decided to visit him. He lives in a suburb of Paris, Garshe. On the way there, I recalled the letters Tsinger wrote to Timofeyev-Resovskiy, illustrated by miniature water-color drawings of exotic animals of the zoos, aquariums, and parks, where flamingos, emus, and other exotic birds roamed free. Tsinger was an animal artist, a pupil of Vatagin, and, judging by these drawings, a worthy pupil. When I began to work on "Zubr /Aurochs, Die-hard/," Tsinger sent me one reminiscence of his friend after another. He wrote copiously, and more important, vividly and with humor, providing many precise vivid details from life in Berlin in the 1930s and 40s.

A memory can be not merely good, or strong, but also talented. Tsinger had a remarkably talented memory which retained, obeying a careful principle of selection, the most juicy, striking details of years gone by. After half a century, they appeared to him with all their color and sound, amusing and fresh. Our correspondence lasted several years and now, finally, we would see each other. He was, in spite of his years, a totally youthful, smart, elegant man, full of energy, a wonderful raconteur, with an ironic attitude toward himself and others. His home was full of paintings and photographs—old, and ancient—associated with the memory of his father, the author of the famous physics textbook; indeed, and with his whole family of famous Russian scholars—mathematicians, astronomers, botanists, and on his mother's side associated with the Russian theater, with the Moscow Art Theater.. At this time, he gave me a wonderful present: a photograph of his father with L.N. Tolstoy. It is a relatively unknown photograph, perhaps one that had never been published.

His Russian was faultless. Moreover, so were his German and French. His family had left Russia in the 1920s and remained abroad. Oleg Aleksandrovich did not turn into either a Frenchman, or a German; he is mindful of his roots and loves his homeland; and yet it has obviously been a long time since he felt himself to be an emigre. At one time he had the desire to visit Moscow, and the city of Peter (i.e., Leningrad), but this desire died out over the years, since the wind blowing from his homeland was cold and hostile. There was no way to obtain a visa, they were not to be had. Now his age and his health will not permit it. There are Russians like this among the new, as well as the old, wave of emigration; I have met quite a number of them. Perhaps there is nothing more unnatural, more ludicrous than a person being prevented from visiting his home, the scenes of his childhood and youth..

I have had occasion to write about how much that first wave of Russian emigration has given European and World culture. It is called Russian, but it included Ukrainians, Belorussians, Armenians, and Georgians... Individuals working in the most diverse areas have gained deserved fame throughout the world, for example, in science—Zvorykin, Gamov, Timoshenko, Ipatyev, Bakhmetyev, Pitirim Sorokin, Dobzhanskiy.. I could go on and on, and there are many that I don't know about, nor do I know if anyone has studied the history of Russian emigration. I should also name such major philosophers as Bulgakov, Berdyayev, Losskiy, Frank, Shestov, Fedotov. And there are still more—famous artists, actors, doctors, engineers. We were brought up to have a single attitude to all of them—they were all lumped together as "White Emigres," they were all associated in the public consciousness with the White Guard, and thus had to be our enemies. Only after World War II did it become known that among these emigres, there were members of the Resistance, which so self-sacrificingly aided us in our struggle against the Fascists. The "second wave" of emigration appeared, and then the "third."

We probably know the most about the third wave. It went on right in front of our eyes. There were a number of reasons, but the upshot was that a number of talented artists emigrated. We lost an entire stratum of our culture. We remember what it was like, how, for just and unjust reasons, they forced and drove out of our country those who were awkward, intractable, or obstinate, such as Viktor Nekrasov, Vladimir Voynovich, Yefim Etkind, Georgiy Vladimov.. The Soviet biologist Zhores Aleksandrovich Medvedev, was one of the first, in 1962 when Lysenko again held sway, to challenge Lysenko's doctrines and wrote a substantive documented research paper "Biological Science and the Personality Cult." He conclusively showed up Lysenko's methods of combat, as well as those of the science journalists who were his followers. And for this they committed him to a psychiatric hospital, from which he was freed only through the energetic protests of scientists, headed by P. L. Kapitsa, and writers, headed by A. T. Tvardovskiy. Soon afterward he was forced to go abroad. A.I. Solzhenitsyn was also compelled to leave the country by force. They also forcibly exiled the poet I. Brodskiy, and the writers, V. Nekrasov, V. Aksenov, and A. Sinyavskiy.

They used diverse methods to rid themselves of heretics, of dissidents. They made working conditions unbearable, they banned films, and plays, they made it impossible to publish, they fired people, they denied artists exhibitions, they prevented people from working. Once they managed to go abroad, people remained there, becoming "nonreturners," and were forthwith branded as traitors or turncoats, and were publicly dishonored; and this treatment was meted out not only to those who had left, but to members of their families who had remained here as well.

Tarkovskiy, Yuriy Lyubimov, Mikhail Baryshnikov, Mstislav Rostropovich, Andrey Volkonskiy, Galina

Vishnevskaya, Nuriyev, Makarova.. Their ranks grew and expanded, but neither the officials of cultural institutions nor those of party organs showed any interest in the reasons causing such diverse individuals to so disrupt their lives, remaining in an alien land, abandoning their friends and families and the way of life they were accustomed to... They did not want to think about it and they did not allow anyone else to. Instead, it was so much easier and more pleasant to simply announce that these people had left because they had been brainwashed by western propaganda, because they were seduced by the prospect of an easy life with lots of money, and that they were actually formalists, creatively sterile... There were no labels they would not use.

The sorrowful lists of losses to our culture and science are long. We were assured that they would all perish and wither in the West, of no use to anyone, that this was their loss, not ours.. And indeed some did languish there in the West. Of course, they suffered and endured many hardships after having abandoned their homeland; it is no simple matter to readapt to an alien way of life, to alien customs. With time, however, they somehow managed to make a life for themselves, some better, some worse. Their talents found themselves and in turn they were discovered... There can never be too much talent anywhere. We seem to think that we have so much, we can afford to squander it.

During these years Mikhail Baryshnikov became a superstar, and some of our other artists met with great success—Mikhail Shemyakin and the sculptor Ernst Neisvestnyy, not to even mention Tarkovskiy or Rostropovich, No, the talents of our countrymen did not perish, they have accomplished and continue to accomplish a great deal, and some of them, in spite of everything, are working for the greater glory of Russian culture. I have before me V. Khodasevich's "White Corridor" (a book of memoirs), elegantly printed by "Serebryanny Vek /Age of Silver/" in 1982 which carries the inscription: "This book was published with the aid of the Mikhail Baryshnikov Fund." This fund was used to publish other books in our Russian heritage as well, works which are little known or even unknown to us. Yefim Etkind sponsored French translations of the collected works of Pushkin and Lermontov, and the publication of a four volume history of Russian poetry. I could also mention other funds, other editions, and exhibitions of Russian paintings organized by emigres.

The emigres have been treated in an unlawful manner, this is the point I am leading up to. Of course, I remember very well that the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet passed resolutions on this subject; however, no one will ever be able to convince the civilized world that one can lawfully deprive a person of his homeland simply because he thinks differently from what [the state] currently prescribes. And for this reason, the "legal" resolutions accompanying expulsion are unlawful. When they deprived people of their citizenship for leaving the country (to all appearances legally), the

authorities cited no justifications, refusing to trouble themselves with reasons. Those who went abroad committed no crime against their country; depriving them of their citizenship was a violation of fundamental human rights.

And if now we are restoring, one after another, human rights, and purging our history of unjust accusations, if we are returning to the party those who had been subject to repression, if we are rehabilitating those who were unlawfully convicted, then there is even more reason why we should restore lawfulness and justice to those who are still alive and return their unlawfully revoked citizenship to them. One could object that they have no more need for it and are not requesting it. But the need is ours; it is our own concept of legality, of lawfulness which we would thus affirm. These days we can afford to be relatively generous and charitable, without having to stoop to weighing each claim and counterclaim.

I am speaking not only of the famous and illustrious. Many emigres are rank and file technicians, industrialists, physicians, physicists, who suffered the same fate, but without the publicity.

Of course, emigres are an extremely diverse lot. They include groups that cannot be reconciled with our society; there are monarchists, confirmed anti-Soviets, those with Fascist views; there are organizations engaging in activities which are obviously hostile to us.

However, a rather significant portion are people who, in spite of all injuries and injustices, have done and continue to do a good deal for our culture. Starting in the early 70s, the Ardis Press has been putting out the books of V. Nabokov in Russian, one after another; virtually publishing a complete collection of his works. Decorated with the picture of a postal carriage, Ardis books have for many years provided readers with the opportunity to become familiar with the works of this remarkable master of Russian prose. And today our journals make use of books published by Ardis when they publish Nabokov. It was Ardis that published the poems of I. Brodskiy, the novels of S. Sokolov and A. Platonov, and other works too numerous to mention. The activity of such well-intentioned foreign presses has made it possible to preserve our literary heritage of a number of Russian writers, philosophers, historians, and essayists living abroad. The first collections of Tsvetayeva, Akhmatova, Pasternak, Mandelshtam, and Bulgakov were published abroad. These books passed from hand to hand, from house to house, they were reprinted, xeroxed; one way or another they kept the flame from going out.

At some point our cultural history will surely give these small, precarious presses and their staffs their due; objectively they performed an important, at times invaluable conservatory function.

Specialists in the appropriate fields, undoubtedly, would have a number of good things to say about Russian ballet schools abroad, about musicians who did and continue to do much to popularize and further Soviet music and the Russian classics. No few facts can be cited to induce us to reconsider our previous attitudes to the emigres. In the final analysis, there will be those among them who refused to be reconciled, who refuted the lie, who put out a "samizdat" containing the very documents and reminiscence which today are being published in mass editions. These are the dissidents who purified our minds, who awoke us, and prepared the soil for new thinking.

Recently, in various interviews with emigres they have been asking: are you not preparing to return to the homeland? This question is repeated so persistently one would think that their desire to return is some kind of consolation to us. Yet, as a rule, they answer evasively or even negatively. Despite their great interest in perestroika and the changes in our lives, the emigres with whom I have had occasion to speak on this topic do not see that we have substantially changed our attitude to emigration, either in our propaganda or in our legal policy. At the same time it becomes more and more obvious how much we are losing by this.

As early as 1987, visiting China, we saw what advantageous conditions were granted to Chinese emigres. There were special hotels for them, they were given the best rooms and other privileges. They were constantly invited to the universities or asked to invest their capital in Chinese enterprises. Why should our Russian emigres not be offered at least our hospitality? Why can't everything possible be done to help them arrange their trips, why can't they be given privileges in the hotels, and be aided in their travel around the country? Why not invite Russian scholars working in foreign universities and laboratories to lecture here? Emigres who are experts in the most diverse areas—medicine, or technology could do a great deal for the Fatherland and undoubtedly would eagerly understand this if they met with unprejudiced treatment. I am speaking about their treatment by government departments, and of the relevant legal acts. A longtime policy of discrimination, has given rise to a like response. However, I think, that there is no sense in reckoning up accounts, and weighing the various complaints and countercomplaints. The strength of our new thinking lies in the priority given to common human values. Throwing open the doors to those who were previously banished, those who became foreigners against their wills, stretching out our hand to them—this might be considered magnanimity, but it would be more correct to consider it a duty. In spite of everything, the majority of them, regardless of their current views, in the depths of their souls continue to feel their blood ties to their homeland, to their childhood and youth. The right to this tie is not a favor to be granted, it is the right of every person; the right to be a compatriot and not an emigre.

Culture Ministry Assesses Theater Experiment
18000170a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 5 Nov 88 p 9

[Article by B. Sergeyev: "Steps Towards Reform"]

[Text] The 1987-1988 drama theater season in the country was summed up at a panel session of the USSR Ministry of Culture for theaters taking part in an integrated experiment for improved management and enhanced effectiveness of theater activities. In other words, the results of the experiment itself were discussed and the state of our drama theater defined as it lies on the brink of general theater reform.

USSR Ministry of Culture head of theater management V. Demin presented the results of the previous season to the panel. Perhaps the season was not a success in all respects, but the theaters which took part in the experiment clearly occupied a leading position in our theater production. This provides a basis for concluding that the experiment was successful on the whole.

But not everything went perfectly with regard to the experiment. Complications, and even contradictions, arose during its conduct. The most substantive of these was discussed by M. Gribanov, first deputy minister of the USSR Ministry of Culture. First of all citing the financial success of the theaters participating in the experiment, he noted it must be kept in mind that this was achieved mainly through increased ticket prices. The number of theatergoers here decreased significantly. Gribanov complained that no purely creative successes were pointed out to the panel. The repertoire of many theaters is far from optimal. The experiment envisioned special work involving theaters and playwrights, including young playwrights. But the doors were shut tighter still, blocking masters of the pen. There was a serious problem with performances for children, which often disappeared entirely from the repertoire or were conducted on such a low artistic level that children left the theater. The experiment failed to develop any policies with respect to touring, resulting in the introduction of many distortions. For example, several theater groups had six or seven annual foreign tours and only one or two within the Soviet Union. This is intolerable. There was a great deal of confusion with the introduction of self-support management.

In short, a whole number of issues related to the experiment still need to be resolved. RSFSR Deputy Culture Minister A. Kostyukovich laid special emphasis on repertoire matters. Theaters compose their repertoires from a small selection of the same works, and the overwhelming majority of theater supposedly designated for young people is aimed at the older viewer. Economist and sociologist B. Sorochkin presented a picture of the state of theater in precise numerical terms. USSR theater union board of directors secretary M. Zakharov again emphasized deficiencies in the work theaters were doing with playwrights. L. Losev, director of the Academic

Theater imeni Mossovet [Moscow City Soviet of Workers' Deputies] stressed those difficulties which unavoidably arise when introducing a contractual system.

At the same time, however, as USSR Minister of Culture V. Zakharov stated in his concluding remarks, the experiment was not a ready prescription for success in all spheres of theatrical activity. He offered workers in the creative arts freedom and the right to think independently, the opportunity of utilizing the freedom of the craft and conscience of the artist. Most importantly, the experiment enabled us to take a qualitative step forward in restructuring the theater, and therefore justifies itself entirely. It will provide a basis, taking into account the observations noted, for shifting the management of all theaters in the country to a new set of operating conditions in the first half of 1989.

The USSR Ministry of Culture panel also looked at the matter of what role is played by the newspapers TEATR [Theater] and SOVREMENNAYA DRAMATURGIYA [Modern Drama] in the development of Soviet theater. The chief editors of the publications, A. Salynskiy (TEATR) and N. Miroshnichenko (SOVREMENNAYA DRAMATURGIYA), spoke about the work of their editorial boards. These newspapers are operating in the spirit of the times, and are constantly seeking new means to promote the theater. They are acquiring a more general nature and moving outside the framework of narrow specialization. They are also playing a great role in promoting the finest works of USSR and foreign theater. Most of the plays reported on in the pages of these newspapers have appeared on our stage. All the same, the publications are still not fully utilizing their creative potential. They have a great deal left to accomplish.

Commentary on 1988 USSR State Prizes in Literature, Art

18000170b Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 10 Nov 88 pp 1, 2

[Article by P. Nikolayev, associate member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, board secretary of the USSR Writers' Union, member of the Committee on Lenin and USSR State Prizes in Literature, Art and Architecture under the USSR Council of Ministers: "A Cultural Self-Evaluation"]

[Text] And thus the next regularly scheduled awards convocation of USSR state prizes was convened, a joyous occasion but one to which we have long become accustomed. Does it satisfy everyone? No doubt it pleases the admirers of those receiving awards. But judging from recent commentary in the press, the decisions also have opponents.

The problem, of course, is not in the outward ritual of creative effort ascending to the "pedestal of honor," although the apparently standard procedure always fails to suit someone or another. No, it is of course other reasons which prompted several radical representatives

of literary society to raise the issue of the prizes, exhibiting the sharpness with which so many are now discussing it. Doubt was cast upon their social and moral benefit and it was therefore proposed that they be abolished.

Such a "revolutionary" recommendation, of course, required justification. And such was found—"a lack of genuine discussion of the proposed candidates in the press makes the prizes not the fruit of free competition among artists, but a barren administrative act" (LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, 5 Aug 1988).

And naturally, in the spirit of the critical frame of mind we see in recent times, there was mention here of too overt a relationship ("in many instances") between the writer's official position and his prizes. There were also several toned down variants of such severe critiques of the prize system in the cultural sphere, but essentially they amounted to expressing a need either to fundamentally change the system or perfect it.

All of this is quite serious and requires society's attention. It would be strange to suppose that the USSR Council of Ministers Committee for Lenin and USSR State Prizes in Literature, Art and Architecture would take no notice of critical arrows aimed in its direction. Of course it has noted this. And if today's committee decision differs qualitatively from those of days past, some of this may be attributed to polemic commentary and radical proposals in the press. The most important aspect is to be found elsewhere, in the fact that the committee's aesthetic criteria have become higher and more dynamic, influenced by the entirety of the social situation as it has formed in recent years. Certain publications critical of the committee's work have failed to evoke sympathy within it because the authors are not fully knowledgeable of committee activities.

The line between incompetence and malicious, subjective partiality is a thin one, as we know, and so the problem acquires a moral character.

I do not know how things worked with the committee in previous years—I will allow that it was not a smooth operation, that a great many mistakes were made which are to this day assimilated with difficulty, both objective and subjective in nature. But how are these acknowledged in the committee today? I would testify that they are seen with a measure of responsibility which meets the self-critical demands of the times. Being involved myself in various spheres of literary, pedagogical and scientific activity, I will even risk adding that it would be nice if such an atmosphere of good-natured exactingness and democratic spirit in seeking collective agreement on complex, often delicate issues existed everywhere.

The committee is comprised of 70 men, representatives of all kinds of artistic creativity. And the high level of professionalism of each continues to be evident when they evaluate their "neighbors" in the arts, their related

fields. Internal workings of the committee are in conformance with country-wide and global practice in artistic competition, and are therefore not made public. The need and careful regard for competitors' self-respect and freedom from external pressure on committee members demand this. Were it not for this provision, it would be possible to observe the entire course of discussions lasting many days on works presented, and the idea expressed above concerning the ethical atmosphere of discussions would be proved. The list of evaluators is remarkable, moreover: K. Lavrov, V. Tikhonov, B. Oley-nik, Ch. Aytmatov, M. Karim, M. Tank, G. Ernesaks, B. Ugárov... The remaining names are equally prominent.

We read today's resolution. Where does one see a writer's official position connected with a prize? Who? V. Dudintsev, A. Pristavkin, D. Samoylov, S. Vangeli or L. Ginzburg occupy high administrative posts? No, they simply represent great literature today. It is worthwhile noting that the fall and September sessions of the committee examined, among others, works of the leaders of the creative unions—some very famous artists. And you see the results.

But can there be any doubt that, in his active participation and steadfastness, V. Dudintsev has given us a moral lesson, that his "White Clothing" has become a social event? Yes, and that's not all. The press has almost unanimously shown that the novel presents a genuine artistic study of the sources of our social deficiencies. Is it possible not to consider this?

"A Golden Cloud Spent the Night," by A. Pristavkin, shares the fate of many unpublished works. It is an honest book, psychologically reliable, and has a tremendous power of emotional influence on the reader both here and abroad (like V. Dudintsev's novel, the story has been translated into many languages of the country and the world). In all surveys of journalistic prose, the book is evaluated as an artistic discovery of conflicts and tragedies in our military history unknown until the present time.

D. Samoylov has long been recognized as one of the most talented Soviet poets of the military generation, and his book "Voices Beyond the Hills" confirms this, although it does not include many beautiful pages of his poetry. Criticism has always noted a special intonation of conversationality in his verse as a democratic form of his analytical reflections, a co-involvement of the modest artist in all being.

The successes are always a source of joy in the culture of the national republics. It is not surprising that committee members, without waiving evaluation criteria, give special consideration to certain artistic phenomena. Moldavian children's poet S. Vangeli wrote the book "Gugutse and His Friends," whose hero has received the joyous recognition of Russian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, English, American, Swedish, Japanese, German—and many,

many more—children. The book appears in 30 languages—now that's popularity. It is a blessing in the spiritual life of children, for the book by the Moldavian children's author delivers lessons of courageous kindness, unselfishness, compassion and an internationalism expressing love for mankind.

The committee was unanimous in its evaluation of Estonian director M. Mikiver's skills and those of his Georgian adopted brother M. Tumanishvili, whose plays show diverse literary material and exhibit the diverse natures of national actors in personifying "the life of the human spirit" through truly theatrical means, convincing in their artistic expressiveness. "Cloud Colors" in Tallinn and "Our Town" in Tbilisi enter our social consciousness and form the spiritual make-up of the contemporary man, joining in the overall process of artistic development. The committee saw a combination of bright, rhythmic expressiveness and the monumentality of vivid resolution in the memorial ensemble created by Georgian sculptor G. Ochauri and a group of architects, which was able to escape the overly familiar stereotype of many memorial structures. The committee supported a tape made by Ukrainian cinematographers entitled "Chernobyl—A Chronicle of Difficult Weeks," requiring not only civic passion, but personal courage as well from the authors, and the film by Latvian masters focusing on sharp problems entitled "Is It Easy to be Young?" The committee's viewing and discussion of talented Leningrad film artist A. German's "Road Check" were accompanied by universal support. Also receiving a prize was the extremely popular movie cartoon series "Hey, Wait Up!" produced by Moscow cartoonists.

I take special "in-shop" pleasure (as does the director of the committee's subsection on theory and history of artistic creativity) in writing about the fairness of presenting an award to one of our outstanding literary artists, spokeslady for Leningrad culture, L. Ya. Ginsburg, who wrote the books "Literature in the Search for Reality" and "On the Literary Hero."

Of course, it is customary now to talk about a lagging behind in our social and humanitarian sciences, and this is justifiable on the whole. But there are different kinds of lagging behind. We must admit that our philological and art criticism ideas have in several instances not known the devastating force of decree as have those of other spheres of the social sciences, and this is not surprising—these ideas have "served" language and art, which enjoy a great independence in the socio-economic and political spheres. This has been known since the times of Karl Marx.

There is a great deal in our science of artistic creativity which speaks of its world class, a factor all forms of scientific knowledge are presently concerned with. Thanks to her books, L. Ya. Ginsburg joins the ranks of prominent Soviet literary artists on a level with A. F. Losev, M. M. Bakhtin, D. S. Likhachev and others.

Ginsburg's literary arts method is distinguished by its universalism, taking into consideration contemporary data in philosophy, sociology and psychology. Her memoirs have received great acclaim from readers and it is through these that she emerges a great artist.

Among the brilliant assemblage of prominent Soviet art researchers—which includes such famous names as B. R. Vipper, V. N. Lazarev and M. V. Alpatov—belongs the name of that revered art historian A. D. Chegodayev, whose book "Edouard Manet" was awarded a prize. Without his works it would be impossible to study the art culture of ancient Greece, France from the Renaissance to our day, England, and the United States of America. The scholar's book depicts the French impressionist in a very objective, but at the same time partial light, reflecting his modern view of the famous artistic trend of the second half of the 19th century.

Let me return to an overall appraisal of the committee's work. Presumed opponents may say that I am right with respect to the current decisions, but that they are challenging previous the methodology and procedure of conferring such a worthy award. I reply that at no session in the past two or three years has there been any subjective "dictate" of partiality or any temptation to satisfy officials. The "electricity of rank," in Gogol's words, has been absent from the sessions. What kind of "administrative act" do we see there? I recall the decision made by the Committee on Lenin Prizes in April 1988. Instead of the usual seven prizes they awarded only two: to T. Abuladze and the Lithuanian architects. And among those who were nominated (quite justifiably so) but not selected for an award were some very prominent, responsible officials (outstanding artists as well), leaders of the creative arts unions. I should add here that among the competitors were some committee members (although, according to the regulations, they were not participating in the work of the committee in this regard).

Does this mean that the practice of awards conferral in the committee requires no corrections or improvements? Of course not. Committee members have often discussed their activities in a concerned and critical manner. Many radical proposals have been put forth—good proposals with moral force which foster the growth of ideologically creative criteria.

The idea of decreasing the number of prizes awarded while increasing their monetary value is a reasonable one. Perhaps we should publish in the press lists of all works which have been presented before the committee, and not only those it has selected for discussion at its sessions.

It is important to enhance the role of the creative arts unions in nominating works for prizes, closely connecting this with the summary of results for the creative arts year. This is necessary to insure that nothing deserving of

an award is dropped from view and also to put up a barrier to "aggressive" authors whose bustling about exceeds the creativity of their works.

One observation on the composition of the committee. This is of course determined primarily by our prominent artists, and the prerogative of forming the committee is that of its founder. But experience has shown that in today's social atmosphere, participation by the leadership of the creative arts unions (previous ones as well as the newly elected) in the work of the present committee is not a detriment, but rather helps matters.

We presently do not see any alternative institution for awarding all-union prizes in all the arts comparable to the current committee. The committee does not stand on public opinion but, in the final analysis, expresses it. This aside, the organization of people in the arts and literature defends its sovereignty under the proposition that the cultural arts have the right of self-evaluation. As long as outside forces do not deprive them of it, as has happened in years gone by, this is their eminent right. Here we find a guarantee of unified opinion between the arts intelligentsia and the broad masses, more and more intensively assimilating the culture of their Fatherland.

So now we congratulate the new laureates—who have become such in the anniversary year of the October Socialist Revolution. This is particularly important and symbolic for our culture, which has always served the cause of socialism—it has been in fact our spiritual socialism.

Moscow Theater Expansion Planned
18000129a Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
4 Nov 88 p 6

[Interview with I. Pisarev, first deputy ispolkom chairman, Moscow City Soviet of Workers' Deputies, by N. Kishchik at press conference held 2 November 1988: "Moscow Theater in the Year 2000"]

[Text] The number of available seats in Moscow theaters will increase by 20,000 by the year 2000. This projection was given by I. Pisarev, first deputy chairman of the Mossovet ispolkom, at a press conference held on 2 November.

[Kishchik] Moscow presently has 40 professional theaters and about 20 studios. Is this a lot or a little? Directories published at the beginning of our century state there are about 10 theater seats in the city for every thousand inhabitants...

[Pisarev] Availability of theater seats today is half what it was at the beginning of the century—currently there are 4.6 available seats per thousand Moscow inhabitants. The rate at which theaters are built, especially in recent decades, lags sharply behind that of the construction of living quarters and social and cultural service facilities. Today there are only 40,000 theater seats in Moscow,

significantly lower than any allowable standard. But Moscow is not just a city of multi-million population—it is the capital. Several million people arrive here every day from diverse corners of the country and the city hosts a great number of guests from abroad.

By the year 2000, with a population expansion to 9.3-9.5 million inhabitants, we must increase the existing number of theater seats 1.5-fold.

[Kishchik] Is this realistic in the 12 years remaining in the century?

[Pisarev] Yes. The "Program for Development of the Material and Technical Basis of Moscow Theater Activity and Its Improved Management Prior to the Year 2000" has presently been developed. This program provides for the construction of new theaters and studios. But before laying the foundations it would be useful to take a good proprietary look at what we already have. To this end we conducted a thorough inventory of existing theater buildings. This enabled us to more correctly appraise the current status of theater management. It turns out that only 13 of 40 buildings were specially built as theaters. Half are 19th century and pre-revolutionary structures. Only seven were built after the war. The utilization of adapted structures is sometimes more expensive than the construction of new facilities. The commission concluded that the absolute majority of theaters is in a deplorable state. Documents show the time frames for their reconstruction. In certain instances it will be reconstruction with simultaneous modernization; in others—reconstruction and expansion of space at the expense of neighboring buildings. A third way will entail constructing a new social and cultural center on the foundation of the existing theater, with video rooms, libraries and presentation rooms. The Theater imeni Yermolova is an example of this... In every case, one item is mandatory—increased number of spectator places.

The overall amount of capital investment to be used for reconstruction and new construction will come to 535 million rubles.

[Kishchik] And where will the new theater studios be located?

[Pisarev] In the near future we are planning to restore 30 houses, architectural monuments which are to be made available as mini-theaters. These will be located all over Moscow. In the central part of the city, major attention will be devoted to forming historically developed theater squares. For example, a large-scale theater complex is being built in Sverdlov Square. Plans call for the Operetta Theater to be made a branch of the Bolshoi Theater and be moved to new premises in Mayakovskiy Square.

It will be built on the site of the torn down theater of dolls. It is planned to create an original children's center on the site of the Children's Musical Theater, including a large theater and viewing complex on Krasnokholmskiy Bridge. We will build a total of eight new buildings in downtown Moscow: a branch of the Malyy Theater, two squares for the "Roman" theater, the Ballet Theater on Skakovaya Street, site of a ballet center which will be constructed by Polish firms. On Spartakovskaya Street we are reconstructing a building for the studio theater under direction of O. Tabakov, and the Uran [Uranus] movie theater is being reequipped for the School of Dramatic Art theater. An experimental creativity center of the studio theater "On the Boards" is being constructed on Vspolnyy Street...

Implementation of the above-named program will provide for a total of 62,000 seats in theaters of our capital by the year 2000.

I foresee a question of equal importance—who will accomplish all these projects? Because, as I repeat, we need 535 million rubles to do it... It is unrealistic to consider accomplishing the entire effort with our own resources. Ministries and departments located in Moscow will take on a significant share, using the increased capacities of their construction trusts—they will account for 165 million rubles. Our partners, foreign firms, will also make their contribution. They will undertake restoration and construction work amounting to about 100 million rubles.

Artist Glazunov Censures Avant-Garde
18000129b Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
4 Nov 88 p 6

[Article by V. Vernikov, IZVESTIYA correspondent: "Export Glasnost—Or an Interview with I. S. Glazunov by the Newspaper 'ABC'"]

[Text] Madrid—Not long ago I opened up the Madrid newspaper ABC and could not believe my eyes. Leave it to the treacherous Spanish journalists to so distort the words of people's artist of the USSR Ilya Glazunov in an interview! Our honored Ilya Sergeyevich could not have said such things. Did they slander him?

I went to the newspaper's editorial office and spoke with the author of the interview.

"No, it's all correct in the interview," he replied.

"Perhaps the translator got it messed up?" I asked. For in a conversation prior to his departure from Spain, the artist himself is supposed to have said not to pay any attention to the interview, that he was completely misquoted.

"No," my Spanish colleague insisted. "We had a good translator. But never mind the translator. I can let you listen to the tape recording of the interview if you find it interesting..."

Interesting? That's not the right word. Three times I personally listened to the tape to make sure I was not having an auditory hallucination.

Let us listen together:

"I think all human culture is divided into two periods. The most recent period lasts 80 years; prior to that is a single flow of humanistic religious culture... And if we consider Picasso and the last 80 years, well, it coincides with the 'International.' Do you remember: 'We will forcibly (!?) destroy the entire world, and then...'? I think this experiment didn't turn out. An example of this is Picasso—it is satanism. 'Guernica' is nothing. For me it is zero. Satanism!" [Translator's note: "nasilno" (forcibly) is used here for "nasilya" (oppression), which appears in the words of the Communist International]

After such a decisive beginning and self-formulated classification of the history of human culture, and after no less daring a quote from the "International," Ilya Sergeyevich thoroughly excoriated the avant-gardism so hateful to him, arguing its unpleasantness by virtue of so lofty an argument as the fact that "man is created in the image and likeness of God," and the avant-gardists can draw an eye wherever they feel like drawing one.

Well—fine. Glazunov doesn't like the avant-gardists. But things get even more curious as the artist's thoughts further unfold:

"All of this art (avant-gardism) is communist. Malevich was a commissar, and Picasso is a commissar. Even Chagal was a commissar—went around with a revolver. And Kandinskiy was a commissar. They destroyed all of our culture and quietly left for the West where they became idols of so-called modern art... Avant-gardism for Europe and America is an expansion of the Comintern..."

Frightening the Spaniards with his "commissars," Ilya Sergeyevich suddenly apologized and started talking about himself:

"I am so sorry, so sorry. But I am speaking honestly—after Stalin I was 26 years old, and the first person to show me life, as it is, was Ilya Glazunov!"

It is nice to know that, like the folk saying goes, the popular artist will not die of modesty. Leaving the subject of his own grandeur and the "commissar" qualities of the avant-gardists, he smoothly moved to other personalities. He mentioned L. Tolstoy, for example, whom he "doesn't like personally."

So Ilya Sergeyevich does not like Lev Nikolayevich. Fine. But why? Here is why:

"Tolstoy is a representative of Freemasonry. Along with others he prepared a catastrophe (?). He said: 'Do not oppose evil with force' (!) and was excommunicated from the church prior to the revolution. He is an extract of Buddhism. Eh-eh-eh... worldwide Masonry."

So—that's clear. But who does Ilya Glazunov like? Could it be that, in the final analysis, he doesn't like anybody? I will answer with a quote:

"I like Stolypin, the prime minister under Nicholas II. A big man! ('grand hombre' Ilya Sergeyevich says in Spanish). He counted on the powerful. Had his reforms been carried out, there would have been no revolution in Russia..."

And somewhat earlier:

"Our economy was destroyed over 70 years. Before, Russia was the greatest, the richest and the most free (!) country in the world..."

Now, dear reader, we have arrived at a no less curious part of the interview—discussing the present day, our current problems. And we find out that the individual to whom all the above statements can be attributed "supports perestroika entirely":

"Perestroika is a very good thing—I support it entirely. But, unfortunately, in art it is a complete disaster because under the form of perestroika they (?) have again begun to introduce avant-gardism."

Is that everything? No, not everything. Perestroika "Glazunov-style" requires that a few more changes be made:

"But, seriously speaking, what are we changing? The roof or the foundation? In order to change the foundation we must rescind Marxism and Leninism, etc."

There we go—take them and rescind them. Once there were Marxism and Leninism, and now—they're gone. True, it isn't clear how we are to change the "etc." Well, all right—the interview isn't over. Perhaps like this:

"Perestroika is a blanket. You are pulling it towards yourself. I am pulling it towards the great Russian culture. All the others are pulling it towards avant-gardism. All Soviet magazines are avant-garde... and 'Guernica,' Malevich, Chagal, Picasso, Tatlin, Kandinskiy—Trotskyism."

Enough?

I think so.

Of course, any interview of the artist, like of other citizens, conducted by one or another foreign newspaper is basically a personal matter. And the presentation of such muddled thoughts, putting it mildly, is also a personal matter. If you want glasnost, really make it glasnost. Let the reader—here and in Spain—figure out what is what. Just one thing is alarming. You cannot have glasnost "for internal use" and "export" glasnost. Just as the criticism cannot be different for some than it is for others. Nor can you have two types of interviews, one for home consumption and one for use abroad.

As Ilya Sergeyevich noted correctly not long ago on the Leningrad television program "Monitor": "The calling of artist consists of carrying certain ideas and discussing them in society." It remains only to add that the Russian word "carry" [nesti] has another meaning.

So, depending on what you are carrying...

Editor's note: Thinking, as did our correspondent at first, that this cannot be, we asked for the tape from Madrid along with the written transcript of the interview. The Spanish newspaper was kind enough to provide them. Unfortunately, we just had to compare one more time the written version with the taped interview of the famous artist we reverently conducted by the ABC newspaper correspondent.

Nationalistic Views, Activities of Uzbek Writers' Union Secretary Assailed

18300255 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
15 Dec 88 p 4

[Article by Yu. Kruzhilin and I. Khisamov: "'Honest Mukhammad's' Double Standard"]

[Text] Recently, we were amazed to compare the statements made by well-known artist Glazunov to "the local press" to those made "for export"—to a Spanish newspaper. Does the man have any shame, we wondered. It turned out, however, that a similar example could be found in Uzbekistan. It was proven on the pages of THE NEW YORK TIMES by Salay Madaminov, a Soviet poet writing under the pen name of Mukhammad Salikh, which means Righteous or Honest Mukhammad.

Let us compare his statements. Here is the first one: "Uzbekistan writers ardently support and approve the party's course toward perestroika, glasnost and the democratization of Soviet society; they unanimously hail the positive changes that have already occurred in the life of our multi-ethnic country and of our republic."

And here is the second one: "The crux of the matter is Stalin's demand for self-sufficiency in cotton. The country's independence in this respect has led to Uzbekistan's enslavement."

The first statement was signed by Mukhammad Salikh, among others, and addressed to the 19th All-Union Party Conference. The second is also his, but it was made to THE NEW YORK TIMES, where it was published. Since very few people in America know of Salay Madaminov's existence, the newspaper explained who he is: "a poet and the secretary of the official Writers' Union."

There is yet another statement, clearly so dear to its author's heart that he published it in two journals at once, in MOLODAYA SMENA and in ZVEZDA VOSTOKA: "Do not hit the one who is down! Call off the fight! He is dead, anyway. Do not strike in anger! He fell in a different way than you and me, a fish bone did not cause his death. A gonfalon staff stuck in his throat, which is not a sturgeon bone. He fell awkwardly, of course, having tripped over the banner and the gonfalon."

We must make a few corrections. Sturgeon has no bones, and "the one who is down" so dear to Salikh's heart—i.e., to state it directly, the father of the nation who died 5 years ago—could not have choked on a bone of that tasty fish. The rest is completely clear, except for one thing: how was the poet able combine without straining his conscience the praise for perestroyka and the love for "the one who is down", who has been exposed by that very same perestroyka?

Yet, he was able to do so.

Another matter that remains unclear is how he could reconcile a call for "the true triumph of internationalism" (contained in the letter to the party conference) with his speech at an academic institute in which he compared the Soviet nationalities policy with Himmler's policies on occupied territories.

And yet another matter: how could he reconcile, without straining his conscience, the very same words about "the triumph of internationalism" with a call to "put an end to the spontaneously organized migration of the population conducted without taking into account the republic's needs?" In other words, strangers keep out.

Please, understand us correctly: let glasnost flourish, and let everyone express his opinion—at least we will know then who is what. But allow us to express our own opinion, too. We think that Salikh, as an educated person, understands that self-sufficiency in cotton was and remains not a "Stalin's demand" but a precondition for the country's survival, and that this great achievement of the Uzbek people has nothing to do with a single-crop economy. If yields were raised by all available means and planted areas reduced there would be no single-crop economy.

If Yuldash Akhunbabayev, Gafur Gulyam, Abdulla Kakhkhar and Khamid Alimdzhan had read those sacrilegious words about the "spontaneously organized migration" of Soviet people—i.e., USSR citizens—they would not have agreed, to put it mildly, with those who wrote and signed them.

The millions of Russians, Ukrainians, Jews, Belorussians and others whom Uzbeks sheltered, fed, warmed and comforted in the great disaster of the war would never equate the disinterested, kind and selfless people with those who make such declarations in its name. (This is how they sign them: "In the name of Uzbekistan's population.")

They demand in the name of Uzbekistan's people to keep out foreigners, while the people themselves mob the Council of Ministers, Tashkent city ispolkom and rayispolkoms hoping to adopt orphaned Armenian children.

They demand in the name of Uzbekistan's people and "for the triumph of internationalism" to close down the Kara Kумы canal and to keep Amu Dariya water from the Turkmens.

They demand in the name of Uzbekistan's people to "give preference to highly trained specialists from the indigenous population". In other words, they propose not to choose the better of two engineers, for instance, but the one whose nationality is more to Salay Madaminov's liking. A similar thing was done in one European country between 1933 and 1945. It also currently occurs in one Mediterranean country. The same happens in South Africa. And they want to introduce the same policy here—"for the triumph of internationalism."

What to love and what to hate is the personal affair of every individual. Yet, it is impossible to understand how the same individual can advocate two directly opposite views. Lack of truth is evident in numerous writings of Honest Mukhammad.

Let us take the birth rate problem. "Our women used to have many children and were always healthy," he wrote in PRAVDA VOSTOKA. He aimed at the young audience, those who are ignorant of the true fate of Uzbek women before the revolution and who do not understand why during the Khudzhum period the women displayed such courage and were ready to accept death in order to build a new life and attain health and education for themselves and their children.

Or let us take the controversial subject of the struggle against negative phenomena. Salikh advances a strange thesis in the DRUZHBA NARODOV journal: apparently, Uzbek villagers sending their children to college feel that they must save up for bribes because some entrance examinations are given in Russian. If fluency in Russian were not required, there would be no need for bribes.

Besides Himmler, he could have recalled Dr. Goebbels. According to the latter's prescription, the lie should be very simple and should contain a grain of truth. Outraged, Salikh writes that the Uzbek language was removed from the 9th grade curriculum in Uzbek schools. Yet, he conveniently forgets that the same unintelligent policy was applied all over the country: Russian was removed from the Russian school curriculum, Ukrainian from the Ukrainian curriculum, etc. Complaining about the destruction of the M. Tarabi mausoleum, he forgets that a similar fate befell monuments connected with such names as A. Tolstoy, V. Komissarzhevskaya, A. Akhmatova, as well as those of the labor of Armenian builders in Tashkent and even of the execution of the 14 komissars.

After the press refuted the rumor about the mythical aluminum smelting plant in Bestanlyk, the editors received a wrathful letter from Salikh: what does it matter whether it was an aluminum smeltery or an instrument plant, the point is that it should not be there at all. Yet, he and a group of coauthors had written differently to the party conference: they asked to build more cotton processing plants (which are considerably more harmful to the environment than an instrument plant). But this is not the point, anyway. An employee of the republic komsomol's central committee who had dared debate Salikh in the press received vicious anonymous letters and equally vicious anonymous telephone calls. We are not accusing anyone in particular of being their author, of course. Yet, the poet's word is his work. Can the work that inspires villains and anonymous letter writers be just, pure and good?

There is food for thought here. Glasnost is not equivalent to lack of principles. A double standard in words may well lead to a double standard in deeds. People are already unhappy that no sooner had the poet become the Writers' Union secretary than his little brother M. Bekdzhan, whose talent falls far short of the older brother's, quickly became a member of the USSR Writers' Union and got a summer house plot and a spot at the head of the line for new apartments. Not everyone is happy that trips to other republics, to visit similar advocates of the people, are paid for as business trips.

The young and energetic secretary has effectively assumed full control of all international contacts of the organization. The profits came quickly: two sentences quoted in THE NEW YORK TIMES and a personal invitation to France.

Numerous mistakes have been made in the nationalities policy in our recent history. Now we are reaping the bitter fruits of haste, showing off, and even arbitrary rule which must not be forgotten. Yet, this makes the entire spectrum of historical truth—the black of the arbitrary rule and the sunny color of the good—all the more important. One of us once saw Uzbekistan from the Afghan bank of the Amu river: on our side there were green gardens, while on theirs nothing but parched desert. On our side there were white tidy villages, while on theirs pitiful clay hovels. On our side there were streams of automobiles running on asphalt-paved roads, the silver glow of high-voltage transmission lines and constellations of electricity, while on theirs only the dim eye of a lone lamp burning in the distance.

Yet, by and large the same people live on both banks, Uzbeks and Tajiks. The same great river supplies them with water. The soil is the same. The same mullahs pray for the blessing of the same Allah. Why are the living standards and the cultural levels different, then; what is lacking there? Tell us, Comrade Salay Madaminov.

What they lack is the Ukraine, Belorussia, Georgia, Russia, Kazakhstan, Moldavia, Armenia, Tajikistan, Azerbaijan, Kirgizia, Latvia, Turkmenia and Lithuania. Anything may happen in a family, but it is when one has no family that life becomes really tough. This family has suffered a great deal, but it has saved us from an even more horrible fate. It has seen many misfortunes, but it has given us a new capital when the old one was destroyed. You ought to remember how people desperately tried to help Tashkent and how they worked for weeks with no days off in order to provide housing for everybody before winter came.

Now we all live in this city. Some of us write poems, others articles. Still others write protests against "spontaneously organized migration of the population." Everyone has his own song.

**UzSSR: Nearly 300 Students Involved in 24 Dec
Dormitory Fight**

Alcoholism, Other Social Ills Cited
18300250 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
25 Dec 88 p 4

[Article by Militia Col A. Artemyev, chief of the Administration for Maintenance of Public Order of the UzSSR Ministry of Internal Affairs: "What Happened in the Dormitory?"]

[Text] A brawl occurred in the dormitory of the Geological Survey Technical School. Ten students were hospitalized. Rumors have spread...

Rumors, as always, are exaggerated. A fight occurred which had been coming to a head for a long time. This incident was the result of many omissions and the lack of required educational and preventive work. And special attention must also be given to the poor living conditions in the dormitory.

Recently, the effectiveness of the struggle against drunkenness and resulting violations of the law has been heightened dramatically. But the measures have proved to be inadequate, since they were not reinforced by educational work. Preventive measures were extremely ineffective in this regard. As a result, drunkenness has spread among young people. Thus, a group of minors committed several thefts while intoxicated. Another group of drunken teenagers committed a robbery.

Drunkenness, alcoholism, bootlegging and drug addiction—these are the real causes and sources of many crimes and violations of the law this year. And the forces of the militia alone cannot cope with this evil.

The problems of maintaining public order, the struggle with drunkenness and alcoholism, bootlegging, drug addiction and hooliganism—these are our common problems, and both the law enforcement agencies and all of the republic's society must actively participate in solving them.

The whole world must combat this evil.

And then there will be neither incidents like the brawl in the Geological Survey Technical School dormitory nor rumors which cover such an incident which arose due to drunkenness.

Uzbek Buro on Causes of Youth Disorder
18300250 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
28 Dec 88 p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the Uzbek CP Central Committee Buro"]

[Text] A meeting of the Uzbek CP Central Committee Buro was held on 26 December. The problem of massive hooliganistic manifestations in the dormitory of the Tashkent Geological Exploration Tekhnikum was reviewed. It was pointed out that on the evening of 24 December 1988, a brawl caused by drunkenness and hooliganism, involving approximately 300 students, took place in Dormitory No 1 of the Tashkent Geological Exploration Tekhnikum. As a result, some received bodily injuries, and there was property damage. The hooliganistic actions were averted by the timely intervention of law enforcement agencies.

This extraordinary incident was caused by neglect of ideological and educational work, lack of genuine concern for students, and the irresponsible attitude of the administration, the party buro and the tekhnikum Komsomol Committee towards their living conditions, life style and leisure time. There are serious flaws in the organization of the educational process. However, the administration and faculty are hiding these facts and creating a semblance of well-being. Party influence in the collective has been weakened, and the authority and guiding role of the Komsomol organization are not felt in the student environment.

The Sabir-Rakhimovskiy Party Raykom and Rayispolkom and the Uzbekgeologiya Main Coordinating Geological Administration have kept themselves aloof from timely resolution of the problems which have accumulated here.

It was emphasized at a meeting of the Central Committee Buro that similar shortcomings are present in a number of other dormitories on the Tashkent campus and in student and workers dormitories of other cities and rayons of the republic. At the same time, the heads of ministries, departments, enterprises and organizations, and educational institutions, and party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol workers practically never visit the dormitories and are isolated from the needs and growing demands of young people. They often avoid conducting political and educational work with them. All this creates the fertile soil in the youth environment which can sprout political indifference and lack of spirituality, various illegal actions, nationalist sentiments, and the desire to consolidate community and parochial interests.

The Uzbek CP Central Committee Buro directed the attention of the Tashkent Party Gorkom to the considerable shortcomings in the organization of ideological

and educational work of party committees among young students and the lack of proper attention to improving the social and living conditions of those residing in dormitories.

Comrade T.M. Akhmedov, first secretary of the Sabir-Rakhimovskiy Party Raykom, was given a reprimand for an unperceptive attitude toward this important area of work, loss of a sense of personal responsibility, a demonstrated lack of concern, and complacency. Comrade T.Sh. Shayakubov, chief of the "Uzbekgeologiya" Main Coordinating Geological Administration, was severely reprimanded for lack of attention and control of the tekhnikum's activities and a lack of proper exactingness of his managers.

It was taken into consideration that the Sabir-Rakhimovskiy Party Raykom Buro announced severe reprimands with entries on the registration cards of comrades A.N. Makhkamov, director of the Tashkent Geological Exploration Tekhnikum, and R. Kuziyev, secretary of the tekhnikum's party organization, and that Comrade A.N. Makhkamov was relieved of duty by decision of the Uzbekgeologiya Main Coordinating Administration.

The Tashkent Obkom Buro was tasked with determining the degree of responsibility of other individuals who shared blame for what occurred.

The resolution adopted gave specific assignments and recommendations to the party obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms, trade union and Komsomol organizations, the Council of Ministers, and the republic's Ministry of Public Education and Ministry of Internal Affairs. It was decided to review the question of the state of student and workers dormitories and the work conducted in them based on the results of the first half of 1989.

Uzbek 'Private' Taxi Drivers Warned Again of High Murder, Robbery Risk
18300251a Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 18 Dec 88 p 4

[Unsigned article under the rubric "Returning to What Was Published": "Money for Life"]

[Text] Enticed by the 15 rubles offered "for one ride," R., a resident of Angren and owner of a private Zhiguli, lost his life.

It was under these circumstances. One night at approximately 10:00, his car was stopped by two strangers. Both had clearly had one too many. They asked "to drive around town" for 15 rubles. Along the way, they strangled him with a slipknot, then threw his body in the Chirchik River.

The murderers were arrested and convicted. An appropriate ending for such stories. But there are rumors circulating in Tashkent and in other cities that the number of such terrible crimes is growing and that owners of private transport are becoming the victims.

"Unfortunately, the rumors correspond to reality," R.F. Tagirov, law counselor and senior public prosecutor-criminologist of the investigatory department of the republic procurator's office, told the Uzbek News Agency (UzTag) correspondent. "Thus, during 5 days in April in Tashkent, a criminal group killed two Zhiguli drivers. It was under approximately the same conditions that existed in the case of R., in the evening and for the purpose of 'earning a little money,' that the private drivers subversively flung open the Zhiguli's doors to the murderers."

"The bitter statistic is that during 11 months of this year, 33 murders of private transport owners have been recorded. Pay attention—more than half of these crimes were committed in Tashkent or in the capital oblast. This does not take into account robberies which ended relatively well for the drivers. Data for the last 2 months: 18 attacks were committed in the capital and the oblast, and 4 drivers died at the hands of criminals."

"And the main thing is that the majority of the crimes have not been detected. There are objective reasons for this: The large stream of vehicles, night time, and the drivers' trustfulness play into the hands of bandits, among whom there are quite a few who are on 'tour'—after perpetrating a crime, they leave the confines of the republic. There are also objective reasons: It points out defects in law enforcement agencies. In the end, retribution awaits the murderers; sooner or later they will be punished for the crimes committed. But today, my words are directed at owners of private automobiles—be careful: Pursuit of easy rubles could end tragically."

"The republic procurator's office appealed to you from the pages of PRAVDA VOSTOKA on 24 December of last year and reported on the increasing frequency of attacks on private drivers. We thought that the article would not go unnoticed and would serve as a warning of heinous crimes. This did not happen."

"That is why I would like once again to remind all who use a private automobile for selfish ends: Deriving unearned income is also a violation of the law. While thinking about superfluous gold coins in a purse, don't stake your life on it."

Further Details of 1 Jan Afghan Cadet Riot in Tashkent
18300251b Moscow GUDOK in Russian 17 Jan 89 p 4

[Article by F. Ovechkin, GUDOK correspondent: "An Extraordinary Situation: What Happened Is Unprecedented"]

[Text] Forty-five people received wounds of varying severity, and four of them died in hospitals. Four vehicles were burned and 27 damaged—this is the tragic

result of the disorder provoked in Tashkent during the first days of the year by a group of Afghan cadets who arrived in Uzbekistan to improve their professional skills...

The residents of Tashkent long ago became accustomed to hearing the Afghan language spoken on city streets, and dozens, even hundreds of citizens of the DRA [Democratic Republic of Afghanistan] acquire a profession or improve their professional skills in many educational institutions. The residents of Tashkent have always treated and continue to treat them with great respect and try to help everyone in every possible way. The vast majority of Afghans also feel the kindest feelings towards the Soviet people...

But sometimes we find irresponsible individuals among them who try to use their stay in the USSR not for gaining knowledge, but for open profiteering with consumer goods they have brought with them. They are the ones who also became the instigators of the mass riots which took place in Tashkent. What is particularly alarming is that these were not simply students, but attendees of short courses for improving the professional skills of officials and employees of the Afghan militia—Tsarandoi.

V.P. Trushin, first deputy of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, told journalists at a press conference what happened in the capital of Uzbekistan on 1 January.

On that day, a group of cadets was offered the opportunity to spend a day off in the city. But some of them did not go on the outing, but went to the Oktyabrskiy Kolkhoz market. There, an argument ensued between them and local residents over the very high prices of consumer goods offered for sale. A fight began, which quickly moved to the nearby Moscow Hotel. The cadets began breaking glass and kiosk windows and throwing stones at passing vehicles and pedestrians. The militia was forced to take prompt action. Most of the instigators of the riot were placed on buses and sent to the school. This was difficult to do, since many cadets were intoxicated by alcohol and drugs.

After arriving at the barracks, the brawlers did not settle down. Having started provocation and slander, they managed to provoke many of their fellow citizens to continue the illegal acts. A massacre began at the barracks. The enraged students ran beyond the school grounds to the ring highway which passes nearby. Here they stopped, overturned and set fire to vehicles, and beat drivers and passengers unmercifully. As a result, 31 Soviet citizens received bodily injuries, 10 of them were militiamen. Three of the victims later died in hospitals. Fourteen Afghan cadets also received trauma of varying degrees. One of them died, having received a head injury while in a vehicle which was passing through the gate.

Having lost control of themselves, the cadets attempted to seize combat equipment at a nearby military unit. But this attempt was effectively suppressed. Weapons were not used in restoring order. They succeeded in ending hooliganistic activities by 10 p.m., that is, approximately 4 hours after they began.

That same day, an investigative group of the most experienced employees of the public procurator's office and Ministry of Internal Affairs was formed by decree of the Uzbek SSR public procurator. Criminal proceedings were instituted on the basis that mass criminal riots had been incited.

In an interview, V.I. Baymeyer, head of the investigative group and senior public procurator of the investigative department of the UzSSR Procurator's Office, called what had happened unprecedented. Nothing like it had ever occurred in the republic. Steps taken will be in strict accordance with the crimes committed and with Soviet laws. Residents of Tashkent should not doubt that the guilty will receive the punishment they deserve.

The people of the city also need not worry that the incident will in any way worsen the traditionally friendly relations between the Afghan and Soviet peoples. The GUDOK correspondent found obvious confirmation of that while visiting the course training corps. Protective vests, which the reinforced guard detail now wear over their overcoats, are the only thing that now remains to remind one of what happened here. Lessons in all battalions are proceeding strictly according to schedule, and there are no violations of discipline.

Learning that I was from a newspaper, Cadet Gulam Mahayudin turned to me and said:

"Comrade, write this down! The absolute majority of students sincerely deplore the events which occurred and angrily condemn the actions of the instigators of the riots, who must be severely punished!"

Cadet Sameulla Haydari supported him.

"We are ashamed of our fellow citizens who lost all restraint. They are totally guilty before the Soviet people..."

At the headquarters of the courses, I managed to chat with Lt Gen L. Pechevoy, deputy chief of the Main Administration of Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, who had arrived here. He said that a group of senior officials of the Ministry of Interior of Afghanistan had already arrived in Tashkent on 2 January, headed by Minister Watanjar, who expressed deep regret to the government of Uzbekistan for what had happened. Sincere condolences were also expressed to the victims and to the families of the deceased.

In the conversation, L. Pechevoy emphasized that one of the causes of the riots was the insufficient attention by the administration of the courses to the well thought-out organization of cadets' free time, and the attraction of some of them to black-market trading was not taken into account. These shortcomings are being corrected now. Exactingness on instructors has been increased, and attention to discipline and to political education of the cadets has been reinforced. Contacts with workers collectives and with representatives of the intelligentsia of Tashkent have been revitalized.

The students received a great positive emotional charge after meetings with former soldier-internationalists who defended the Afghan people, with Khodzhaakbar Ehr-gashev and Iman Nishanov and with Ismail Akhunov, an Arabic language teacher of school No 29, and with many other Soviet people. Such meetings convincingly prove that no one has any animosity and that the incident cannot nullify the deep traditions of friendship. It was, is, and will be.

AzSSR Procurator Ismailov on Corruption in Azerbaijan

18300285a Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian
20 Dec 88 p 3

[Interview with Ilyas Abbasovich Ismailov, Azerbaijan SSR procurator and state legal advisor, second class, by E. Aliyeva, Azerinform correspondent: "Corruption Is a Social Evil"; date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] [Aliyeva] Recently, at workers' meetings, they have been talking more and more often and with condemnation about the strong resistance being offered by corrupt clans to perestroyka, to the implementation of currently planned measures for improving living conditions and to the solution of problems affecting Azerbaijan's social development, who see in these things a real danger of their positions and privileges being undermined. They have been frightened by the open call to the party organization and to all the people of Azerbaijan to conduct a decisive war against this phenomenon, which is thoroughly alien to the nature of socialism. I would like to know, Ilyas Abbasovich, what is being done specifically in the struggle against corruption?

[Ismailov] The alarm of the people who are talking with anger and indignation about the corrupt clans is understandable. I do not remember who is responsible for the tragic joke: 'Geese saved Rome, but corruption ruined it.' We find ourselves today in a state of open conflict with those who, like fires, in great panic, fear the refreshing winds of perestroyka, glasnost and democratization. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave a precise definition of these anti-perestroyka forces, calling them political adventurers. 'These are power-hungry people. And they must be stopped by using all our might, political and administrative.'

Under the leadership of the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee, with the assistance of the USSR Procuracy and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the republic's law-enforcement agencies have waged a decisive fight against criminal groups of operators—the embezzlers of socialist property. I will tell you flat out that we have been extremely late in starting this struggle: indeed, the first signs of organized crime began to appear back in the '60's. However, the republic's former leaders overlooked or deliberately did not want to see them and, in any case, their guilt in the establishment of encouraging conditions for the existence and development of organized crime is beyond any doubt.

The dawning of corruption and its transformation into a dangerous social phenomenon occurred particularly in the middle of the '70's, when the political, legal, social and economic laws for the development of socialism began to be actively distorted in the republic. It is precisely in those years that the organizers of criminal associations set up steadfast ties with workers of various state and party organs who permitted them to expand their own criminal activities on a broad scale and to pump out from the state treasury tens of millions of rubles per year. The investigative agencies bothered only with individual, frequently trivial cases of embezzlement of socialist property, while organized crime, as a phenomenon, remained invulnerable. This was also facilitated by the circumstance that cases of lawlessness were not accorded the proper political evaluation in the republic's party and soviet organs. Today, we have the testimony of guilty parties about the fact that they were driven to crime by a number of former leaders of party and soviet organs. Statements about abuses had also been sent previously to the republic's procuracy. However, as a rule, they were sent on to the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee to be checked out.

Today, the struggle against organized crime in all sectors of the economy is being conducted on a broad scale and without compromise. Over a comparatively short interval of time, groups of wheeler-dealer embezzlers have been uncovered in the system of the Ministry of Light Industry, the State Agroindustrial Committee, the Ministry of Local Industry, in trade, in housing and municipal services and consumer services and in other departments. Several days ago, shown on television screens was the trial of a group of wheeler-dealers from the Baku Fancy-Goods Factory. The television viewers, of course, took note of the fact that the embezzlers created conditions favorable for themselves by bribing persons, each of whom should have stopped the indicated violations in light of their own official responsibilities. Thus, in connection with this criminal case, the investigation established that bribes were taken by one Aliyev, the deputy chief of the Administration for Gostorginspektsiya of the republic's Ministry of Trade, and Gadzhiyev and Manaforov, inspectors from the Ministry of Local Industry's Control and Inspection Administration. Bribes were also given to extra-departmental control workers and even to administrators of the plant's social organizations.

I want to say that many people responded to the alarm which resounded from the television screen. Literally on the very next day, reports began to come in to us about the bad state of affairs in a number of enterprises. It is significant that even some representatives of the 'shady' economy turned themselves in. It must be that they were led to come in by the desire to clear their consciences and by their faith in the humaneness of Soviet laws, the point of which is aimed not at minor persons who have been drawn into criminal acts, but rather, mainly at the big organizers who are corrupting the labor collectives.

We will not labor under a delusion. But, indeed, all this is proof of the understanding of the fact that an uncompromising struggle against corruption has truly begun in the republic.

A similar situation has been exposed, for example, in the toy, leather goods, textile and footwear factories of the Ministry of Light Industry, in the home crafts combine, in the Azerbaijan Supply Department Personnel Training Section and in a number of other enterprises of the Ministry of Local Industry and the Ministry of Social Security. The greatest alarm has been caused by organized crime in the republic's agroindustrial complex. On the cotton-growing kolkhozes of the Shamkhorskiy Rayon and other rayons as well, the criminals operated according to a tested system. Added to the plan for sales to the state of raw cotton were significant quantities of non-existent production, for which fictitious rosters with the names of kolkhoz workers were compiled and wages were charge, which were then given out by the farm managers. Part of the money was transferred in the form of bribes to the workers of the cotton mills for concealing the inevitable shortages and so on. The criminal group's organizer was one Veliyev, the former first secretary of the Shamkhorskiy Rayon's party committee, who involved in the criminal activities many managers and specialists of various farms in the rayon. Just over a 2-year period, the state suffered a loss in the amount of more than 20 million rubles.

Over a relatively short period, uncovered and brought to trial were 358 bribe-takers and 284 officials who had set out on the path of deception of the state and had made additions and misrepresentations in the accounts and 1,624 people had been involved in various economic crimes and malfeasance. They inflicted on the state a loss of 32.8 million rubles. Even in the last few weeks, embezzlement has been uncovered in the Ali-Bayramly and Salyany cotton-cleaning mills.

[Aliyeva] Which sectors of the economy have been hit hardest by corruption?

[Ismailov] As I have already mentioned, disguised groups of embezzlers have been and are still actively operating in the State Agroindustrial Committee's system and in the Ministries of Light and Local industries and Transport. In the agro-industrial complex, the central place is occupied by the cotton-growing, viticulture

and other farms. I think that the administrators of the Azerkhlopkoprom Republic Production Association and the ministries and departments should draw the corresponding conclusions. There are also such examples in the Ministries of Housing and Municipal Services and the Construction Materials Industry. Many citizen services bureaus cheated customers out of large sums during the manufacture of grave monuments, using for this stolen granite from the quarries of the construction materials combine, where the director was one Manucharov, who is now under arrest.

Corruption is making itself felt even in the consumers' cooperatives system. Just at Azerittifak's enterprise for the manufacture of equipment and metal structures, which lists 500 employees, at various times, 430 'dead souls' were listed, 110 of whom had never worked anywhere at all. The director of the 'little plant,' one Makhmudov, and others pocketed more than 1.2 million rubles. Such large-scale manipulations with personnel were not noticed by higher officials, although the facts were so flagrant that it was simply impossible not to see them.

[Aliyeva] Ilyas Abbasovich, you mentioned that there were also quite a few official among the uncovered criminals, including even the first secretary of a party raykom. Also known are the facts of the institution of criminal proceedings against a minister and a chairman of a rayispolkom. What is the role of an administrator in our time, when a struggle is being conducted on a broad scale, uncompromisingly, against corruptions and the anti-perestroika forces?

[Ismailov] The law is clear and unambiguous. An administrator bears full responsibility for the state of lawfulness in enterprises. I would advise those among them who do not want to reform and do not strive to keep in step with the times to take a less responsible position than the management of an economic sector or installation.

I recall a discussion at a session of the republic's Council of Ministers about a year ago concerning our information about the status of the struggle against such a dangerous type of violation of state discipline as padding. Imagine, one of the administrators of the ministries and departments tried to reduce the presence of the facts they had regarding the most flagrant misrepresentations in the accounts to the inadequate competence of the bookkeepers. This is hardly the kind of explanation of this organized evil which can help us to struggle against it successfully.

[Aliyeva] Please tell us, what are the complexities with which the procuracy's workers have to contend in the struggle against power-hungry political adventurists and corrupt clans?

[Ismailov] In addition to the purely professional complexities, our workers are encountering difficulties of a different kind, aimed at undermining and compromising our associates themselves. A great amount of effort and energy is being spent on checking a large number of unfounded complaints against them on the part of 'interested' persons. Frequently, group visits to the waiting rooms of the administrators of not only our organs, but also of the central soviet and party organs, are being incited. Having encountered the principled and persistent position of the organs' workers, the criminals are embarking upon an even more aggressive path, shifting to active and, as they obviously think, frightening means, with no aversion in their selection. Here one can recall the circumstances of the uncovering of the embezzlement of more than a million rubles at the Sabirabadskiy Rayon's Leningrad Kolkhoz, about which our press has already reported. After an attempt to bribe the procuracy's workers failed and there was an unsuccessful search for approaches to the investigation through swindlers who took them for nearly 200,000 rubles, the evil doers decided to burn down the rayon procuracy's building where the criminal case materials were being stored. Again, hired criminals set out and attempted to perform their black deed for 80,000 rubles. But this scheme was also foiled.

Unfortunately, such instances are not isolated. As has been mentioned, in the course of the recent disorders committed by some of the inhabitants of the Shekinskiy Rayon, an attack was also made on the rayon's procuracy and the building was burned. The indicated events were preceded by the successful work of this procuracy in uncovering large-scale embezzlers of socialist property. Into its field of view had also fallen other serious facts concerning violations of the law by certain highly placed officials. Obviously, they were counting on the fire destroying the materials needed for the disclosure. The wheeler-dealers' dreams were not realized. A team of investigators from the republic's procuracy and other regions of the country, along with workers from the offices of the Ministry of Internal Affairs got down to business. But even this does not stop the evil intentions of the interested persons. The methods are the old ones—staked on intimidation. During the night from 15 to 16 December of this year, an attempt was undertaken to burn the vehicle of an associate of the Criminal Investigation Division who was taking part in this investigative group's work.

Our associates are not frightened by such opposition, just as they were not shaken by the attack by an unruly crowd on the oblast procuracy of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast in Stepanakert. We knew that, among the attackers, were quite a few people who had been deceived by Manucharov and his accomplices who used nationalistic slogans to mask the large extent of the bribery and other machinations.

[Aliyeva] Ilyas Abbasovich, in this enormous work that has currently been expanded in the republic in the struggle against organized crime, do you and your associates need earnest help?

[Ismailov] The procuracy's organs are receiving support every hour daily from the leadership of the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee. Since May, and especially since August of 1988, we have become aware, almost physically, of how inexorably the relapses of the 'telephone,' 'made-to-order' and other antisocialist types of 'rights,' so typical for the leaders of the stagnant era, have become a thing of the past. A large group of comrades from the USSR Procuracy and other regions of the country are giving us earnest help in eliminating organized crime.

It is not really possible to complain of difficulties when the support of the republic's party staff has been assured. And, of course, we are inspired by the support of the republic's workers and entire community.

Single Mother Without Papers Forced To Live on Streets

18300235 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 23 Nov 88 p 1

[Special correspondent N. Varsegov report: "Show Me a Television, Mama..."]

[Text] In 1986 a thin 20-year-old woman called Katya Golovkova was wandering half-starved and with a babe in arms around the basements and attics of the city of Izhevsk (at that time, Ustinov). At that time the whole country was "sobbing" in front of television screens, listening to lengthy reports on the fate of a homeless American who had been found in the slums of New York and who had come to the USSR.... But Katya could not even sympathize with the New Yorker since, lacking a home and, consequently, a television, had no inkling even of his existence.

Two years have elapsed. What the fate of the homeless American has been I know not. But Katya and her little daughter are still living on the street. They spend the nights at the station, in attics, at the police station.... "Last time Uncle Ravil gave us some money so we spent the night in a hotel...." "And there's even television there, Mam! It shows everything!"

Katya was born in a remote Udmurt village. Her father was a drunkard. He used to torture both her mother and the children. Once, when Katya was 16, her father, off his head from hooch, kicked her out of bed at night and knifed her: in the face, in the stomach.... The doctors came, but she became an invalid.

She left for Izhevsk and found herself a job at the "Neftemash" plant in the guard department. She had worked for 2 years, and everything was so-so, but.... pregnancy. Katya Golovkova said: "The superintendent

and governess came down on me hard: clear out of the hostel! But where was I to go? Prokofyev, chief of the guard, summoned me and said: 'Either have an abortion or you are sacked.' And then the superintendent and the governess stole my papers and expelled me from the hostel. When I had given birth, I immediately went looking for work. Somewhere as a cleaner temporarily, somewhere as a hospital attendant, but they would not give me accommodation, and around the attics it is cold in winter.... This year I was taken on by the guard at the engineering works. I was delighted: I would have the hostel. I had worked for some time and had gone on my days off to see my mother in the village. But the next day I was so beaten up by my brother that I ended up in hospital with concussion of the brain. I left the hospital, and was immediately sacked from the engineering works. I pleaded with them and wept, but they would not take me, and everything...."

It is sad listening to this confession. It is hard to believe that such callousness and hard-heartedness are possible in our day.... But here is the fate of another young woman—Irina Grigoryeva. She and Katina are as alike as two peas. I will not retell it, just one detail: "When I was pregnant, Prokofyev (chief of the "Neftemash" guard, I would remind you—N.V.) went on and on using foul language: 'Get an abortion, and that's all there is to it.' He even suggested an old woman 'specialist'. They began to hound me out of the hostel, well... I had to leave."

Love at the "Neftemash" is a degrading concept. It simply cannot exist in some other dimensions here. In order to love and start a family the conditions are needed, but what kind of conditions if even former internationalist soldier A. Abramov, who returned from Afghanistan an invalid and who had worked at the "Neftemash" for 3 years, could not obtain an apartment. He languished with his wife and two children in a roomlet 9 meters square. True, just prior to my arrival Abramov acquired an apartment, but only after having appealed to the CPSU Central Committee. His life's drama pales against the background of the dramatic fate of the other homeless members of the "Neftemash" outfit.

In order to describe morale in Department 016 (the "Neftemash" guard) I need to quote a number of documents. They speak for themselves eloquently, I believe. So, the first:

"We workers of Department 016 complained to A.N. Alalykin, secretary of the 'Neftemash' plant party committee, about the abuses of Department Chief Prokofyev and N. Savelyeva, chief of the Permit Office.

"Comrade Alalykin thanked us for coming to see him and asked us to provide new facts in writing, which we did...."

"We the undersigned bring to your notice the fact that Department Chief Prokofyev is abusing his office. On 3 September 1987 he illegally acquired a firearm—a Margolin pistol—and has used it for personal ends...."

Which precisely is not said. Personally I simply cannot understand how a Margolin pistol may be used for personal ends under Izhevsk's conditions. Using it as a threat, persuading the next woman guard into an abortion?

The "undersigned" guard workers go on to paint a vivid picture of the work routine of their subdivision and their department colleagues. "Proceedings were instituted in 1985 against Permit Office Chief Savelyeva for embezzlement, but she continues to work in her old job. In work hours she drives around the city's stores with a shopping bag... with Telitsina (an officer of the guard) and drinks tea in work time. While on duty at her post Telitsina goes by bicycle and with the drivers for vodka."

Scandalous facts, seemingly. Check them out and take steps! But after a while the "petitioners" were forced to write another "petition" to the party committee secretary: "How did you react to our joint letter? Some 'quadrangle' hung up a notice saying that there would be a meeting. The 'quadrangle' announced that the meeting had been assembled on the results of the commission's work. Those who criticized Prokofyev were called bawlers, and Abramov, the invalid-internationalist, was coarsely called names by Teplitsina in the presence of the 'quadrangle'. And Teplitsina further declared that she would hit Grigoryeva after the meeting. As a result the big political activity—the meeting—ended in a fight...."

Yes, finally, the last document, which sums things up, as it were: "To the gorkom party commission, to the Udmurt Obkom party commission.

"An extremely unhealthy atmosphere has taken shape in Department 016 of the 'Neftemash' plant created by the writing of complaints and objections by department communists R. Mukhamedshin and S. Vakhrushev. The situation is beyond the control of the plant party committee and management and could at any moment experience a dramatic outcome since the vast majority of guard officers has access to weapons. The more so in that there has already been an instance of a set-to on these grounds."

Let us look at the correlation of contending forces. On the one side department communist S. Vakhrushev and Prokofyev's deputy, R. Mukhamedshin, that same Uncle Ravil who on occasion gives money to the homeless Katya Golovkova and her little daughter.

On the other, of course, Savelyeva and Prokofyev. Between them is A.N. Alalykin, secretary of the plant party committee.

The enmity of the parties threatening to develop into a shooting match did not come about all at once. A person was once detained in the passageway. No, not with a valve from a high-pressure oil pipeline in short supply but with 5 kg of meat! The meat had been purchased in the plant restaurant. "However," Prokofyev explained, "by order of the director taking meat from the plant is most strictly forbidden. Why? Because a person who has bought 5 kg of meat in the restaurant is depriving 100-150 persons of a nutritious high-calorie meal!" And the purchased meat was confiscated. Prokofyev and Savelyeva drew up a document, but... the further fate of the piece of meat remained unknown not only to the community at large but to Mukhamedshin himself even, which added for "Uncle Ravil" another portion of dislike and suspicion in respect of his chief.

Nor was Prokofyev without trump cards. Once Mukhamedshin was knocking together from plywood, of which there is much lying around at the enterprise, a parcel box. He was suddenly grabbed by the arm!

Here the party committee and its secretary should have intervened in good time! To dot the "i's," as they say.... Alas, the same R. Mukhamedshin had reason not to trust the authority of the party committee and its secretary. Last year A.N. Alalykin had acquired a handsome three-room apartment, having worked at the plant for about 6 years (a simply fantastic length of time for obtaining an apartment at the "Neftemash"!). R. Mukhamedshin and V. Novikov, correspondent of the plant newspaper, showed that the apartment should be granted Abramov, who had been hit by bandit bullets. Correspondent Novikov prepared material for his PROGRESS newspaper entitled "The 'Afghan' Should Be Helped". But Comrade Alalykin went and removed this material from the issue! In addition, the party committee secretary

recommended for the same paper an article of different content. Entitled "Sailor From the Battleship". "...Not many people know," the reporter excitedly informed us, "that Maksim Vasilyevich is the grandfather of A.N. Alalykin, secretary of the plant's party committee...." The article described the glorious revolutionary fate of Maksim Vasilyevich. And the article ended with the following words of the grandfather-revolutionary: "Thus was the truth attained, young man."

Words addressed, seemingly, to all of us.... To his grandson, the plant party committee secretary, also, consequently?

Had not A.N. Alalykin forgotten the main thing: the reason for the conflict which had erupted at the plant? The reason was as before.... Here she is again "traveling" from house to house, living cooped up in the attics and asking to be able to spend the night at the hostel with her young daughter.

The reason is Katya Golovkova, homeless and without a permit in the city of Izhevsk. Is she to blame for the fact that Prokofyev, who is called upon to safeguard public property, has a "unique" understanding of his role and sees it primarily as moral and ethical pressure (read: at pistol point!) on pregnant colleagues?

And the sole person who fought Prokofyev at their plant and who helped her, "Uncle Ravil Mukhamedshin," was expelled from the party.

To ask the party committee secretary: "Why so?" and look Comrade Alalykin in the eye: "Whose heir are you, can it be of your grandfather-revolutionary?" Katyusha does not dare—the lives of a party committee secretary and a female guard are too different.

Armenian CP Buro Scores Local Officials' Performance in Political Crisis

*18300266a Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian
6 Dec 88 pp 1-2*

[Unattributed report: "At the Armenian CP Central Committee"]

[Text] On 4 December 1988, a regular session of the Armenian CP Central Committee Buro was held.

The question was discussed of the immediate measures to prevent facts of clashes between the nationalities. It was pointed out that a tense and explosive situation continues to survive in the republic. Recently this has assumed an overtly threatening nature. In certain regions with a mixed Armenian-Azerbaijan population there have been an exacerbation and broadening of conflicts and clashes on nationality grounds and the mutual flow of refugees has increased. In a number of instances, events have gotten out of control and people have been killed. The republic has been on an extremely dangerous edge. A particularly tense situation developed in Gugarkskiy, Stepanavanskiy, Gorisskiy, Kalininskiy, Araratskiy, Vardenisskiy and other rayons.

In the existing situation the party, soviet and Komsomol bodies are not showing proper firmness. In the work of many of them there is no clear political line deriving from the true interests of the workers. Often they surrender principled positions and there is not sufficient depth and aggressiveness in the ideological indoctrinational work carried out. The fear of "losing trust" and the giving way to nationalistic moods have led to a situation where a portion of the party aktiv is slipping from its internationalist positions.

Many materials published in the press and broadcast over the airwaves fan emotions and passions and heat up the situation.

The Armenian MVD and its bodies on the spot have not taken decisive measures to prevent clashes on an inter-nationality basis and have not met the tasks of ensuring the safety of the public.

The situation which arose in the republic was a result of flagrant mistakes and failings in the activities of the party, the soviet law enforcement bodies which were unable to bring about a fundamental change in improving the moral and psychological climate in the labor collectives, institutions of learning, and to mobilize forces to prevent clashes between nationalities as well as mass disorders involving human victims.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro has obliged the party gorkoms and raykoms, the first secretaries personally, and the law enforcement bodies to head the work in stabilizing the situation in the regions, to restore legality and order and prevent the escalating of the mass disorders and violence. They are decisively stop

instances of forcing persons of Azerbaijan nationality to leave Armenia, and are to provide a principled rebuff of demagogues who provoke clashes between the nationalities as well as those attempting to replace democratic forms of public behavior with unbridled, uncontrolled actions.

The party, soviet, Komsomol and public organizations have been instructed to thoroughly explain that the main task at present is to unite and consolidate the workers on positions of internationalism and revolutionary restructuring, to overcome all the reciprocal insults and be concerned with placating people and halting events in their dangerous development. There must be a sound improvement in the international indoctrination in the primary party organizations and in the labor collectives. This must be carried out by the method of painstaking, thorough work with each communist and with each worker.

The party gorkoms and raykoms, the executive committees of the local soviets and the law enforcement bodies have been instructed to ensure the safety of the public and to take effective measures to improve relations between the nationalities. They are to conduct an uncompromising struggle against those who incite the people to disorder, who sow all sorts of rumors and fan mistrust between the nationalities. In a most decisive manner, including the expelling of the guilty parties from the ranks of the CPSU and instituting criminal liability, they must struggle against the disgraceful facts of the dismissal of persons because of nationality.

The mass information and propaganda media must do everything to help halt events and bring them into the channel of normalization and reconciliation. Their most important task is to bring the sense and spirit of the Appeal of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the Situation in the Nagorny Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and Around It to each person and to all the workers of the republic.

The republic procurator's office and the Armenian MVD have been instructed to implement immediate measures to promptly and fully expose and investigate the committed crimes. Within the period of a week the collegiums must review the question of the personal responsibility of the leaders of the rayon law enforcement bodies where instances of mass excesses have occurred.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro has reviewed the question of the internationality conflict and its tragic consequences in Gugarkskiy Rayon. The adopted decree pointed out that under the conditions of the extremely tense situation existing in the republic, the Gugarkskiy Party Raykom (raykom first secretary, Comrade L. Bagdasaryan) and the executive committee of the rayon soviet (chairman of the RIK [rayon executive committee], Comrade S. Kazaryan) permitted the escalation of the internationality conflict and did not ensure proper supervision over public order.

Contributing to an exacerbation of the situation in Gugarksiy Rayon were the provocative actions by the organization of the so-called Karabakh Committee in Kirovakan.

All of this led to direct internationality conflicts. Instances of violence and pogroms were permitted and as a result of this in recent days there have been victims on the territory of Gugarksiy Rayon. The events which occurred became possible as a consequence of the political shortsightedness and inertia of the Gugarksiy Party Raykom and the Executive Committee of the Rayon Soviet as well as flagrant mistakes and failings in their work in the area of ideological-moral, international and patriotic indoctrination of the workers. Determination and efficiency were not shown in preventing the illegal actions, conflicts and crimes. A principled assessment and decisive rebuff were not given to the nationalistically inclined elements, to the political demagogues and provocateurs. Hard-to-remedy damage was done to internationality relations.

All of this was possible under conditions of inaction, the indifference of a significant portion of the party, soviet, trade union, Komsomol and economic aktiv, as well as the extreme slowness, indecisiveness and inability to flexibly assess the situation as evidenced by the Gugarksiy ROVD [Rayon Internal Affairs Section] (chief, Comrade S. Abovyan).

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro, for the evidenced political shortsightedness and for the criminal actions which occurred in the rayon and involved an escalating of the internationality conflict and human victims, has announced a strict reprimand against the First Secretary of the Gugarksiy Party Raykom, Comrade L.M. Bagdasaryan, with the entry of this in his party card; he has been released from the position held.

For passivity and the failure to take effective measures to prevent clashes between nationalities, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Gugarksiy Rayon Soviet, Comrade S.A. Kazaryan, was given a strict reprimand with the noting of this in the party card. His further employment in the given position was considered impossible.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro obliged the Gugarksiy Party Raykom and the Executive Committee of the Rayon Soviet to take immediate measures to improve the political situation in the rayon, to thwart any attempts at criminal, provocative actions and establish safe conditions for the life and labor of the people.

The Armenian MVD and the republic procurator's office were instructed to conduct a careful investigation of the activities of the law enforcement bodies in Gugarksiy Rayon and hold strictly responsible any officials who had shown inactivity and passivity in the developing situation.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro reviewed the question of instances of mass flight out of the republic by persons of Azerbaijan nationality from Yekhegnadzorskiy Rayon.

It was pointed out that the party raykom (raykom first secretary, Comrade S. Tarverdyan) and the executive committee of the rayon soviet (chairman of the RIK, Comrade M. Dovlatyan) in an emergency situation showed political shortsightedness and inertia, they committed major mistakes in working in the area of ideological-moral and international indoctrination of the workers and were unable to mobilize the forces of the party, the soviet, trade union, Komsomol and economic aktiv and the law enforcement bodies to ensure a normal pace of life and labor and stabilize the situation.

The conflict which arose in June 1988 between the Armenian and Azerbaijan population of certain villages in the rayon led to a deterioration of internationality relations and became the pretext for intensifying overall tension. This told seriously on the rayon's economy. In virtually all the Azerbaijan villages, agricultural work was paralyzed. Around 17,000 head of sheep and goats and 1,300 head of cattle remained untended.

The unstable situation which has lasted over the last months in the rayon, the unceasing meetings and strikes were not a matter of serious analysis and the adopting of decisive measures by the party, soviet and economic aktiv.

The buro of the party raykom and the executive committee of the rayon soviet by their passivity connived with criminal elements who were heightening the situation of hostility and discord between the nationalities.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro pointed out the unsatisfactory work of the Yekhegnadzorskiy Party Raykom in ensuring a normal situation in the rayon and in preventing the migration of the population, and for the failure to take decisive measures to fundamentally improve the political situation, strict reprimands with the entry of this in the party cards were declared for the First Secretary of the Yekhegnadzorskiy Party Raykom, Comrade S.P. Tarverdyan, and the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Yekhegnadzorskiy Rayon Soviet, Comrade M.A. Dovlatyan.

The Yekhegnadzorskiy Party Raykom was instructed to take immediate measures to improve the moral and political situation in the rayon.

**Armenian Media's Performance During Unrest
Blasted by Party Buro**
*18300266b Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian
28 Dec 88 p 1*

[Unattributed report: "At the Armenian CP Central Committee"]

[Text] The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro has discussed the question "On Serious Shortcomings in Treating the Questions of Internationality Relations in

the Republic Mass Information and Propaganda Media." It was pointed out that in a meeting at the CPSU Central Committee between M.S. Gorbachev and deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet who were representatives of Azerbaijan and Armenia and with the leadership of both republics and Nagornyy Karabakh, it was justly pointed out that the Azerbaijani and Armenian press often by their rash and imbalanced articles had been guilty of inflammatory appeals, had played on national feelings and had helped support antirestructuring forces as a result of which passions were fanned, tension increased and serious harm done to the relations between the two peoples.

Individual leaders of the republic mass information media have at times shown a miscomprehension of the exceptionalness of the situation and this has led to instances of publishing ideologically and politically immature materials not contributing to the tasks of settling internationality relations and bringing the republic out of a crisis situation. The press, television and radio, under the conditions of the special situation, were unable to quickly adapt, to revise the subject and problems of their articles and broadcasts and their focus in order to actively aid in altering the atmosphere in the republic over the NKAO [Nagornyy Karabakh Autonomous Oblast], to switch the accent to improving the situation, to purge it of everything that poisoned internationality relations and spoiled life over these months. They were slow in beginning to implement the demands of the Decree of the Armenian CP Central Committee of 29 November 1988 "On the Situation in the Republic and Immediate Measures to Normalize It." On the pages of the newspapers SOVETAKAN AYASTAN, KOMMUNIST, YEREKOYAN YEREVAN, AVANGARD, KOMSOMOLETS, the journal VOZNI and in the TV and radio broadcasts, there still have not been balanced speeches and comments by the leading party and soviet workers, scientists and cultural leaders and which would contain a sober and thorough analysis of the situation in the republic and would call for reason, coordinated actions and practical steps toward one another, and for lifting the reciprocal boycott. The press and television in a timid and inadequate manner have come out against the inadmissible openly provocative actions of irresponsible and adventuristically inclined persons. They have not always soberly assessed the extremely acute situation arising in the region, the dangerous development of events fraught with irremediable consequences in an always correct and party manner. Certain leaders of the mass information media have been held prisoner by feelings and emotions and at times have shown an irresponsible attitude toward the performing of their duties.

Individual press bodies, instead of condemning the involvement of children in a discussion of internationality problems, in meetings and demonstrations, on the contrary, have encouraged this phenomenon. The Sisianskiy Rayon newspaper VOROTAN has permitted instances of a distorted treatment of the questions of

internationality relations, it has encouraged the involvement of citizens in demonstrations and meetings and has shown nonobjective criticism of articles appearing in the central press organs.

Recently, along with the city and rayon newspapers (Abovyan, Aniyskiy, Razdan, Megri, Sisiyan, Shamshadinskiy and others) there have been instances of a lack of discipline and a nonfulfillment of instructions of Armenpress [Armenian Press Agency] on the publishing of official materials.

The designated shortcomings, oversights and mistakes in the work of the republic mass information media have been the result of poor discipline and lax exactingness in the editorial offices of the newspapers, Gosteleradio [State Television and Radio] and Armenpress on the ideological and political level and content of the materials as well as due to a professional immaturity on the part of certain workers and their failure to understand the primary responsible tasks in normalizing the situation in the republic and region.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro has drawn the attention of the leaders of the press organs, Armenpress and Gosteleradio (Comrades B. Mkrtchyan, Shch. Davryan, S. Pogosyan, E. Manukyan, K. Varanyan, M. Zograbyan, and M. Mkrtchyan) to the unsatisfactory execution of their official duties and as a result of which harmful materials not helping to normalize the situation in the republic were published in the press and transmitted over the airwaves. They were warned that they bear personal responsibility for the political content of the published materials. For the ideologically harmful publications found in the journal VOZNI, a strict reprimand was issued to the editor-in-chief, Comrade A. Saakyan.

The Yerevan Party Gorkom was instructed to review the questions of holding responsible to the party the Deputy Chairman of the Armenian Gosteleradio, the CPSU member, Comrade P. Stepanyan who was guilty of a negligent attitude toward organizing direct radio relaying as well as sending over the airwaves ideologically and professionally weak radio broadcasts; the same was initiated against the editor of the newspaper SOVETAKAN DPROTS, the CPSU member, Comrade L. Karapetyan for publishing materials having an antiindoctritional nature, which provided incorrect orientation for children and contained appeals to involve them in meetings and demonstrations.

The Sisianskiy Party Raykom was instructed to review the question of holding strictly responsible the editor of the rayon newspaper VOROTAN, the CPSU member, Comrade K. Gevorkyan, in line with the harmful publications which appeared on the pages of the newspaper.

The results of the review are to be reported to the Armenian CP Central Committee within a period of 2 weeks.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro has obliged the party gorkoms and raykoms to review the facts of ignoring the instructions of Armenpress on publishing important political materials and documents on the part of the editors of the city and rayon newspapers.

The leaders of the mass information media and the publishers of agency newspapers and journals have been instructed to take specific measures to improve the ideological and political level of the materials, to fundamentally revise the subject of articles on internationality relations and the problems of the NKAO and to decisively stop publications which could impede the improving of the situation in the region and the shifting of events into a channel of normalization, reconciliation and friendship.

All the work of the press should be based upon the materials of the November (1988) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the Extraordinary 19th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Decree of 1 December 1988 "On the Request of the Group of Deputies on the Situation in the NKAO and Around It," and the meeting at the CPSU Central Committee of M.S. Gorbachev with the deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet who are representatives of Azerbaijan and Armenia and with the leadership of both republics and Nagornyy Karabakh. They have been instructed to broadly support and popularize the appeal found in the Decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 1 December 1988 to the workers of Armenia and Azerbaijan to show wisdom and restraint, to surmount the mutual insults and accusations, to establish a proper pace of work at the enterprises, organizations and institutions of learning, and make every effort so that each Soviet person, regardless of nationality, feels himself to be a citizen with full rights on Armenian territory.

The mass information bodies, as their main task, should effectively help to unite and consolidate the workers on positions of internationalism, friendship and the unity of the Soviet peoples, and should widely show the enormous, unselfish aid to Armenia from the paternal republics in line with the natural disaster. They must pay particular attention to a thorough and complete elucidation of the questions raised in the interview with M.S. Gorbachev for the correspondents of Central Television and Armenian Television. For this purpose, they must organize actions by the leading party and soviet bodies, scientific and cultural figures and production pacesetters, and must publish materials on the manifestations of political and civil maturity, humaneness and high morality in relations with the representatives of the national minorities inhabiting the republic. There must be a decisive move against attitudes of national discord, instances of violence committed against Azerbaijani and the attempts to expel them from their homes. On the pages of the newspapers and journals, in the radio and TV broadcasts as well as by the other mass information

media they must provide sharp, principled criticism against the harmful activities of the so-called Karabakh Committee and show its dangerous, adventuristic nature.

The leaders of the republic newspapers, Armenpress and Gosteleradio are obliged within a 1-week period to submit a quarterly specific plan for these publications to the Armenian CP Central Committee.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro has obliged the primary party organizations in the mass information media to revise ideological and political work in the editorial collectives, to indoctrinate the communists and other editorial workers in a spirit of party loyalty, principledness and internationalism, and to take effective measures to raise their responsibility for the assigned job. Considering the existing situation, in the collectives it is essential to establish a situation of great exactingness and rectitude excluding the possibility of the appearance of immature, harmful materials on the pages of the press or on the airwaves. They must assist in every possible way in normalizing the situation and in bringing the republic out of a crisis situation.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro has also discussed the article "Into Whose Hands Does This Play?" published in the newspaper SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA on 9 December 1988. The article pointed out that en route to the destination of Leninakan, nationalistically inclined, hooligan elements endeavored to beat up and then, being threatened with reprisal, forced to return to Azerbaijan a group of drivers and welders being sent to the republic to provide aid to the victims of the earthquake. The workers of the public health bodies present here did not intervene into the incident.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro has pointed out that such an instance of heightening discord between the nationalities and intensifying anger and hate is a direct extension of the actions of the Karabakh Committee which over the last 10 months has endeavored to prevent a decline in tension and has not ceased fanning nationalistic passions.

The provocateurs from the Karabakh Committee, in speculating on the misfortune which befell the Armenian people, in a very difficult situation are impelling others toward discord between nationalities, they are fanning hostility and profaning pure motives. And this is happening in a time when the Armenian people have felt deeply the entire great force of Soviet internationalism, and when in an hour of tragedy our grief has been shared by all the nation and supported by the peoples of the world.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro feels that in these grief-stricken days for the people and under these unprecedentedly complicated, extreme conditions which require the greatest responsibility, organization and

unity, such provocative actions by the nationalistically inclined people cause irreconcilable harm to the friendship of the Armenian and Azerbaijani peoples.

The Armenian CP Central Committee Buro has decisively condemned the instance which occurred of unleashing discord between the nationalities and heightening tension in the region, as described by the newspaper SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in its article "Into Whose Hands Does This Play?" and has drawn the attention of the party gorkoms, raykoms and their first secretaries personally to the need to strengthen ideological and political work among the public, to take immediate measures to prevent irresponsible provocative actions by individual extremist and nationalistically inclined persons and to give them a principled party assessment.

The Armenian MVD has been instructed to carry out immediate measures to investigate the instance which occurred of instigating discord between the nationalities.

The Central Committee Buro reviewed the structure of the apparatus of the Presidium of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, the organizational structure of the management of the Armenian State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, and the general managerial schemes for the Armenian Ministry of Communications and the Armenian State Committee for Environmental Conservation.

Other questions were discussed involving the socioeconomic life of the republic.

**Recent Activities, Goals of 'Transformed'
Karabakh Committee Rebuked**
*18300267a Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian
28 Dec 88 p 4*

[Article by S. Petrosyan "Is This a Time to Collect Rocks?"; a translation of an abbreviated form of this article, texted from the 3 January KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, appeared on pages 36-37 of the FBIS DAILY REPORT: SOVIET UNION, FBIS-SOV-89-002, dated 4 January 1989]

[Text] The natural disaster in Armenia involving tens of thousands of victims and the virtually complete destruction of a number of cities and population points in the republic's north evoked great pain and sympathy on the part of millions of honest people in the world. Everywhere, from all ends of our nation and from foreign countries, including from the Armenian countries, money and donations, medicines and essential goods were dispatched to assist in the nationwide aid developing in our country to help the Armenian people in eliminating the consequences of the destructive earthquake. We can read about this every day in the newspapers and magazines. But not only read. Hundreds of thousands of residents from Leninakan, Spitak and scores of destroyed villages are now feeling the reality of

the aid. Yes, the world "turned over," more accurately, it faced away from confrontation toward mutual understanding. And if not completely, at least such an attempt is present.

The pain of the Armenian people and the sympathy for this pain on the part of millions of people has seemingly brought closer even the rabid ideological opponents when confronted with the tragedy that befell one people, a small heroic handful of mankind. The world, probably for the first time in its history which so abounds in wars and conflicts, misunderstanding and hostility, has realized the entire interdependence of our common human society and the fragility of the world. We have begun to realize that without help, without charity and pain for the pain of others we will not survive. The noble words that we cannot escape the pain of others precisely in these days of our world has been proven with concrete deeds.

Against the background of humanistic acts which have assumed an international scale, all the more blasphemous is the desire of individual adventurers to extract political dividends from the arising situation and overemphasize the problem of the so-called informal associations.

Arising on a surge of democratic changes in our society and in the fight against negative phenomena, a number of such associations has gradually been turned into a "Trojan horse," which threatens to strike at restructuring.

We feel that it is worthwhile looking more closely at that transformation which the Karabakh Committee has undergone in the last 10 months in altering its political goals, slogans, methods of shaping and influencing public awareness and, most importantly, the actual results of its activities. Yes, the outburst of public and political activeness on the part of the people was objectively predetermined by the powerful democratic processes occurring in the nation. There was a social basis for this in the form of a clump of urgent and acute problems which we had inherited and which had been exacerbated by the errors of the former distant and close leaders. Finally, there was the problem of Nagorny Karabakh which under the conditions of glasnost was given the broadest social exposure.

However, let us recall how frequently the voices of excited nationalism had intervened in this problem. How many phrases had there been heightening social conscience to a point of active nonacceptance of other languages, cultures and religions. From where did these derive. In any event not from our people, a profoundly international people. A people who had learned to imbibe and accept other traditions, another culture..., "to pass" them through their own national "ego" and assume a new quality.

At that time, where were these hostile slogans coming from concerning national restrictiveness, particularness and exclusiveness? Was it right for some of the newly appeared zealots of the nation to use them? Did they not know, did they not foresee the consequences of the tension, the escalating of national instincts, the playing and manipulating of feelings and thoughts of others for the sake of selfish political goals?

Is there an alternative to a peaceful, political solution to the problem of Nagornyy Karabakh and which, as was said on the highest level, has not been removed from the agenda? Is there an alternative to the fraternal alliance with Russia, to the collective nationwide restructuring of the decrepit sociopolitical, economic and legal structures and the "lean" peace with neighbors? If these do exist what are they? A "good" quarrel and, hence, more blood, the mutual counting of victims and a curfew? The fatiguing strikes which sharply turn public opinion in the nation against Karabakh? The shameful and fatal idea of a pan-national state?

Or perhaps destruction is the end in itself? And what will happen as a result of all of this with the people? These natural and fateful questions, alas, do not fit into the scheme of the political course of the Karabakh Committee. The main thing for it now is to bring nationalism to the point beyond which one has merely to calmly "gather stones."

In the opinion of the leaders of certain informal associations and, in particular, the Karabakh Committee, the time to "gather stones" is already here or just about.

But just what "stones" are meant?

The Deutsche Welle radio station on 20 December 1988 proclaimed: "The Armenian human rights activist Ashot Manucharyan has warned of the danger of civil war in Armenia which could engulf, in his opinion, all the USSR. Manucharyan urged the head of the Soviet state and party Gorbachev to resume the interrupted dialogue with the Karabakh Committee." And on 21 December, the same radio, in developing this theme, announced that Manucharyan had given an interview to the Hamburg magazine *Stern*, having stated that "throughout Armenia the youth armed with hand grenades and guns is ready. No one knows their precise number, however if the situation grows more tense, they will launch an attack."

The Deutsche Welle was seconded by Radio Canada in announcing equally "important information": "In the words of Manucharyan, among certain young Armenians there is the widespread opinion that only by armed struggle is it possible to achieve the annexation of Nagornyy Karabakh by Armenia."

But against whom will the grenade attack be launched and in what manner of armed combat can one secure the annexation of the NKAO [Nagornyy Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] to Armenia? Are these really the words of a man in his right mind and not those of a political adventurer? And such people are claiming the role of the nation's leaders.

It is difficult to judge how accurate are the references by Deutsche Welle to the statements of A. Manucharyan. Seemingly, in such a situation it would be a matter of honor for Manucharyan himself to clarify this question, however he prefers to be "on the run." Certainly if, as we were assured by someone on Manucharyan's behalf in an anonymous letter which is circulating through the city, he and his co-comrades have not done anything contrary to the law, then why hide from human eyes.

It was whispered through the city: "Manucharyan could not have said that, his words were twisted by the magazine *Stern* and the various radio stations." Could he not have said that? He could! Both he and his colleagues on the Karabakh Committee.

It was L. Ter-Petrosyan himself who, in a meeting on 21 September 1988, stated that "if a legal path brings the people to a stalemate, if the people believe that we have no law, then in this instance the people will resort to armed struggle."

Let us leave to Ter-Petrosyan's conscience the references to the people. The people are not the question rather his ideas and words. At a meeting on 22 September he stated: "You must recognize that Armenia is occupied. The army which is quartered in Yerevan and other places in Armenia is not our army. It is the enemy army." The enemy army! This is how far one can go in endeavoring to achieve one's goal no matter what the cost.

On the very same day, A. Manucharyan stated: "If suddenly these troops should attack the people, then let them know that this will be a second Afghanistan."

From whence this hate for our army, this blasphemy against the internationalist soldiers among whom are many Armenians who honestly carried out and are carrying out their duty? We can come back to this.

We can come back to this.

The question now is that the references of STERN and the others to the statements of Manucharyan are not devoid of validity. But this is not merely a statement.

Here is a letter which made its way to one of the law enforcement institutions.

ULTIMATUM

We demand the immediate release of the leaders of the Karabakh Committee and all political prisoners arrested recently. We will grant 24 hours for consideration. Otherwise, we will switch to mass terror. We will not state the time and place of action. We are armed with "Stingers" supplied by our friends.

The start of the ultimatum is 22 December 1988 at 2100 hours local time.

Someone might say that this is merely a hooliganistic action by a rash young person. But the grenades which A. Manucharyan mentioned do exist and in large numbers. Here they are, the housings of these grenades, in a photograph [not reproduced].

What is shown here is just part of what was confiscated. The young people, close acquaintances of A. Manucharyan and other committee members, had made these housings and acquired the explosives for them. Perhaps Manucharyan had them in mind in threatening a "second Afghanistan."

Just what is all of this: the insinuations of the Western mass information media, children's pranks or reality? For understandable considerations, for now nothing more can be said on this question. But the time will come and everything will be in place and the people will learn the entire truth.

We are far from the idea of identifying the political leaders who rode the wave of Karabakh with those who heeded them on Theater Square and followed the moving phrase and the vivid word. But what lies behind these words? In our minds we turn to many sober-thinking authorities of the nation who for 10 months have not voiced their opinions to the demonstrating fellow citizens. When will their ardent words be needed?

Incidentally, in recent months any speech by a "dissident" on the square, in the street, by radio, television or at a party or trade union meeting was fraught by very lamentable consequences for him. He risked being turned over to the ridicule of the crowd, to experience obstruction and social ostracism on the job, at home, by telephone or in writing, and to be deprived of his position and good name. And without any concession for advanced age, weaker sex or even high clerical position.

The path of transformation was as follows: from a "spontaneous" democracy to the establishing of subcommittees at enterprises, organizations and institutions. From restructuring, constitutional constructive slogans to nationalistic exhortations. From disobedience of the requirements of marshal law to direct forms of confrontation with the authorities....

In the mail which is arriving now at the Armenian CP Central Committee and in the letters to the editors there are numerous letters which provide a sober assessment of the activities of the newly appeared zealots of the nation, and they analyze their political and moral results. This, in particular, was taken up by the war and labor veterans Shota Avanesyan from Dilizhan, Ilya Sarkisyan, a group of students from Yerevan and many others. They voiced their concern over the extremely acute situation between the nationalities and their negative attitude toward those who during these tragic days for the republic think up and disseminate all sorts of fanciful rumors, who spread fear and panic among the people and incite new demonstrations and clashes with the authorities. "...On the front," wrote the war veteran Vilen Dadayan from Yerevan, "provocateurs were condemned under all the severity of wartime. And this was done correctly, for a single incorrect word of a provocateur could have the most lamentable consequences...."

The analogy is perfectly apt. Certainly we must show truly frontline tenacity and discipline when confronted with the disaster and its consequences. Precisely the appearance of human solidarity and charity at present are gaining their proper social response. For this reason people are naturally indignant over the continuing activities of those fond of loud words about national interests. "...We express our indignation," write the General Director A. Ayrapetyan, the Party Committee Secretary A. Petrosyan and others from the collective of the Yerevan Garment Production Association imeni K. Zetkin, "over the question of the immoral conduct of certain irresponsible persons in these tragic days for the republic. We are convinced that their attempts will end in a complete defeat...."

They are convinced that the voice of reason and common sense will grow stronger day by day. There is no and cannot be any alternative.

Role of Karabakh Committee in Post-Earthquake Efforts Condemned

*18300267b Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian
30 Dec 88 p 2*

[Article by K. Akopyan: "Confronted With Disaster"]

[Text] It took just 30 seconds. That was precisely how much time the disaster required in order to carry away tens of thousands of lives, to wipe towns and villages from the face of the earth and leave hundreds of thousands of persons homeless. The disaster put all its destructive force into these fatal seconds, having turned to dust what had been created over the decades. Healthy persons full of life lost their lives and who had been raising children and working, who had been dreaming and loving and who lived for the ordinary human joys and concerns. It was hard to believe that a terrible tragedy had befallen the people just a hundred kilometers from the capital.

The dimensions of what happened are daunting. At present, specialists have estimated the economic damage caused by the disaster and they are planning the cities and settlements which will rise in the place of those destroyed. But this is now. What about them.... The main task was to rescue the people and provide them with aid. Even on 7 December, the first brigades of physicians arrived to aid the republic medical service which was fully at work and an unending flow of freight, medicines, vehicles and equipment poured in from the Union fraternal republics and from foreign countries. The entire nation took the pain of Armenia as its own and the entire human world extended a hand of aid. What one saw in the disaster area caused even the strongest who were working here around-the-clock to flinch. No one was ashamed of his tears. It was realized that this eased the pain coming from the heart, from the depths of the soul.

Yes, it was hard! No one in the republic had experience in organizing such vast rescue work. It was essential to learn along the way and to quickly correct mistakes. The activities of the Commission From the CPSU Central Committee Politburo were inestimable. Here was concentrated the center of the rescue and reconstruction work. An enormous national economic mechanism was put into motion and this, in going to work, increased the scale of aid with every passing day. Money from individual citizens and enterprise collectives flowed into the republic from the entire nation, like life-giving streams and rivers. There was a fierce struggle for the people and in this struggle each person endeavored to do everything possible to win even one life from the disaster. Of course, not everything went smoothly and without a hitch, there were mistakes and there was disorganization. The disaster posed a tough exam for the participants of the rescue work. And it must be said directly and honestly that not all passed it with honor. But the work was carried out and continues to be carried out.

In such a situation, in the hearts of the people there was a strange, incomprehensible echo from the actions of those persons who, instead of joining the ranks of the hundreds of thousands, joined battle for their own political ambitions, their chief authority and the right to style themselves the only zealots of the nation. They suddenly began to arbitrarily allocate state property, to interfere in the work of the staffs and assume the functions of various agencies. What resulted from this? Imagine that during a heart operation a person is present who is not informed about medicine but gives advice to the physicians and even directs the scalpel. Each error is the inevitable death of the patient and the probability of an error is great.

Recently a letter has begun to circulate among the population and written over the signature of Ashot Manucharyan where the author endeavors to justify his own actions and the actions of his "colleagues" in the

arising situation. Assuming the mission of the "protector" of the people, the author directly and unashamedly ascribes to the "committee" the arrival of the volunteer rescue brigades, the blood donor movement and so forth. Such a thing can only be viewed as an insult to the people. No, it was not under the appeal of the "committee members" that hundreds of thousands rushed to rescue persons, but by the calling, by the imperative of the soul, heart and conscience. It might be thought that the people could remain indifferent to the disaster of their compatriots and assume a position of observer if it had not been the call for help from the Karabakh Committee. It turns out that people gave blood to the victims because of the efforts of Ashot Manucharyan and others. It is shameful to engage in such absurdities and to assume the achievements of others and the enormous work of thousands of people during these awful days for the Armenian people when there still are persons buried alive under the ruins.

At present, it is essential to draw a clear divide between the people and those who are trying to speak on their behalf. It must be said publicly that any incompetent interference by the "committee members" has disrupted the coordinated work and destabilized the situation. In considering themselves to be some think tank, they phoned the staffs and tried to give advice and even instructions. The staff of the republic Ministry of Public Health, for example, repeatedly received indignant alerts from the "committee members" concerning instances of the supposed lack of bandaging materials or medicines in one or another hospital. In following the "alert" under conditions of a shortage of motor transport, vehicles were immediately assigned and were sent out with everything required to the designated address. But the alerts were most often false. The vehicles wandered through the city, seeking out the addresses, but then came back. Time was lost, so important for the rescuing of people, and efforts were diverted in organizing effective aid for the victims.

Clearly at the sight of the destruction there should have been first of all specialists and heavy equipment. However, the members and activists of the committee thought differently. They halted ordinary city buses, took them off their routes and sent persons untrained for rescue work to Spitak and Leninakan. The "committee members" were not concerned that the columns of such buses, in mixing in with the infinite flow of private cars, created "plugs," they obstructed the rapid evacuation and delivery of the wounded to the clinics and prevented the rescue equipment from arriving promptly in the disaster area.

But the "committee members" went even farther. By their petty intrigues, they in every possible way impeded the work of the Commission of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, a governmental USSR commission. They began to irritate people.... And at this moment they raised the question of Nagornyy Karabakh. New attempts were made to instigate discord among the nationalities.

As is known, Leninakan is an international city, where persons of many nationalities work side by side. And thus they perished at their jobs, by the machine tools and under fragments of collapsed buildings—Armenian and Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian. And help arrived for them without regard to nationality, differences in language, faith and culture. All the thoughts of the people were focused on rescuing those who remained under the ruins. But there were persons who pretentiously assumed the role of a body which could permit or prevent the rescuing of others. What was a life for them. For them something else was important, that is, not to allow the wave of distrust between nationalities to die down, to draw attention to themselves and to recall their existence, even at such a terrible price. How many unsaved lives are there due to this irresponsibility, and this is the price of the actions of the "committee members" who for a period of 3 days held up in Idzhevan an international column of 26 vehicles traveling from Azerbaijan to the disaster area. How can they now look in the face of their compatriots who lost dear ones and who still could have been saved then?

Questions, questions.... We try to ask them of Ashot Manucharyan, to meet with him and endeavor to understand what motivated him when he prepared the letter. Had he actually written it or could this be a "regular" forgery? Possibly, not encountering support for his theses, he would again disavow his position and state that his name had been used. This was the case certainly in the story of organizing the protest of persons against the sending of children from the disaster areas outside the republic. Thousands of young children remained orphans and thousands remained by the ruins which not long ago had been their homes, warming themselves at bonfires. There was confusion and fear in their eyes. They needed warmth and tenderness. It was essential to give some thought to their immediate treatment and careful study of their psyche. Naturally, the republic could not house all of them or organize proper care for the children. Certainly many of the vacation homes and boarding houses in the republic were full of refugees from Azerbaijan and because of the frequent strikes there had been a significant drop in the rate of completing housing. And again precious time was lost in persuading relatives and friends. Many of the children left late with severe colds. Being convinced that the people understood the absurdity of the action taken, the "committee members" immediately stated that it had not derived from them.

They endeavored to belittle any successful action, not forgetting to distance themselves in the event of a failure. This was the case at Zvartnots Airport during the first days after the tragedy, when the freight arriving through the aid channels was being shipped out without supervision to unknown destinations. Did the students of the polytechnical and other institutes know that everything done by them was assumed by the Karabakh Committee and not ascribed to their enthusiasm and human sympathy. This was the case also on 10-11 December, when the

Karabakh Committee decided to conduct a number of actions in Yerevan, benefiting from the fact that a large portion of the troop contingent which ensured the curfew in the capital had been sent as an emergency to Leninakan and Spitak.

Knowing that meetings and demonstrations had been banned in the city, the "committee members" assembled in front of the writers' Union. And this was done when the military command over a period of 3 days had virtually granted the public a complete lifting of the curfew and thousands of people at night went unobstructed to the blood donor stations, traveled to and from the disaster area. Naturally, the organizers were apprehended and arrested under the law granted to the military commandant. Having resolved to respond angrily to this, the zealots of the nation fully forgot that the republic was in mourning.

"The Karabakh Committee did not organize any meetings and parades on 11 December," the committee members now state. They supposedly calmed down the angry crowd. Does not A. Manucharyan wish to admit, or possibly he is afraid of this, that the day before this all the forces were thrown into urging many to assemble in the city center and hold a "protest action." It might not be good to point out that the author personally called the capital's institutions and warned of the holding of a mass meeting on 11 December, he presented an ultimatum and stated that everything would be done in order "tomorrow to bring the people into the streets and then the soldiers will have to shoot."

However, the people did not support them. Only a group of fanatic young people and activists roamed through the city and provoked clashes with the troops. Among them the tone was set by the "committee members" Ashot Manucharyan, Vano Siradegyan and Ambursum Galstyan. Some 12 servicemen were wounded and hospitalized. Due to the restraint of the soldiers, not a single civilian suffered serious bodily injury and did not seek aid in the medical institutions.

In this terrible time, when nature created a severe testing and hardship, all our people endured it with honor. Unnoticed, without publicity, they carried out their feat, rescuing people and providing aid to all the victims.

The people have withstood a severe testing. But what about the Karabakh Committee? We feel that the people themselves will assess its actions.

**ArSSR: Efforts to Bring Damaged Leninakan
Factories Back on Line**
18300293a Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian
25 Dec 88 p 1

[Article by K. Vlasenko: "A Factory is Being Restored"]

[Text] The Armlesprom Territorial Production Association [TPO] has organized the production of deck chairs in a single-story facility that was preserved on the

grounds of the destroyed and completely inoperative Leninakan Furniture Factory, where they are still digging up those that have perished and clearing away debris.

Temporary electric power has been hooked up to the building, and work is underway to inspect and start up the factory electric-power plant, which will provide permanent electric power. The first 300 chairs were manufactured using woodworking equipment that was preserved by twenty furniture makers who had earlier worked at the factory.

The leaders of USSR Minlesprom [Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry], in conjunction with the Armlesprom TPO, has organized operations to clear debris and search for victims right in Leninakan on the premises of the destroyed factory, which operations are being conducted around the clock and have already dug out 100 victims. The republic and all-union enterprises of the sector are rendering great assistance with people and needed equipment and transport. Thousands of people in every corner of our sprawling country perceive the grief of the Armenian people as their own misfortune. Some 80 workers came from Moscow, the Ukraine, Tyumen, Ust-Ilimsk and Rostov and are housed in tents or in the factory cafeteria building, which was preserved. This production will in the future be putting out all essential carpentry and furniture items for the needs of the construction workers.

"The USSR Minlesprom has promulgated the order 'Urgent Steps to Overcome the Consequences of the Earthquake in the Armenian SSR at the Enterprises of the Armlesprom Territorial Production Association in Leninakan, Kirovakan, Stepanavan, Dsekha and Dilizhan,'" said Armlesprom TPO First Deputy General Director Erik Onikovich Aznaurov. "All of the essential steps have been taken by an operational group of the ministry and the staff to overcome the consequences of the earthquake and to complete the emergency-rescue operations on the premises of the furniture factory for the most rapid possible surmounting of the consequences of the natural disaster, which has entailed a multitude of human casualties and the major destruction of production, social and cultural facilities. We have provided the required amount of equipment and people to organize around-the-clock operations."

A considerable amount of additional cranes, excavators, bulldozers, dump trucks, mobile repair shops and other equipment has been sent to be at the disposal of our association from the ministries of the timber industry of the Ukrainian and Belorussian SSRs and the installation and set-up organizations of the USSR Ministry of the Timber Industry along with a number of territorial production associations.

The sector administrations of the USSR Minlesprom have been charged with organizing the production and accelerated dispatch of pre-fabricated wooden homes to

the disaster area (no less than 38,000 square meters) along with 150 mobile railcar-homes, parts for home kits (no less than 44,000 square meters) and Les-type heating huts by the end of this December.

The placement of a state order for additional product output is envisaged by the councils of the labor collectives in coordination with the leaders of production and scientific-production associations and enterprises and in conjunction with the Main Process Administration for the Production of Furniture, Plywood and Wood Sheet, having in mind the necessity of compensating for the capacity at our TPO that was knocked out for 1988-89.

The Main Process Administration for the Production of Furniture, Plywood and Wood Sheet should prepare the technical specifications for planning a furniture factory for Leninakan with a capacity of 20 million rubles in a seismic-resistant design execution with the maximum possible degree of pre-fabrication in a single-story unit version with the use of the most contemporary imported equipment before 1 Jan 89. The Kiev Branch of Giprodrev [State Institute for the Planning of Sawmilling, Woodworking and Lumber-Hauling Enterprises of the Lumber Industry]—Ukrgiprodrevprom—has been approved as general designer.

The Main Economic Administration is currently resolving the question of allocating the essential and financial resources to our TPO to render assistance to families that suffered from the earthquake as well as the execution of other calculations connected with the complicated business activity of the association.

A special-purpose mobile mechanized column with an annual volume of up to 5 million rubles of construction and installation work will be created and based in Leninakan for the most rapid possible rehabilitation of social, cultural and production facilities of the Armlesprom TPO that were destroyed by the earthquake in Leninakan and the execution of repair and restoration work in the cities of Kirovakan, Stepanavan, Dsekha and Dilizhan.

We should complete the formulation of the column and its staffing with construction, installation and mechanical personnel within two weeks, outfitting it with the essential equipment and devices—excavators, cranes, bulldozers, dump trucks, compressors, welding and flame-cutting equipment, residential railcars and containers for housing, mobile cafeterias and other equipment, as well as food and medical support for the highly productive work.

As you see, USSR Minlesprom responded to our misfortune immediately, and today much depends on us—to work so as to restore what was destroyed more quickly.

**ArSSR: Kirovakan Avtogenmash Factory
Reconstruction Under Way**
*18300293b Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA
INDUSTRIYA in Russian 24 Jan 89 p 1*

[Article by S. Vidgof: "Kirovakan: The Plant is Being Restored"]

[Text] The greatest concern of Kriotehnika Scientific Production Association [NPO] General Director V. Kurtashin today is the Avtogenmash Plant in Kirovakan.

In December he was in Kirovakan and saw the anguish and sorrows of the people, the destroyed streets, the dark windows of houses where people feared to enter, plant walls covered with cracks, rickety beams...

"It's a good thing the collective escaped almost entirely intact," said Kurtashin. "But it's not a miracle—the people were saved by the farsightedness of the planners. The principal wings, which were built at the beginning of the 1960s, were rated for a quake of 8-9. There was thus no catastrophic destruction at the plant—which is part of our association—but there was a great deal of serious damage. We will have to pull down the old buildings that were wrecked by the tremor that housed the foundry, the galvanizing section, garages and warehouses. According to preliminary estimates, the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the plant and the construction of housing for the construction workers will require over 40 million rubles. Avtogenmash makes a sad but not lifeless picture today—lighting, heat and water had already been hooked up by December 28, and the sewage system was working. We have a free cafeteria going there now. The plant oxygen station supplies Spitak as well as Kirovakan. We are making every effort to see that production returns to normal as soon as possible."

We must give our due to the leadership of the center and the sector—they did not tarry. On December 8, the day after the earthquake, vehicles left Kriotehnika with 50 tons of freight—tents, stoves and building materials. On December 9 the enterprises of the scientific production center transferred 700,000 rubles to the plant account. Kriotehnika also appealed for help from allied industries; without undue formalities, by a telephone call from the general director of the Voskresenskoye Chemical Combine, two railcars of cement and two of slate were dispatched. Teams from the Kiev Giprokhimmash [State Institute for the Planning of Chemical Machinery Plants] and its Baku branch headed by Chief Engineer I. Kokhan were already on the scene on the fourth day. V. Smirnov, manager of the Khimneftemashstroy [Chemical and Petroleum Machinery Industry Construction] Trust, flew in with a group of specialists. All of these people worked for days on end without sleep to give their expert conclusions to plant workers as fast as possible on the safety or danger of buildings and to make blueprints according to which the shops could be rehabilitated. A

telegram from Smirnov and Kokhan—"Search concluded, we have begun rehabilitation work"—was lying on the desk of Minister of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building V. Lukyanenko on December 25.

The clearing of territory and the removal of buildings continues at Avtogenmash today. The plant people are coming out of their shock a little. Some 600 plant workers are taking part in working with the specialists who have come here to reinforce columns, trusses and structural elements. "Trial runs" of basic equipment are underway in some shops—the possibility of its further use is being determined. One wing will go into service in February, two in March and another one in May. A temporary foundry has to be set up over this time. June will be the start of product output.

The earthquake has linked difficult problems together. Avtogenmash was producing burners, cutters and gantry machinery for metal cutting, demand for which was high. But the plant was strongly indebted to its suppliers this year due to the events in Karabakh. The natural disaster, halting production, has naturally increased the debt. Product output must be started up as fast as possible and the technical level must be raised to increase productivity and improve the quality of the equipment. Something else no less important is to provide people with at least minimal domestic comfort and to offer housing. Many are still living right at the plant, after all, or in tents or garages.

"We decided at the directors' council," related V. Kurtashin, "that each enterprise would send construction specialists to Kirovakan for the whole term of the rehabilitation work, that is, for two years. So far we are talking about 60 people, whom we will supply completely with materials, equipment and food so that they will not be a burden to the plant. The Planning and Capital Construction Administration of Minkhimmash [Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building] is forming up a mobile mechanized column that should begin operating in the first quarter of this year. A unit of plant workers has been added to the construction workers. The sector planning organizations in Baku, Kiev and Sumy should issue reconstruction plans that meet the most contemporary requirements at the same time. NIItekhkhriogenmash [Scientific Research Institute of Cryogenic Machinery] in Odessa—one of the subdivisions of our center—has the task of renewing the technological processes in the shops that are being rehabilitated. There should be a modern foundry at Avtogenmash along with a new painting and galvanizing section, flow lines, robotized complexes and automated assembly. The main thing here is not to lose time, there is too little of it. The plant will begin operating this year, and it should reach planned capacity and then increase production volume by 14 percent by 1990."

I dropped in on G. Yepachin, the chief of the technical department of the Main Planning and Capital Investment Administration of Minkhimmash, on the eve of his

trip to Kirovakan. He was being sent there as part of a ministerial commission to evaluate the financial and business activity of the plant. This commission should, as he put it, carry out a complete "inventory" of everything, beginning with verifying the availability of people by specialties and ending with inspecting every meter of the plant's premises. This commission includes economists from the ministry, engineering personnel from Kriotehnika and construction workers. They will have to decide how to insert a new shop into the plant's grounds. Avtogenmash has been allotted a Molodechno module of 10,000 square meters that will house a new foundry and a shop for consumer goods. A plot of land of 30 hectares has moreover been allocated in the city for the construction of individual cottages along with a plot for a temporary construction-workers' settlement. The housing problem has been partially solved thanks to the Italian firm of Danieli. The firm has decided to send high-comfort bathrooms equipped with all the necessities for free.

Armenian Official on Compensation for Earthquake Losses

18300290 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
25 Dec 88 p 3

[Interview by IZVESTIYA special correspondents S. Bablunyan, F. Ivanov and S. Taranov with O. Davtyan, chief legal adviser of the Armenian Ministry of Finance: "Compensation for Loss: To Whom, How Much, When?"]

[Text] Special information services have been created in Yerevan and other cities and rayons within the disaster area. Their task is to determine the order to giving aid to the population of the Armenian SSR which has suffered as a result of the earthquake.

In the first, most sorrowful, days concerns of a material nature were left aside. To rescue the living, to give a fitting burial to the dead, to evacuate the sick, the elderly, and the children—the entire country worked on solving these problems. But now, having barely recovered from the shock, people are asking the question: How will we live now? After all, half a million Armenians have been left homeless. Tens of thousands could not extract from the ruins even a small portion of that which they had acquired and earned over many long years. Thousands of injured, upon leaving the hospital, have practically nothing except the clothing and shoes which were given to them...

The special resolutions adopted by the country's government and by the Armenian SSR Soviet of Ministers have been called upon to solve these problems. But how can they be realized in practice? Where can a person who needs help turn? These and other questions are answered by the workers of the information service. In Yerevan it has been organized at No 35 Moskovyan Street. Appointments with visitors (several thousand every day) are held by specialists from the republic ministries and

departments—Minfin [Ministry of Finance], Minsobes [Ministry of Social Security], Goskomtrud [State Committee on Labor Affairs], MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], the trade unions, Gosstrakh [Social Security Financing Administration], Minyust [Ministry of Justice]...

Armenian SSR Ministry of Finance Chief Legal Advisor O. Davtyan answered our questions.

[Correspondent] Ovik Nikolayevich, there were around 700,000 residents in the disaster area. Some of them lost everything they had. Others were luckier. Whom should we consider to be the victims? Is there a legal definition of this?

[Davtyan] The legislator does not give such a definition. To what degree a person has suffered, and whether he has suffered at all, is determined by the commissions which are being formed and which include deputy groups, representatives of the social security services, the finance organs, trade union organizations, enterprises and institutions in the area. In determining losses, they may base their findings not only on documents which have been preserved, but also on the testimony of witnesses and the victims themselves. Trust is one of the principles of their operation.

[Correspondent] But what has been decided? Well, let us say now, in the order of giving most immediate financial aid?

[Davtyan] First of all, there is a one-time grant in the amount of 200 rubles per person, with an additional 2,000 rubles to families who have lost their breadwinner. Aside from this, there is 500 rubles for burial expenses for each family member who was killed, regardless of the actual cost of the burial. This is aid provided by the state. It does not exclude receiving monetary sums from trade union and social organizations, or from private parties.

[Correspondent] Who specifically must issue these funds? Most of the victims have left the disaster area. Does this mean that they have to go back to petition the ispolkom commission?

[Davtyan] We advise those who can go back to do so. There will be less red tape and delays that way. After all, many of them are known by sight in the rayon soviets. But this is an extreme case, we might say. Registration centers for victims temporarily living in Yerevan have been set up in 8 rayons of the city. These centers contact the ispolkoms in the disaster area, after which special tickets are given out which may be taken to the bank. As for those who have been evacuated to other cities, they must write to the ispolkom at the place of their permanent residence...

[Correspondent] Frankly speaking, it is a complex system. It is difficult to imagine that it works quickly and efficiently...

[Davtyan] The sum of aid and the forms of its distribution are defined in the resolutions. Yet there is not a single word about the "technology" of the matter and its local organization. This is unsatisfactory. We have no experience or practice in such large-scale measures. We will have to work it out as we go along, to change some things and to reject others. As a jurist, I believe that in this case we must give more rights and freedom of action to the local organs, rather than limit ourselves merely to the Minfin directives.

[Correspondent] We understand about the one-time grant. But what payments are made for lost property? Obviously, they are due to those who insured their property in time. Yet part of the victims, and a considerable part at that, were not clients of Gosstrakh.

[Davtyan] Maybe this disaster will force us to understand the need for mandatory insurance... In the meantime, the USSR government has decided to compensate the loss to all victims, regardless of their dealings with Gosstrakh. The cost of residential houses, summer cottages, garages, and farm structures is established by the government. The compensation for loss will be in accordance with this. The loss of automobiles and other means of transport will be compensated fully, with consideration for wear depreciation, based on the state retail prices currently in effect. The same is true also for farm animals which were insured by citizens.

[Correspondent] But what about furniture, appliances, and other household goods? Some families had the bare minimum, while others lost many thousands of rubles worth of complete sets and expensive apparatus. It is practically impossible now to determine who had what.

[Davtyan] It is indeed a very complex matter... Therefore it has been decided that regardless of a person's former state of well-being, household goods, fruit and vegetable crops, and uninsured farm animals will be compensated as follows: 4,000 rubles to single citizens, 7,000 to two-member families, and an additional 1,500 for each additional family member. For example, a family of five will be able to receive 11,500 rubles.

[Correspondent] Let us suppose that prior to the earthquake a victim took out a loan for the construction of cooperative housing. Does he still have to pay the loan back now?

[Davtyan] No. All bank loans are written off at the expense of the republic budget.

[Correspondent] After the earthquake, thousands of people, sick and injured, became invalids. Can they expect to receive a pension?

[Davtyan] Of course. And not only they, but also those who lost their breadwinner, as well as orphans who lost both parents and are being raised by relatives, guardians, or trustees. Their pensions will be determined in maximal amounts from the day of death (disappearance) of their parents. As for adults who have sustained permanent injury or illness, the amount of their pension depends on the amount of their wages at their last place of employment. In general, all these questions are regulated by the effective pension legislation. The local Soviet ispolkom commission will carry out the appropriate decision.

[Correspondent] If a person is unhappy and challenges the decision of the commission, where can he turn? To the court?

[Davtyan] Only to the superior organ of Soviet authority, up to the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the republic and the country. Unfortunately, for example, in matters of designation of pensions and payments the law does not give the right to go to court. In my opinion, this law is outdated. It is a disparagement of judicial authority, incompatible with the goal and principles of the legal state. It is time to review it.

[Correspondent] Thousands of women with children, having left their homes and their work, have been evacuated to health resorts in Armenia and other republics. Many are living on total state support. Yet even if the children's clothing and food are free, they still need money, at least for "pocket" expenses...

[Davtyan] Mothers with minor children who lost their jobs after the earthquake retain their average wage and uninterrupted labor seniority up to the moment they find a job, but no longer than 6 months. Those women with children who went to boarding hotels and health resorts must be paid 50 percent of their average wage for 6 months. They can also take jobs at their temporary place of residence.

[Correspondent] The Red Cross society, the Soviet Children's Fund, and many other organizations are giving aid in various forms to the victims in Armenia... Can this affect the amount of state payments and compensation?

[Davtyan] Not in any case! We cannot say to a single person: You have already "gotten yours", and therefore we will reduce the amount of your grant or pension. The government resolutions are mandatory for the departments and organizations who are a part of their realization, without any exceptions or subjective interpretations. Another matter is the danger of "burocratization" and confusion in this far from simple matter. After all, the task is an extremely crucial one: to treat each victim with maximal fairness. Let us think all together how to implement this task more effectively and quickly...

[Correspondent] Well, the fears of our interviewee are quite well-founded. Yet O. Davtyan represents only the information service, while the practical work must be developed in the ray- and gorispolkoms of Yerevan as well as the cities and villages in the disaster area. They have many, very many, concerns after the earthquake. One more has been added to them. It is no less important that the other first-priority concerns.

**Moldavian Official Opposes Language Initiatives,
'People's Front Movements**

18000356 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA
in Russian 11 Dec 88 p 3

[Article by V. Iovv, first secretary of the Moldavian CP Beltsy Gorkom and delegate to the 19th Party Conference: "Being True to the Spirit of the Times"]

[Text] Wide-ranging, concerned discussion of the Moldavian CP Central Committee and Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers theses "Affirming Perestroika by Actual Deeds" is under way in Beltsy, as throughout the republic. The working people of all nationalities are unanimous that this is a document which affects the central aspects of economic, social and sociopolitical development and is food for profound thought. This is natural, after all, the policy adopted by our party of perestroika under the conditions of continued democratization and glasnost corresponds to the cherished aspirations of the masses at large and is prompting them to active practical activity for the accomplishment of the tasks outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Each communist or nonparty individual, Komsomol member or member of a trade union organization has the right to express and defend his viewpoint, even if it does not coincide with the established opinion of the majority. And it is very often the case that this idea or the other which yesterday seemed exceedingly radical and immoderate today proves essential to society.

Pluralism of judgments and opinions affords an opportunity, all the pros and cons having been evaluated, for selecting the optimum versions and methods of tackling complex tasks without perpetrating crude gaffes and repeating previous mistakes and to activate the social and economic levers which produce the greatest results under our conditions of not all that high a degree of technological, managerial and database provision. This is important when central questions of the development of production and social support for the individual are being decided, and doubly important when it is a question of the spiritual and cultural development of nations and nationalities and the Soviet federation as a whole.

A highly distinctive situation has come about currently. In discussing the theses many people are touching only fleetingly on the sections concerning the economic and

social aspects of the republic's development. Their propositions are encountering approval and support, on the whole. The townspeople are sure that the new rights of socialist enterprises, the practice of elections of executives, the leasing of certain shops and enterprises, the system of direct relations between outfits, the various models of cost accounting and self-support and the increased level of people's practical and political assertiveness will necessarily have the desired effect. Discussing this part of the theses, they are submitting a multitude of proposals, which could contribute to progress in the economic sphere.

The vast majority approves of the third section of the theses also.

However, certain citizens, particularly from the ranks of those who have found themselves under the influence of certain informal groups, are attempting to turn pluralism to the seamy side, so to speak, making demands for recognition of Moldavian as the official language, campaigning for the establishment of qualifications for the acquisition of republic citizenship and the introduction of the Latin alphabet and concocting ideas concerning all kinds of other privileges and restrictions along national lines.

No one takes issue with the idea that in the years of Stalinism and the stagnation period home culture incurred serious losses reflected ultimately in our people's level of spirituality. Standardization and one-sidedness of approach to the development of the national cultures and languages, the unjustified premature anticipation in the evaluation of the prospects of the fusion of the multinational cultures in a national culture, the residual approach to the creation of the material resources of culture and other phenomena slowed down and deformed natural processes of the people's spiritual development. All this, the theses observe, was characteristic of Moldavia also, and the community of the republic is speaking openly of this today. In its appeals to the party and soviet authorities and the mass media the republic's scientific and artistic intelligentsia is rightly raising questions of an enhancement of the level of significance of Moldavian and of shortcomings in the material resources of establishments of the cultural sphere.

Our city is actively discussing the urgent problems. It is not just the artistic and scientific intelligentsia but also other categories of the population which are speaking correctly, on the whole, about the need for the better organization of the teaching and study and expansion of the sphere of use of Moldavian and other languages prevalent in the republic and about the creation of all the conditions for the mastery of Russian, as the language of inter-nation communication. And it should be noted that very important and positive changes in this respect have already been mapped out.

The gorkom has adopted a number of measures contributing to the better development of Russian-Moldavian and Moldavian-Russian bilingualism. They take into consideration, as we see it, in full the particular features of Beltsy and its history and national composition. Thirty-four percent Moldavians, 28 percent Russians and 28 percent Ukrainians live and work here. Fifty-two nationalities constitute one-tenth of the townspeople. Compared with last year the number of Moldavian schools has doubled, and the number of children in kindergarten and students in schools which teach in Moldavian has almost doubled. Sixteen percent of the children in kindergarten and 18.5 percent of the city's students are being taught in Moldavian. It is planned before the end of the current year opening a new school and kindergarten with Moldavian as the language of training and education. The opportunities for tuition in Moldavian in the vocational-technical schools and secondary educational institutions are expanding. These and other measures have made it possible to fully satisfy the townspeople's desires in choice of language of training and education.

Moldavian study courses and groups operate in the city's workforce. Our cadres are undergoing special training in the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, mastering the knowledge necessary for work in courses of intensive study in Moldavian for the Russian-speaking adult population, which will begin in the city in the first quarter of next year.

As of next January the city newspaper KOMMUNIST will be duplicated in Moldavian.

Of course, there are in this work certain difficulties of both a material and psychological nature. There is a shortage of methods and teaching aids and training hardware, and parental inconsistency is impeding matters also. But, as a whole, bilingualism processes are gaining momentum, and there are no grounds for maintaining that some people are attempting to throw a wrench in the works.

I am convinced that were we to conduct today a secret or public sociological survey, the vast majority of the indigenous population residing on republic territory would vote for voluntary study of Moldavian. This certainty is implanted by Soviet people's internationalist feeling inculcated in the time of our difficult historical development.

Yet in our city, as, incidentally, in the republic as a whole, there is a stratum of the intelligentsia which is not averse to discoursing on the "language tragedy" of the Moldavian people, some contrived humiliation of the language of the indigenous nationality and on its gradual disappearance even. Such talk is, of course, groundless. An objective analysis enables us to speak of eradicable distortions in respect of the language and a recultivation of respect for the language of our forefathers against a background of unconditional respect for the languages of

the surrounding nations and nationalities. It is in this spirit, it seems to us, that we should raise the youth of indigenous nationality, which is particularly receptive to opinions whose rashness is harmful for the evolved union of the nations.

The question of whether a party, soviet or industrial executive working in a national republic necessarily needs to know the language of the people after which it is named would seem very legitimate in this connection. This question has arisen frequently in the course of discussion of the theses, and I have always answered: it is desirable. And, of course, I observe that it would be ideal were the executive to know not only his native language, the inter-nation language (Russian) and an international language (English, French and so forth) but also languages of the indigenous peoples of neighboring republics with whom he has dealings in the system of the uniform national economic complex. But we have to be realists—human possibilities are, alas, limited. But life is fleeting, and it is better to devote it to the most important and pressing problems, of which we have many today and of which there will be no fewer tomorrow. Which executive should be preferred? He who affords pleasure by conversing in several languages, but causes distress, possibly, by his inadequate professional competence? Or the "monolingual," but adept specialist and adroit manager? Under the conditions of perestroika and transition to financial autonomy the scales of the people's choice would, I am sure, tilt increasingly toward the latter.

This is just one, individual, but fundamental question, which arises against the background of another, more capacious question—should Moldavian be accorded official language status? The theses speak quite convincingly about this also—hasty conclusions and rashness only hamper a search for the truth. We have to agree that groundless statements allegedly on behalf of the people only hinder the cause. Emotions should not gain the ascendancy here, and the hasty issuing of decrees, which could lead to a complication of inter-nation relations, is impermissible. This is why I have to support the opinion of Prof V. Yakovlev, doctor of legal sciences, who in appeared in SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA with the article "Balanced Approach Needed".

These are the facts. Only in three of the union republics currently in force are there special articles devoted to the official language. We are talking of the constitutions of the Armenian, Azerbaijani and Georgian SSR's, according to which the republics ensure official concern for the utmost development of the national language and cater for its use in state and public authorities and cultural, educational and other establishments. The free use of Russian and other languages which the population uses is declared and provided for, per the constitution, in these republics. No privileges or restrictions in the use of this language or the other are allowed here. The content of these articles testifies that the term "official language"

is employed to also denote the further development of the most used language employed by the "indigenous" population of these republics.

Information adduced by scholars of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences is interesting also. The fact of an "official language" in the constitutions of these republics is not contributing to the development of national-Russian bilingualism. The "officialness" of the national language, while performing for it a protective function, is in practice not in the least stimulating the development of national-Russian bilingualism. The role of the language of inter-nation communication is underused—more than 65 percent of Armenians in Armenia have an inadequate knowledge of Russian or do not know it at all. The reasons for this vary and are largely unstudied as yet.

Historiography is entirely different when it comes to the use of languages in our republic. The constitution of Autonomous Moldavia has since 1925 recognized as the most prevalent languages Moldavian, Russian and Ukrainian. Since that time the free use of each of them has been provided for by all legislative enactments of the union republic, and the right of choice of Moldavian at the time of contacts in respect of all aspects of vital activity has been enshrined in legislation of the 1940's through the 1980's. It is important to emphasize in this connection that no direct or indirect restriction of rights or the establishment of direct or indirect advantages at the time of employment depending on sex, race, national affiliation and attitude toward religion are permitted.

These and other indisputable facts testify to the existence of full legislative guarantees of the equality of all languages, including Moldavian. Consequently, it can only be a question of problems of the further realization of these guarantees given a stimulation of the efforts of all citizens of our republic.

The proposition that Moldavian is an independent and equal language with its own history, present and future would seem very balanced against this background. The assertions that the Moldavian people lack a native language and attempts to identify it with Romanian merely on the grounds of their having a single root are scientifically unsubstantiated and insulting. After all, no one today would identify, for example, Russian and Ukrainian, although they have an Old Slavonic basis. Moldavian, like any other language, functions not in an isolated environment but lives and will develop in interplay with other languages without losing its originality here.

There is no need to accord Moldavian on the territory of the republic official status. This would be tantamount to the establishment of direct advantages for citizens of Moldavian nationality, which is not only contrary to the law but could do irreparable damage to the friendship and cooperation of the fraternal peoples on the territory of the republic and the unity and cohesion of all of Soviet multinational society. Determining some rules creating

privileges for the citizens of one republic or nationality and limiting the status of citizens of other nationalities would signify a violation of the principle of Soviet people's equality.

In stubbornly insisting on having their own way the supporters of Moldavian being accorded official language status are forgetting or deliberately ignoring the existence in our country of the single national economic complex. They do not understand that an official language cannot be binding in the sphere of material production, where outfits of mixed national composition work. Nor do they take account of the process of the internationalization of life, the economy and culture within the framework of the socialist community countries. It is not inappropriate to recall the internationalization of the relations of the countries of West Europe, on the path of cooperation with which the CEMA countries are embarking.

In close connection with this some people are discussing also questions associated with introduction of the Latin alphabet as the basis of "renewed" Moldavian. Some representatives of the intelligentsia are expressing the opinion that it is time to return to the Latin alphabet since the start of the Moldavian written language was associated with the Roman alphabet. This was not so. The start of the Moldavian written language coincides with the spread of the Slavonic written language in the Carpathian-Balkan regions. Throughout its history, that is, from the founding of the Moldavian independent state (1359) through this day, Cyrillic has been used for writing in Moldavia.

The development of the productive forces and the affiliation of Bessarabia to Russia in 1812, which, as F. Engels pointed out, performed a progressive role in respect of the peoples of the Balkan peninsula, contributed to the process of the further development of the Moldavian literary language. Since that time the Moldavian people, which were closely connected with the East Slav peoples earlier also, have conclusively linked their destiny with the great Russian people. These circumstances contributed to ensuring that the alien linguistic systems of Latin scholars did not catch on in Moldavia.

More detailed information concerning the history of the formation and development of Moldavian may be drawn from works of scholars of our republic. Unfortunately, many of the compilers of the "appeals" and those who have unthinkingly signed them do not know their subject and sometimes deliberately ignore the facts. There are many such people in our city also. Some of them are not averse to referring to the authority of the well-known Moldavian writer Aleksey Mateyevich. They fail to observe the main thing here—that the famous writer, whose name has been adopted by Kishinev's lovers of literature and music, was typified by genuine national

pride in his affiliation to the original Moldavian nation and the interests of the language, which he championed by reliance on genuine, and not contrived, historical arguments.

The theses rightly note that transition to the Latin alphabet would require great expenditure, would have a negative effect on the population's spiritual development and would render it for many years illiterate. We would recall to make this issue completely clear lessons from the history of Azerbaijan. In accordance with a Stalin injunction, the Arabic alphabet, in which the people's entire history had been written for centuries, was in 1930 by an arbitrary decision done away with in the republic. Ten years later the Latin alphabet was replaced by the Cyrillic alphabet. In other words, in a short period of time a fatal blow was struck at the social and intellectual consciousness of the people, which were cut off from their national culture and their historical past. Now 95 percent of Azerbaijani research associates in academic institutes and VUZes can read in neither Arabic nor Latin! In order to enjoy the literary heritage it is necessary to study the Arabic alphabet from scratch, but this takes time, which the people do not have. If a start is not made now in the schools and VUZes on study of the Arabic alphabet, all the archive material and social and political literature published prior to 1930 in Azerbaijan will remain for the people double-dutch. In this criminal fashion the Azerbaijanis were artificially deprived of the opportunity of knowing their history, culture, literature....

An attempt to switch from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet was made in the same way and by the same Stalin in the Moldavian ASSR in 1932, but subsequently, in 1938, people returned to the native Cyrillic. And they did right: as distinct from the Azerbaijanis, the Moldavian people may enjoy their literary heritage and know their history and culture. These facts from the history of the formation and development of the linguistic culture of the two fraternal republics should finally persuade everyone of the absurdity and fatal nature of even thought of the Latin alphabet.

Thinking about all this, one sees distinctly what a great social function has been assumed by the republic's mass media. While being the transmitter of social thought on the problems at issue, they should at the same time themselves be the exponents of balanced proposals because far from each of them contains deep-lying popular interests. I speak of this with disquiet because rash, purely personal judgments and attachments having nothing in common with a genuine pluralism of opinions sometimes splash out in republic publications.

One reads some publications and one is distinctly aware that some journalists and writers would like to use the paper field as their own football field, and for a game with only one set of goalposts, what is more. Yet genuine

pluralism is by no means a game but a constructive exchange of socially meaningful and useful ideas in the interests of the further democratization of our life.

One sometimes has the impression that people working in the mass media have forgotten the fundamental conclusion drawn by K. Marx, F. Engels and V.I. Lenin concerning the fact that the press in society always and inevitably expresses the interests of the people and is a means of realization of party policy.

It is particularly important today to remember and implement in practice Lenin's principles of the party-mindedness and public spirit of the press, remember its writ, objectivity and civic responsibility. It is important in our newspaper judgments not to slide into a subjectivism wrongly taken for pluralism of opinions and glasnost and not to take the path of many of the mass media in Estonia, which have essentially emerged in antisocialist positions fundamentally at variance with the interests of their own people.

Unfortunately, some intellectuals in our republic are thinking in categories of representatives of the "People's Front" there and speaking of Moldavia's sovereignty. They are unwilling to understand the one incontrovertible truth that Moldavia, like the other union republics, cannot exist without the union, just as newborn children cannot exist without their mother. Merely the fact that almost all means of production are imported from other fraternal republics and that we receive annually from the union more products than we give to the tune of approximately R1 billion shows the utter absurdity and profound delusion of the supporters of the "Estonian version of democracy".

The highest responsibility to the times and to one's people—this is what should be predominant today when we undertake to submit our assessments of the current moment for public judgment. Not rushing from one extreme to another and rashly giving this the name of elements of perestroika but treating phenomena in balanced and exacting manner, weighing them in the scales of conscience and conformity to popular interests.

Particularly telling and meaningful, proven and convincing should be the word of the party worker—political rapporteurs and organizers of ideological studies at the enterprises, "Znaniye" Society lecturers and Komsomol activists, school teachers, vocational-technical school foremen and all communists.

When the party initiated perestroika, it was intended that extensive glasnost and diversity of opinions would be expressed within the framework of socialism and that the "spokesmen" for these opinions would not forget the principle of party-mindedness and its responsibility. Unfortunately, some people have resolved to turn pluralism of opinions to "free" it of socialist content even. And for some reason or other virtually all the mass media, via which the call "learn from our Estonian

comrades" and borrow their experience is heard, have recently been at their disposal. To what this "experience" has led we see from the material of the 26 November 1988 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session and its edict "The Nonconformity of the Estonian SSR Law 'Changes and Additions to the Estonian Constitution' and the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Declaration on Estonian Sovereignty Adopted on 16 November 1988 to the USSR Constitution and USSR Laws".

Recently certain newspapers have been persistently propagandizing and agitating for the introduction of the processes occurring in the Baltic republics, openly misleading people and supplying unobjective information. It is incomprehensible in whose interests the mass media are being used. Their work should undoubtedly be organized on democratic principles. But before presenting something or other in the press it is necessary to think over thrice and, perhaps, more how this will be reflected in national relations and in the general feeling and mood of the whole population. The party, V.I. Lenin said, should constantly demand of the leaders of the mass propaganda media that they retreat in their activity not one step from Marxist teaching and pursue the party line under all conditions. A most important Leninist principle of leadership of the press was its strict subordination to the party committees, the clear consistent ideological and political line of the press organs and their fidelity to Marxist teaching. It seems to me that this cardinal principle has not been realized in full by the party organs recently.

I believe that the time has come for the party committees and the republic Communist Party Central Committee to place under strict supervision the work of all mass media, realize Lenin's principles of leadership thereof in full measure, put a stop to the unhealthy manifestations, make a high-minded party assessment of immature publications and their authors and the communists working in the mass media and prevent a single instance even of the propaganda of antisocialist views.

Writer Advocates Raising Status of Ukrainian Language

18000265 Kiev *RABOCHAYA GAZETA* in Russian
5 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by writer Yevgeniy Shmorgun, under the rubric: "Living Spring of Unity": "This Is Our Blood Relationship"]

[Text] I deeply respect the Russian language. For me personally, the language of Pushkin and Turgenev, of Yesenin and Mayakovsky, of Astafyev and Rasputin, is a wealth, whose worth I am in no condition to estimate. Reading the works of Russian authors hundreds and hundreds of times, an interaction with the holiest spirit of the Russian people, has given rise to a thrilling sense of loftiness in my heart. I am grateful to the Russian language for the fact that the works of many geniuses of other peoples, whose languages I, unfortunately, have

been unable to learn, although I do not respect them any the less, have become accessible to me precisely through Russian translations. I am grateful to Russian for the opportunity to interact with fellow literati from fraternal union republics: Toktosun Samoudinov of Kirghizia, Nina Matyash of Belorussia, Vasilii Bocharnikov, a Russian, and other writers.

However, I am my parents' son, above all. I would be ashamed to go to my native village of Iskra, in Rovenskiy Rayon, and demonstrate a personal apostasy of my native tongue. I have well learned an unwritten rule from my countrymen: the language of one's fathers ought to take first priority for a person. Thus, I openly admit that I will never believe in the self-respect of, for instance, an Estonian, Georgian or Russian, if he suddenly prefers someone else's native language.

Whether or not to study one's native language should not, I think, generally be a question for a cultured person. Nor should respecting the language of another people or not be a question.

However, let us be frank: not only in the eastern and southern Ukraine, but also in the western oblasts, here in Rovenshchina, many Ukrainian parents are not sending their children to Ukrainian schools now, and are writing statements releasing their sons and daughters from studying their native language since it, they say, has no use. After all, in many institutions and organizations here, all official and unofficial documents are written in Russian. Even the poster for our oblast art festival "Songs of the Goryn" (traditional!) is no longer written in Ukrainian here. One also hears it rarely during tours of the oblast museum of local lore, history and economy, the N.I. Kuznetsov Memorial Museum-Apartment and many other cultural institutions.

Loss of interest in one's native language contributes to the ignorance of one own people's history and culture, or to one-sided knowledge. Hence, the results. For example, a great deal is being said in Rovenshchina, as well as everywhere in the Ukraine, about the fraternity of cultures and literature, but to this day no one has found the time to erect a monument to Gerasim and Meletiy Smotritskiy, Ivan Fedorov, Vladimir Korolenko, and a good dozen other devotees who, in strengthening friendship among peoples, shaped the history and glory of our kray, who fill our hearts with pride at just the mention of their names. I think that accounts, opened in a bank in order to collect funds for erecting monuments to the above-mentioned leaders and others not mentioned by me, would do far more to instill internationalism and patriotism, than thousands of ordinary appeals.

There are no small peoples in terms of spirit. There are small people. Unfortunately, these have existed throughout the ages, and here as well. They obsequiously refer to themselves as Little Russians. Unblushing, 1939 they called themselves Little Poles before September 1939. They would have had to call themselves the Little

Moguls. And why not? These people, with the prefix "little" in their hearts, exist right now. Indeed, they still exist and shout at others, so as not to take it into their heads to rise above their wretchedness. Precisely thanks to these, I am sure, something was invisible, for example, the inscriptions in Ukrainian on the facade of the Rovno Museum of Folklore, History and Economy, the Puppet Theatre, and the Chamber and Organ Music Hall—regardless of which nationality is written in the passports of these "enthusiasts."

A feeling of friendship and fraternity with our great-great-grandparents lives in the blood of our people. Even the ancient names of the settlements in the area of Rovenshchina persuasively attest to this: Duliby, Krivichi, Polyany... It seems that the representatives of different tribes plowed fields, gathered weeds, and created spiritual values shoulder to shoulder. The Volyn voevoda Dmitriy Bobrok was considered one of the chief heroes in the battle against the hordes on Kulikovo Field. Fedor Ostrozhskiy headed all the Russian standards in the battle of Gryunvald, where the combined forces of the Slavs conquered the Teutonic Knights. Then the same Fedor Ostrozhskiy, with our great-great-grandfather-Volyns, helped the uprising Czech-Hussites liberate Prague. That was a long time ago. Yet, look at the column of veterans of the Great Patriotic War on Victory Day and you will see inscriptions on the chests of many of our fathers and grandfathers which begin with the words "for liberation..." "for defense..." Friendship reinforced by blood is a strong friendship, and no black-mouthed Ivans whomsoever, who do not remember this relationship, will discredit it.

However, true friendship exists only among equals. Similarly, it does not recognize either humiliation or arrogance. Moreover, it will not tolerate it, when one among equals begins losing his dignity.

Facts are stubborn things. To this day, the use of Ukrainian has shrunk right before our eyes. So much so, that soon Ukrainian will remain only a name, even at our Ukrainian Institute for Water Resource Engineering.

I recently glanced through the plans for the publication of literature next year and rejoiced: the "Naukova Dumka" Publishing House promises to publish "*Peresopnitske Evangelie*" [The Peresopnitsa Evangel] (1556-1561). At last! After all, this book is not only witness to the first stage of Ukrainian writing. The living native speech was expressively written precisely in its pages, and thus impetus was given to the tempestuous development of our national culture. I am referring to the fact that, since the main ideological mover of society in the 16th century was religion, "*Peresopnitska Evangelie*" in fact gave official blessing to creativity in the Ukrainian language. This is of unparalleled significance (incidentally, the famous "*Ostrozhskaya Bibliya*" [The Ostrozhskaya Bible], on which so much has already been written and rewritten, was published in 1581 in Old Slavonic, which had already been long dead at that time). No

matter how our language develops, no matter to what heights our culture achieves, an eternal halo of light from that remote star, the light of the Book written in Peresopnitsa, will always shine upon them.

In short, the publication of the manuscript "*Peresopnitske Evangelie*" is an event in the cultural life of the Ukraine. This very thick folio will be accompanied by textual research, a word index, and commentaries, and it will become an adornment for libraries...

I wrote these last few words and began thinking. Unfortunately, this publication will adorn few libraries: the price is exorbitant. After all, it costs 120 rubles! An unthinking reference to economics is pointless here. There are things which one can earn money for, and there are those, for which even thinking of earning money is sinful. Yet, since there will be virtually no advertisements at all in this case, then, understandably, there will be few individual customers as well. It would be nice if somebody, after reading this article, nonetheless ordered this rare publication for himself through the book trade organizations.

I know that this publication is a facsimile, really just for looking at, and not for reading, like a souvenir, so that... And so on. To which I answer: did all of our contemporaries purchase Meletiy Smotritskiy's "*Gramatika*" [Grammar] ("Naukova Dumka" Publishing House, 1979) in the stores exclusively in order to read it? For 99 percent of those who acquired this publication (also a facsimile!), it speaks a language which was never written. However, a copy of "*Gramatika*," in a set including a detailed scientific study, does not cost 120, but only 3 rubles, 20 kopeks. Notice a difference?

Incidentally, there is another consideration. A stone cross stands on the outskirts of the quiet village of Peresopnitsa (formerly, a fairly significant ancient Russian city, where the Congress of Princes, the then rulers of the Russian State, was held in 1150), which is in Rovenshchina. It is unknown how long it has stood—the winds have polished it so that only a small pillar remains of the cross. Sometime in the past, our illiterate ancestors thus designated the place where the Old Ukrainian Pervokniga [First Book] was written. Is it not about time for us, entirely literate, to put up even a modest memorial plaque in Peresopnitsa to remind passers-by that, in the words of the Encyclopedia, the "outstanding monument to Old Ukrainian literature and art" was created precisely here.

I have repeatedly raised the problem of the survival of the Ukrainian language in the local press. My article in the Rovno Oblast youth newspaper ZMINA was discussed for almost half a year. Unfortunately, most of the problems are still problems for the time being, even though they were named aloud. This is even so for the situation with signs on the walls of cultural institutions. True, the director of the oblast Museum of Komsomol

Glory recently boasted to me that he had already made a sign in Ukrainian and had hung it in the museum. However, a single swallow does not bring spring.

In order to really move matters, so that specific action follows words, we decided to create a society for admirers of the Ukrainian language in our oblast. Many people of like mind have responded. The youth newspaper ZMINA became an initiator in creating this society. A work group has been formed and we are drafting plans for activity. There will soon be a constituent meeting, although, to be frank, the road leading to it is not smooth.

All of these problems were voiced at the last Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum. Moreover, I entertain myself with a hope that the time is quite near when a republic society for admirers of our native language and culture will be created. The culturally oriented societies which already exist would be able to do a great deal in this area. We are much in need of a strong voice, so that the Ukrainian language finally gains the appropriate status in the republic.

Development of Tajik for Contemporary Science, Arts Urged

18300243 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian 14 Dec 88 p 3

[Article by Mukhammadzhan Shukurov, member of the Tajik SRR Academy of Sciences: "Whoever Is Ineffectual in His Own Language"]

[Text] Dushanbe—As is known, for many peoples bilingualism and multilingualism are in the blood: for several centuries now certain Central Asian peoples have known more than just their native language. The lyric poetry of Navoi and Fizuli was studied in the Tajik prerevolution school together with that of Hafiz and Bedil. The Persian-Tajik lyric poetry of Hafiz and frequently that of Bedil also were textbooks in the Uzbek school. And today also Turkmen and Kazakhs may be encountered who can recite from memory in the original verses of Persian-Tajik poets which they learned in childhood in the old school.

In our time bilingualism in Central Asia is a widespread phenomenon. But the more it develops, the more the problems that arise. Primarily the concern for the part of the youth, schoolchildren and students which finds it hard to master Russian, which is indeed difficult for them, is not unfounded. And the situation is unpropitious in the school and the VUZ not only in respect of study of Russian. The native language is in no better position either. Nor is schoolchildren's knowledge high when it comes to history, physics, chemistry.... The extremely inauspicious situation which has come about in the school, which has led to the loss of its authority and capacity for educating and providing in-depth knowledge, is reflected here primarily.

Many of the factors which have led the school to crisis point have yet to be ascertained and studied. In Central Asia they have their own specific features. The 1930's were for Tajikistan a time of the rapid development of public education. The elimination of illiteracy was undertaken, an extensive network of general schools was developed and teacher-training institutes and schools were opened. But significant numbers of the teachers underwent accelerated training merely at 3-month, 6-month and 1-year courses. The graduates of these short-term courses subsequently acquired higher education by correspondence. Both the resident students and correspondence students were virtually without textbooks and educational aids in Tajik or in translation from Russian: there was simply no time to write such owing to the smallness of the numbers of qualified personnel. The war did serious damage to the cause of public education.

The main source of knowledge for the students of teacher-training courses, as for students in the 1930's and 1940's-1950's also, were lectures given by instructors, and the correspondence students could attend such lectures for only one or two months in the year, prior to the summer and winter examination sessions. Thus people frequently became teachers without having acquired even a small proportion of the necessary knowledge and skills, and their pupils—high school graduates—pulled the standard of VUZ teaching down sharply. This standard rose somewhat only in the 1960's-1970's, but the overall lag will obviously not be quickly overcome.

The native language is the basis of the spirituality, true inner breeding and moral development of the personality. Yet serious sociopolitical factors, which led to major miscalculations in cultural building, were operating back in the 1930's. To take just the following fact. In a short timespan, from 1929 to 1940, the Tajiks changed their written language twice: they switched from the Arabic alphabet to the Latin alphabet and then to the Cyrillic alphabet. But switched without any preparation, as a result of which they found themselves in a very short space of time completely cut off from the 1,000-year-old fiction and poetry and scientific literature and the literary language. A people which had for centuries been raised on books were in fact left without books. In addition, over a period of almost 15 years they destroyed with their own hands ancient manuscripts and prerevolution lithographed publications, declaring them religious and therefore harmful.

The old intelligentsia took virtually no part in the cultural revolution—our last "Mohicans" were wiped out in 1937, and such outstanding figures as Ayni and Lakhuti worked under difficult conditions. The loss of many ties to age-old spiritual values also explains, in particular, the low linguistic culture of the writers of the 1930's and subsequent generations of the intelligentsia.

Primitivism and vulgarity are penetrating the way of thinking increasingly deeply, lowering the standard of the spoken and written language, blunting the feeling for

the language and leading to the crudest violations of its rules—in word formation and word combination, in syntactical structures and so forth. All this is assuming general proportions. One rarely finds in Tajikistan signboards, slogans, notices and other inscriptions in Tajik which do not contain stylistic and spelling mistakes. Linguistic unintelligibility, slovenliness and simply illiteracy have long been customary phenomena in the press and radio and television programs. And when at meetings with the public the most prominent specialists in medicine, economics and legal, agricultural and other sciences, party and soviet officials, composers, artists and people working in motion pictures speak in Tajik, one is simply frequently ashamed to listen to them.

E. Yusupov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, recently wrote about Uzbekistan: "A certain section of the local intelligentsia cannot make itself freely understood in its own language and is incapable of writing in its native language not only a scientific work but an article even" (the newspaper TOSHKENT OKSHOMI, 5 November 1987). It is like this in Tajikistan also. With us scientific work in the native language is performed virtually solely in Tajik philology and, partially, in the history of philosophy. The development of a modern Tajik language of science in respect of the majority of the main branches has in fact not even begun. And this is largely connected with that same vacuum in the historical consciousness and cultural memory. Yet the Tajik scientific language has a 1,000-year history, at whose sources were such coryphaei as Avicenna and Biruni. Despite its medieval character, it could, in my view, serve as the basis for a modern Tajik scientific language for here also, as in the solution of any linguistic problem, continuity and the historical principle should not play a secondary part. If we are thinking about the genuine, all-around revelation of all the latent possibilities of the literary language (and without such an endeavor any developed language will wither away), we are obliged to create a modern language of science and technology capable of expressing the most complex concepts. And until we achieve this, the national language will remain at a low level, and its lag behind the requirements of the times will grow.

The modern Tajik literary language is normally to be found mainly in fiction and poetry and among philologists. But in journalistic circles its functioning cannot always be considered to be in accordance with requirements. And in the school also, at geography or biology lessons, for example, the speech of the teacher (and the pupils, of course) rarely approximates literary standards. Tajik has been supplanted completely in such VUZ's as the medical and agricultural institutions, whose graduates have by their occupation to be in the thick of the people, but who can converse with them only with difficulty. Of course, their teachers also, acknowledged specialists frequently, who have been delivering lectures in the VUZ for 30-40 years, find it difficult to address the rural population.

So a national language may possess the necessary level of development only if it functions in accordance with requirements in the main spheres of the life of society—education at all levels, in science, culture, art and a considerable part of clerical work, in official circles and, naturally, in ordinary intercourse. When use of the native language is increasingly confined to the family circle and the four walls of the school, there is no hoping for its development. Even the fundamental restructuring of teaching can produce tangible results only when the youth knows that the native language is needed not only at home and for passing examinations but in all man's activity.

If today we have to speak of the need for knowledge of Tajik by representatives of the nonindigenous population, this also is a requirement of practice. This will contribute to the protection and preservation of the national language and an expansion of the sphere of its social functions.

We often speak of the dialectical unity of the national and international, but upon their transference from the aesthetic to the social plane and the practical solution of life's problems we regard these concepts for some reason or other as opposite and mutually exclusive. Whence wrong conclusions contrary to both national interests and the principles of internationalism. Whence also our fear of the possibility of being accused of nationalism when it is a question of defense of the national language. It is time, it would seem to me, to finally realize that concern for national culture and the development of any language is a principle condition of internationalism.

A failure to recognize this simple truth creates many difficulties. How can we explain, for example, the arguments which have arisen in various republics about whether it is necessary in multinational cities to open kindergarten which raise children in the language of the indigenous nationality? As if this were contrary to the principles of internationalism! Teaching a child Tajik has long been a problem here in Dushanbe. Those who have the opportunity send their children for the summer to the village, to relatives and grandmothers and grandfathers. But what about the rest? Can it be considered normal that in 1987 in Leninabad only 3 kindergarten out of the 39 operated in Tajik and a further 3 were mixed? Roughly the same picture may be observed in other cities of the republic also. There are many young people in Tajikistan who are unhappy with their parents and who come into conflict with them even owing to the fact that the latter in the past "caringly" protected them from the native language.

Blunting the feeling of national pride and the capacity for taking pride in one's language and one's people and their culture and history cannot lead to the molding of true internationalism. The essence of the principle of the voluntary approach and democratism in the choice of language of tuition was revealed in depth by Chingiz Aytmatov: "No one can be compelled, of course, but nor

should we free a nation's conscience from its history, even less, call for and encourage a renunciation of the native language. This is virtually the same as renouncing one's own parents" (KYRGYZSTAN MADANIYATY, 17 December 1987). The Ukrainian Yu. Mushketik, the Belorussian N. Gilevich and others spoke convincingly about this at the USSR Writers Union Board plenum at the start of March this year.

We know of what significance the work of Sadriddin Ayni was in the development of Tajik. He was an outstanding expert in Persian-Tajik classics and the living folk language, and it was in Ayni's prose that the historical process of democratization of the Tajik literary language was completed and its basic modern rules defined. Ayni's literary works, current affairs writing, scientific studies, letters and his "Explanatory Dictionary of the Tajik Language" imbibed the incalculable riches of the native language. But if one looks at the general picture of the literature of the 1970's-1980's, with certain exceptions (the novels of S. Ulug-zody and Dzh. Ikrami and the poetry of M. Kanoat and Loik), one is struck by the absence of a serious linguistic orientation and the loss of stable criteria enabling the writer to distinguish the authenticity of national style from "literary rubbish". How often after having read some book or other one tries to recall if only one apt word and expression or original construction! There stick in one's memory only examples of the free use of language, unintelligibility and lack of taste. The blind copying of primitive everyday conversation or newspaper cliches and bureaucratese, tedious uniformity, dullness and inexpressiveness lead many writers to what may be called "speechlessness".

Unfortunately, there is no serious official concern in the republic for Tajik, and effective measures are not being adopted to create the optimum conditions for its development. We are looking on with composure while the circle of the social functioning of the national language narrows increasingly and its prestige declines. Nor is our leadership troubled by the fact that the Tajik press enjoys no authority and that radio and television programs simply cannot rise above the average level.

The Tajik Communist Party Central Committee and TaSSR Council of Ministers recently adopted the decree "Measures To Improve the Study and Teaching of Tajik in the Republic". This is the sole such document in many years, and we will hope that, given fulfillment of the measures outlined therein, there will be some practical improvements. But, in my view, the decree does not provide for specific measures to ensure the social functioning of the national language in accordance with requirements and fails to determine the main areas of work pertaining to the creation of new school programs and modern teaching methods. A long-term comprehensive system of measures capable of ensuring realization of genuinely Leninist principles of national-language policy is needed.

The idea concerning the need for the enactment of a law on the languages of the USSR peoples has been received with tremendous interest. Of course, the law must be created on the basis of a thorough study of the state of affairs in each republic and precise determination of the status of the national language and the principles of the legal regulation of its use. Obviously, it is necessary also to define the status of Russian as the medium of international communication and the legal principles of its interaction with other languages. This could be an important step in society's recognition of the true essence of the concept of bilingualism in the culture of the USSR peoples.

It seems to me that the main reason why Tajik youth currently does not know Russian or knows it inadequately should be sought in its ignorance of the native language, which is the basis of the spiritual and moral self-knowledge of the personality and intellectual character of the individual and his civic attributes. And it is no accident that there once appeared the Tajik saying: "Whoever is ineffectual in his own language is an ignoramus even if he knows 200 languages."

Political, Ecological Concerns Over Construction at Topkhana, NKAO Reviewed
18300297 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian
2 Dec 88 p 4

[Article by Yu. Khalilov, chief of the Department of Land, Mineral, Flora, and Scenic Area Conservation, and S. Israfilov, chief of the Azerbaijan SSR State Environmental Commission's Department of Nature Preserves and Monuments: "Topkhana: An Analysis of What Happened and Thoughts About the Future"]

[Text] Recently, the media have told us repeatedly about events in a tiny place known as Topkhana. And Topkhana has spent the last few days as the word most frequently spoken by participants in rallies on Lenin Square in Baku, as well as in other cities and towns of the republic. The unpardonable invasion of Topkhana has quite rightly angered and outraged our people.

As direct participants in the investigation of the situation there, we feel it is our civic and official duty to inform Azerbaijanis of our findings and the steps that have been taken to rectify problems.

The first reports that Topkhana's environmental laws were being broken, that plants were being uprooted, made their way to the Azerbaijan State Committee on Environmental Protection as far back as late June of this year. But if we keep in mind that the situation in and around Nagorniy Karabakh had already reached the flash point by then, we can see why Shushinskiy Rayon public, party, and soviet efforts to understand and defuse events already underway were doomed to failure. The problem is that the Shushinskiy and Topkhana Plateaus, which are divided by the Dashaltynskiy Gorge and the

Karkarchay River that flows through it, are an indivisible, historically articulated entity. Yet Topkhana is in the jurisdiction of the Askeranskiy Rayon, as it is on land belonging to the Engels Kolkhoz. Because of this, residents of Shushi were forced to seek help from republic-level organizations.

As soon as the reports from Shushi came in, a team of experts (including one of the authors of this article) from the State Environmental Commission, the State Agricultural Commission, and the Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Forestry left for the site. The situation they found themselves working in was an unusual one. This becomes manifestly clear when we note that representatives of the Askeranskiy Rayon and oblast organizations did not participate in the investigation, even though they were officially notified of it in writing.

We were treated upon our arrival to a magnificently beautiful site from which we had a panoramic view of Shushi. Then we saw a bulldozer and the havoc it had wrought in Topkhana during its barbaric rampage over almost 4.5 hectares of land. From dense underbrush to 10 and 15 year old trees, everything had fallen under the blade of the bulldozer, to be entombed beneath a layer of upturned earth.

Attempts to get those "delegates" of the Engels Kolkhoz who were on the scene to explain the bulldozing did not produce very convincing answers. The chief "delegate" was a young fellow who tried to tie the devastation to events in the NKAO, Armenia, and on the world scene. When it was suggested that he take part in the investigation, he categorically refused, explaining that he was a private citizen from Yerevan, and that he was on vacation, visiting relatives. Naturally, the others in attendance also made their "unofficial capacity" clear.

We now know that construction had been scheduled at Topkhana in advance, and that the bulldozing was only the first stage of a much larger project. Both the NKAO prosecutor, comrade V.V. Vasilenko, and the heads of the oblast ispolkom were informed of our findings.

The State Committee for Environmental Protection sent the materials dealing with the bulldozing incident to the Azerbaijan SSR Procurator, and the NKAO Procurator decided to prosecute the case. (As we subsequently learned from the republic procurator, the chairman of and chief agronomist at the Engels Kolkhoz have been charged. As we were already in Stepanakert in connection with the construction at Topkhana, we visited comrade Vasilenko and saw "with our own eyes" the decisions made by the Askeranskiy Peoples Court.) At that moment, it seemed to us that justice had triumphed.

As we departed Shushi, we did not imagine that we would soon be involved in another investigation in the same location, although this time in connection with far more serious breaches of the law.

There is a multi-staged process involved in condemning and appropriating land, including land to be used as a building site. The Azerbaijan SSR Land Code clearly defines the jurisdiction of the republic's Council of Ministers, the NKAO Soviet of Peoples Deputies Ispolkom, and the rayon ispolkoms. Moreover, the appropriation of agricultural, State Forestry Fund, sanatorium, or park preserve land within the republic—that is, within the NKAO as well—is the exclusive domain of the Azerbaijan government, as long as it has the consent of the appropriate republic organizations.

As soon as the news that construction had begun at Topkhana was announced, the State Committee for Environmental Protection appealed to the USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection. The chairman of the State Committee flew to Moscow, and on 18 November the deputy head of the USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection and the chief engineer of the USSR Gosstroy arrived in Baku. And they were followed a day later by representatives of union [soyuz] organizations, the State Committee for Environmental Protection, and the republic's Ministry of Justice.

We had no sooner stepped from our cars when we were surrounded by people. They already knew why we were there, and demanded one thing: decisive action and results. The commission left immediately for Dzhydyrdyuzu. It was dark, and the fog over the Dashlynskiy Gorge hid the far side, but we could hear the sound of machinery.

It is significant that even then, when work at Topkhana had been stopped completely, the machinery would continue to be operated at night. Aerial surveys showed that there was no construction underway, so the only conclusion we could come to was that the machinery was being operated to grind at the nerves of the people of Shushi and force them to take desperate action. To their credit, no one succumbed to the provocation.

In the morning a single look sufficed to tell us the scope of the problem. Machinery, building materials, electric power cable, and three completed foundations were in view. A few kilometers below the plateau, a hangar belonging to the Kanakarskiy Aluminum Plant Cooperative gleamed in the sun. The hangar was built as a shop for producing aluminum consumer goods.

In order to study the evidence surrounding the construction at Topkhana itself, the commission went to Stepanakert, where work started with the new arrivals being reproached for having entered the NKAO through Baku, and not Yerevan. This was certainly a strange reproach if one considers that the commission was invited by the Azerbaijan State Committee.

What did the examination of the evidence surrounding the land issue show?

In August of this year, the Kanakerskiy Aluminum Plant asked the oblast ispolkom for permission to build an aluminum consumer goods plant in Askeranskiy Rayon, on land belonging to the Engels Kolkhoz. The Kanakerskiy Plant requested that it be given 10 hectares of land for the construction of a 150-room hotel, also on land belonging to the Engels Kolkhoz. And a letter from the plant contained a unique resolution from S.A. Babayan, the chairman of the oblast ispolkom: "To Comrade V. Ovsepyan: You are requested to provide the land indicated. This matter has been resolved." One is inclined to ask who resolved it with whom. And are we to understand that the head of the ispolkom section [otdel] has the authority to allocate land?

In accordance with the instructions from the ispolkom section, the Askeranskiy Rayon Ispolkom created a commission that then selected a six hectare tract of common pasturage, although the law requires that potential options be considered and every effort be made to preserve historical and archaeological monuments and areas of scenic beauty. It should be noted that the commission consisted of several experts who certainly knew these laws. On 28 October, after producing a number of opinions, including one which A. Agababyan, the acting chairman of the Askeranskiy Rayon Ispolkom, issued to himself, the Askeranskiy Rayon Ispolkom adopted a decision embodied in a document entitled: "Appropriating a Tract of Land for Construction of a 150-Room Hotel Belonging to the KanAZ [Kanakerskiy Aluminum Plant] in the Village of Shushikend." On 1 November, the NKAO ispolkom approved this decision to appropriate (meaning we give it up) this tract, thereby ending the paperwork and starting the building.

What is the most noteworthy feature of the decisions made by the two ispolkoms, one at the rayon and the other at the oblast level? Both overstepped their authority by deciding to appropriate agriculturally zoned land, and arrogated powers belonging to the government of Azerbaijan. In their decisions, both ispolkoms indicated that construction had to begin immediately if the Askeranskiy Rayon was to be able to provide housing for the influx of refugees from other parts of the republic.

But there is an inconsistency here. If the hotel was being built for the plant, what do refugees have to do with it? And if it was being built for refugees, why the smoke-screen?

No one doubts that refugees are a sad reality in that part of the country. But in the interview he gave to the Armenian SSR newspaper KOMMUNIST, party obkom first secretary Pogosyan spoke of 6,000 vacant buildings when he invited the Armenians to come live in the NKAO. Is there anything keeping the refugees out of these buildings? They never answered that question either.

The evidence from the land dispute case showed that six articles of the Azerbaijan SSR Land Code had been violated, as well as article 22 of the Azerbaijan SSR Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Law. The Azerbaijan SSR State Committee for Environmental Protection then informed the government of Azerbaijan of this fact, providing them with materials for their consideration, particularly an Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers resolution that was drafted in conjunction with the republic's Ministry of Justice.

We arrived in Topkhana during the day on the 24th of November, a group formed of Muscovites, three persons from Baku, and some oblast-level representatives. We started our routine work, which consisted of locating the construction site on the ground, determining its size, reconciling the site with what was on the land-use map, arguing, finding evidence, and more arguing. There was no work underway, and there were virtually no builders around. Near the approaches to Topkhana, only soldiers and their equipment could be seen, while at Dzhydyrd-yuzu residents of Shushi crowded together, watching us. As we looked at them, we once again felt the magnitude of the tensions that have been mounting here for the last few months. The people wanted a decision.

On 24 November, the republic Council of Ministers rescinded the decision made by the NKAO Soviet of Peoples Deputies Ispolkom. The oblast ispolkom was instructed to stop construction of the hotel and other projects associated with the KanAZ, and to return Topkhana to its former condition. The machinery was withdrawn from Topkhana.

Topkhana was saved. But it will take some time, effort, and money to heal her wounds. We hope the people will not turn a deaf ear; that they will instead become involved in the effort to restore the area. There are already examples to follow: a special account has been set up for Topkhana.

But the Topkhana story does not end here. Instead, we need to reflect on the future of this unique natural treasure that is home to rare and endangered plant and animal species, some of which are so rare that they have been entered in the USSR Red Book and the Azerbaijan SSR Red Book. It was to preserve these species that the Dashaltynskiy State Preserve was established on 24 November by a resolution of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers. The preserve will be part of the unique framework of natural complexes formed by Dzhydyrd-yuzu, the Dashaltynskiy Gorge, and the area around Topkhana.

How will this framework protect the areas we have been talking about? In the areas that are part of the state preserves system, the following forms of economic activity will be strictly limited or, if necessary, banned: plowing fields, grazing cattle, building, pesticide use, hunting, prospecting, and mining. The preserve will have

its own staff, which will be responsible for protecting the area and enforcing regulations. Work on setting up the Dashaltynskiy Preserve is already well underway.

But the State Committee for Environmental Protection cannot do the job alone. Among the work to be done on the State Preserve lands is delineating the natural habitats of plant and animal species in the Red Book, and finding ways to protect them and encourage their reproduction. For the effort to succeed, the botanists and zoologists of the republic are going to have to show some initiative. We also need to determine the maximum stress the landscape can tolerate. Nor can we forget that the Dashaltynskiy Preserve is home to many historical and archaeological monuments. These must be included in the appropriate record of sites under state protection, and marked as such with signs. After all, Shushi is a resort city, with thousands of visitors every year, and there is no doubt that they will be interested in learning about its history and architecture, as well as that of the surrounding areas. It seems to us that it would be reasonable for the preserve to put a tour guide on its staff as well.

Is there any reason not to put several Ibrahim Khan vintage cannons, or exact copies, in Topkhana; or anything contraindicating the erection of a commemorative plaque describing the events of his time? After all, Borodino has celebrations on the day of the battle there. Perhaps we too should memorialize certain chapters of the heroic past.

The work on the future of Topkhana has begun. We hope the Academy of Sciences, the republic Ministry of Culture, and the other organizations in a position to help Topkhana will hear our request for assistance.

**Biologist Reymers on Industrial Pollution,
Clean-Up Possibilities**
*18300109a Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA
INDUSTRIYA in Russian 4 Nov 88 p 3*

[Interview with Doctor of Biological Sciences N. Reymers, deputy chairman of the "Ecology and the World" association of the Soviet committee for world protection, by SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA correspondent G. Dadyants: "If It Is Ecological, It Is Economical"; date and place not specified]

[Text] [Dadyants] We know how the problem of environmental pollution is turning out in the West. The major scandals involving export of harmful waste products to the developing countries are well known. A far from irrelevant question arises—how ecologically clean will those enterprises be in which Western firms are involved in the construction? The decision to construct a complex for ammonia processing in the Odessa port zone has turned out to be highly controversial. Public anxiety has also raised a question with respect to construction of an enterprise in the Crimea for production of sulfur dyes. Our publication has received letters from

readers expressing indignation at this decision. Therefore, our first question to you, Nikolay Fedorovich, is—would it be expensive to combine technological progress with protection of the environment?

[Reymers] I would like to begin my answer to this question on a positive note. Not long ago I had occasion to be in Latin America, where I visited a large-scale enterprise, a cellulose-paper combine. An engineer here was fighting with the enterprise because it was discharging tremendous quantities of sewage and poisonous waste into the atmosphere. He fought long and hard, but in the end the owner of the firm got sick and tired of it saying, in coarse fashion—look, you've got 40 million dollars to accomplish this venture. But keep in mind that if you don't show a profit at the end, you can blame yourself. So what do you think? The engineer introduced a number of purification measures leading to a situation today where the enterprise also produces large quantities of organic fertilizer and makes an impressive profit based on its additional, secondary production. He changed from being an enemy of the concern to one of its directors.

Let us look at another example. Finland and Sweden have a tremendous number of cellulose-paper enterprises which do not release anywhere near the quantity of harmful discharges that, say, ours do—at Ladoga, for example. In other words, it is possible to combine technological progress with protection of the environment.

What conclusion seems to suggest itself here? Our policies with respect to foreign firms must first of all be oriented on the progressive technology which has been developed there, and not on low prices.

[Dadyants] In other words, we should not be accusing the Western firms with whom we are cooperating, but rather our departments, which are chasing after cheap contracts?

[Reymers] Certainly. A capitalist enterprise remains a capitalist enterprise, and its primary concern is profit. But there are two approaches to making a profit. The first entails using the highest possibilities technology has to offer to get the highest price, and the second—selling outdated technology where it is possible to do so. This is not the principle of "If you don't deceive, you don't sell." It is simply the fact that if a buyer has little money and he wants to acquire inexpensive technology, then he should blame himself if he gets technology which is, as is currently described, ecologically inadequate.

[Dadyants] But the firms which sell us technology can hardly be expected to say that it is not the very best.

[Reymers] In order to know, you have to have your own specialists, your own knowledgeable people—even two levels of them, apparently. The first level is a sort of reconnaissance level—something like what we did in

Brazil. I spoke with local experts there—ecologists like myself—who told me quite frankly, without any regard for the interests of one firm or another, what was good and what was bad. This is the first means which must be used. The second level entails the direct expertise of every kind of technical mutual relations that would enable us to achieve ideal trade conditions.

[Dadyants] How specifically do you relate to the combined enterprises our readers are so concerned about? I am referring to the Odessa port complex and the enterprise in the Crimea for producing sulfur dyes.

[Reymers] This kind of innovation with foreign firms must frequently be expected to lead to conflict with the local society. This was the case in Odessa and the Crimea with regard to the deal with the Sandoz firm. I don't want to say anything bad about this firm in particular, but it has been fined fairly heavily in Western Europe. Failures occurred there leading to very serious ecological consequences for the Rhine River basin. The firm is being damaged psychologically at its very birthplace. The element of distrust there is naturally transferred to our society. And here you get a collision between society and the departments.

[Dadyants] As we know, many Western firms are operating on a non-waste-product technology basis. Isn't this where we must look for a way of creating ecologically pure production?

[Reymers] These days I am forced to argue with a great many people I respect as regards non-waste-product technology. The fact is—this is not achievable. There will always be heat in waste materials and we must pay heed to the ionic composition of the atmosphere. Any large-scale enterprise will sharply alter it. And in the resort areas, this is one of the main health-benefit factors. Our facilities at Yurmala, Sochi and Sukhumi cannot be considered recreational—the air quality there is such that it is impossible to improve one's health. The only way would be to lie face down to the surf and breathe at that level—and if you so much as walk, you are already losing good health in spite of anything else.

[Dadyants] Let us pose the question directly, Nikolay Fedorovich. Will we pollute the Crimea if we construct "Tavriya" there?

[Reymers] I don't think we'll pollute it if everything is done on a fairly high level. But, of course, we are reducing the recreational potential of the surrounding territory. It is difficult to say right now how all of this will look in reality. Special research is required—the ecological expertise so many people talk about but no one actually employs.

[Dadyants] What do you mean by genuine ecological expertise?

[Reymers] This is primarily independent research they don't spare money for in the West. And we believe it is sufficient to gather 60 or 70 people together, a sort of boyars' duma, to sit, think and decide what will be and what will not be. This is a fallacy. There is literature on this issue. There is operational experience. There are firms which exercise ecological expertise. Perhaps in planning mutual ventures with our foreign partners we should invite one such firm over and see how it operates.

[Dadyants] Of course, we do not have such firms.

[Reymers] Not yet. But I for one am prepared to organize such a firm. The Kemerovskaya Oblast Ispolkom, it seems, intends to allocate funds for such an operation. What should the firm constitute? Six or seven prominent specialists with assistants, conducting independent, extremely important research. I will state straight-away that the American firms are no example, because they poorly employ their ecological expertise. I am convinced of this. But there are firms in other countries which operate well. Of course, they cannot function poorly if they want to obtain orders. With us, everything is forgiven of those who make mischief.

[Dadyants] All the same, Nikolay Fedorovich, what do you think determines the barbarous point of view some of our departments have taken with regard to the environment—is it helplessness and inability to see the consequences of their actions, or limited financial resources?

[Reymers] First of all it is extremely low knowledgeability. Our technical engineering profession has been disqualified. Prior to the revolution and immediately afterwards, to be an engineer was a very high calling. Today an engineer is a semi-skilled individual. Secondly, we see imposition on the part of officials. Our departments think they can create what they wish.

I am against falling into an ecological hysteria—that is absolutely worthless. We must be realistic about things. At the same time we must roll up our sleeves, train our own cadre of experts and change higher education at its roots. In order to avoid making mistakes—including in selecting our foreign partners—we have to teach people to think. Our specialists differ from those of the past in that the latter knew how to think; ours today are able only to execute. The lack of thinking is simply killing us.

[Dadyants] In other words, you have in mind a new thinking as applied to our internal problems?

[Reymers] Yes. A lot of time has been spent breaking us of the habit of thinking, but we now we must change direction. For example, I learned a great deal from the Finnish firm "Nokiya." They adhere to one principle—they undertake only those efforts which either no one has yet worked on or on which the work done is inadequate.

We must cooperate only with those foreign firms that are working in branches with a future. At present we are involved with those who let us and those who are cheaper.

When speaking about ecology we must remember that everything that is ecological is economical and social as well. This should be the key for us, if you will, in establishing any combined associations and concluding any contracts with foreign firms.

Azerbaijani Health Minister on Pesticide Abuse in Republic

18300109b Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Aug 88 p 2

[Article by T. Kasumov, Azerbaijan SSR minister of health: "The Poisoned Earth: What Has Developed From Excessive Use of Pesticides in the Fields of Azerbaijan"]

[Text] Baku—Our burning steppe stretches over many hundreds of hectares—across Mil, Mugan and Shirvan. If there were water, gardens would long ago have begun to bloom here and fields of grain to ripen. But it is felt that these lands are more suitable for cultivating cotton. For that reason, no matter in what direction one might cross Mil or Mugan, all one sees on either side of the road, almost up to the level of the horizon, are cotton plantations.

The cotton culture has occupied a solid position in the agriculture of the republic. It is indeed an invaluable wealth of our land. But being unable to use it wisely, turning benefit into harm, we are today paying for this in full.

"Let the mountain of cotton grow to reach the clouds..." Could the poet who wrote this loudly resounding metaphor think that, taken completely seriously without due consideration being given to the land's actual capabilities, it would become the combat slogan of the time of stagnation? That it would become an end whose realization would justify all means?

In the pursuit of immediate results, of reaping bountiful harvests now, everything has been permitted—the exhausting 12-13 hour working day of the farm population (everyone, without exception, including pregnant women, children and medical personnel forced to cast sick people at the mercy of fate), increased areas of cultivation extending right up to the peasants' back yards and homesteads, massive, repeated chemical treatment administered primarily from the air leaving thick layers of pesticide on floors and meadows, on grazing lands and in reservoirs. It has happened that poisonous chemicals have literally fallen on people's heads when they've been unable to find shelter in the field from a sudden, unscheduled and unexplained air raid. This has most often been a mixture of DDT, that highly toxic pesticide whose use in agriculture was officially prohibited in 1970. As a rule, the Azerbaijani Council of Ministers has submitted an

application of request to the USSR Ministry of Health and, without any special attempts at persuasion, the chief medical authority of the country has given permission for the use of DDT in Azerbaijani agriculture "as an exception."

How many of these exceptions we have had!

With respect to pesticides, Azerbaijan occupies first place in the country for quantity used per unit area. With a variation in this index of from two to five kilograms per hectare for the country as a whole, it reaches 40 in our cotton and vegetable growing regions, and up to 183 kilograms in our wine-growing regions. Additionally, according to World Health Organization data, the average application of pesticides amounts to 1.9 kilograms per hectare in the European countries, 1.5 in the United States and 0.13 in Latin America.

Little subject to biological decay, DDT and other dangerous pesticides will be maintained in the cycle of nature for many years to come, with all the consequences that entails. We are actually feeling these consequences already—trees destroyed to their roots, leaves scorched at the height of the summer, poisoned rivers and lakes, land so soaked through with poisons that it cannot now and will long be unable to bear healthy fruit. This is, alas, the sad reality prevalent in most of our cotton growing regions. Analyses conducted by the Azerbaijani Sanitary and Epidemiological Station have shown repeated instances of pesticide concentrations exceeding the maximum allowable levels—in one out of four tests of food products from Neftechalinskiy Rayon, in one of every eight tests from Bardinskiy Rayon, in one out of ten from Zhdanovskiy Rayon.

All of these gross violations cannot help but have an effect on people's health.

Fairly comprehensive studies conducted at two farm enterprises in Agdashskiy Rayon show the typical picture. Indices showing overall incidence of disease among children through age six in the zone of powerful chemical treatment (the "Uzbekistan" kolkhoz) turned out to be 4.6 times higher than in the minimal treatment zone ("Kavkaz" kolkhoz). Skin diseases were higher by a factor of 5.6, chronic eating disorders and metabolism problems—by a factor of 4.2, problems of the nervous system and respiratory organs—by a factor of 3.1, digestive tract disorders—by 3.6, problems associated with reduced body reaction—by 2.5. Retardation of growth and physical development in children less than one year old increased 12 percent. Moreover, one of the fundamental reasons for high infant mortality in the agricultural regions is pesticides. The facts are astonishing and appalling. This is the high price—the health of the population, of our future generations—which was paid to achieve the "loud" victories of the stagnation era that have brought us to the damage we see today.

The situation is currently straightening itself out somewhat. The assortment of highly toxic pesticides being used has diminished over the past year and biological means of protecting plant growth are being introduced on a more widespread basis. Sanitary control and supervision of poisonous chemical applications is more strict and measures have been taken to improve preventive medical checkups for rural workers. Nonetheless, we cannot say that these changes have had any significant influence on the state of affairs.

How can we explain the fact that intensive use of pesticides remains, as before, unjustifiably high and at the same time dozens of tons of microbiology compounds against pests lie subject to destruction because they are not being used in timely fashion and grow obsolete. Why, in 70 percent of the cotton plantations studied in a number of rayons, are poisonous chemical preparations stored under awnings, in unsuitable warehouses and even under the open sky, to be blown about by the wind and washed away by the rains? Why is there as yet no solution to the problems of destruction and burial of pesticides which are no longer usable or whose use has been prohibited, which have accumulated in tremendous quantities at farm enterprises? Why has there been a postponement year after year in making operational the only proving ground in the republic for these purposes?

Frequent relapses of the old disease are causing particular alarm. In March of last year the USSR's chief health official prohibited production and use of the highly toxic pesticide butifos, extremely dangerous to the health of people and the environment. And after half a year our health service has discovered that it is being used on a widespread basis for cotton plant defoliation in several regions—specifically in Salyanskiy and Neftechalinskiy rayons. It was revealed that permission was given by the chairman of the all-union association "Soyuzselkhozkhimiya," A. Gulenko, who thus grossly violated the ban

of state health supervisory agencies. How can we evaluate such an outrageous situation from today's viewpoint? And is there any guarantee that it will not happen again?

We have undertaken measures along with the unions to keep the situation under constant control in the future. But we must admit honestly that without a change of attitude on the part of the enterprise managers and the rural workers themselves, it will be difficult to expect success. Apparently, along with stricter measures for punishing violators, it will also be necessary to conduct explanatory, propaganda work on a more widespread basis. Years of silence which created an illusion of well-being in all areas, including the ecological sphere, have not been in vain. Still we cannot seem to bring ourselves to being completely frank with respect to the true state of affairs. It is urgently necessary now to state the situation as it is, to publish regular reports with respect to the content of harmful substances in the atmosphere, in the soil and in farm products which are often sold freely on the market.

It is understood that significant problems are associated with all of this. Laboratories are extremely poorly stocked and supplied. There is a critical lack of trained personnel and suitable equipment. The supervisory and analytical control service of the Azerbaijani Agricultural Industry Commission finds itself unable to accomplish sufficient research even for the present stage. All the same, the problem must be solved.

We are placing great hope in this regard on a long-term, integrated and comprehensive program developed at the initiative of the new Azerbaijani leadership, "The Health of the Azerbaijan SSR Population." Presented for widespread discussion, this program will enable all strata of the population to get involved in working out concrete measures to improve people's health, protect the environment, and make efficient use of natural resources. It will involve those who will be living and working on our Earth, saving and preserving it for future generations.

10
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.