

106073

JPRS-UPA-88-010
1 MARCH 1988




**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs



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

19980812 126

10
130
A67

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-010

CONTENTS

1 MARCH 1988

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Fuller Text of Ryzhkov Interview for Swedish Daily Published [Christina Jutterstrom; NEW TIMES, Jan 88]	1
Kamchatka Obkom Plenum Proceedings Viewed [Yu. Balakirev; IZVESTIYA, 9 Dec 87]	9
BSSR CP CC Discusses Failings in Agriculture, Other Sectors [SOVETSKAYA BELORUSIYA, 16 Dec 87]	11
Guryev Obkom Plenum Reported	13
Shortcomings, Successes Noted [G. Groyser, K. Kadelov; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 15 Dec 87]	13
Kolbin Reviews Leadership Tasks [KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 17 Dec 87]	16
Tselinograd Obkom's Handling of Perestroyka Inadequate [K. Zhoykinbekov, I. Yavorovskiy; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 2 Dec 87]	20
Azerbaijan CC Implements CPSU Decision to Close Institute [BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 1 Dec 87]	21
Kurgan-Tyube Obkom Criticized for Indifference to Cadre Incompetency [V. Matonin, L. Makhkamov; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 22 Dec 87]	24
Information Report On Eighth Georgian CP CC Plenum [Gruzinform; ZARYA VOSTOKA, 20 Dec 87 p 1]	26

MEDIA, PROPAGANDA

Readers Advise Newspaper on Topic Preferences, Glasnost [S. Zapolskaya, N. Ryabova; SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA, 12 Nov 87]	28
Ways To Improve Quality, Usefulness of Kirghiz TV I. Layliyeva; SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA, 24 Nov 87]	29
Armenian Journalists Review Perestroyka Progress in Media [KOMMUNIST, 15 Nov 87]	31
Armenian CP Wants Improvements in Ayastan Publishing Work [KOMMUNIST, 25 Nov 87]	32

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Period of Collectivization, Impact of Perestroyka Pondered [I. Klyamkin; NOVYY MIR, No 11, Nov 87]	33
Historian Explains Stalin's Rise to Power in 1920's [D. Shelestov; OGONEK, No 47, 21-28 Nov 87]	45
Perestroyka-Motivated Research At Latvian History Institute [L. Zile; VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS, No 11, Nov 87]	50

RELIGION

Paper Discusses Presence of Krishna Sect in Lithuania [A. Koryakov; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 29 Nov 87]	56
Uniate Metropolitan Accused of Supporting Nazi Occupation	57

CULTURE

Filmmakers Union Plenum Views Restructuring Problems [I. Ivanova, G. Simanovich; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 12 Dec 87]	59
Writers' Union Plenum Holds Conference in Alma-Ata	64
Chairman Proskurin Interviewed [A. Samoylenko, A. Pelekhatkiy; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 2 Dec 87]	64
Kolbin Meets With Writers [A. Samoylenko; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 16 Dec 87]	67
Republics Voice Needs at Artists Union Plenum [T. Rykhlova; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 24 Dec 87]	68
'OGONEK' Rates 'Best' Contributors to Literary Journals [T. Ivanova; OGONEK, No 46, Nov 87]	70
MOLODAYA GVARDIYA's Ivanov and Author Kaverin 'Square Off' [A. Ivanov, V. Kaverin; OGONEK, No 46, Nov 87]	74

Ukrainian Writer Gonchar Speaks Out on Nationalism [O. Gonchar; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 9 Dec 87]	77
Literary Journal Experiments With Young Contributors [N. Zenova; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 9 Dec 87]	80
PRC Interest in Soviet Literature, Language Described [S. Selivanova; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 16 Dec 87]	81

SOCIAL ISSUES

Jurists Debate New Laws on Glasnost, Press, Demonstrations [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 22 Dec 87]	88
Arbat Becomes Youth Group Forum; Official Reactions Vary [S. Avdeyev, M. Korchagin; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 27 Nov 87]	93
Estonians Debate Problems of Russian Integration	97
Znaniye Official's Article [B. Matveyev; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 18 Dec 87]	97
Various Readers' Letters [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 27 Dec 87]	99
Estonian MVD Chief Interviewed On Post-Amnesty Crime Rate [F. Kaazik; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 3 Dec 87]	101
Azeri MVD Chief Discusses Restructuring of Militia [A. Mamedov; BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 3 Dec 87]	102
Jurist Urges Use of Videos to Improve Work of Courts [A. Karanadze; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA ZAKONNOST, No 11, Nov 87]	106
Translator Warned Against Contact With Foreign Citizens [V. Ustich; OGONEK, No 48, Nov 87]	107
Tajik Press Conference On Family Planning, Women's Roles [KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, 28 Jan 88 p 2]	108
Religious Belief Given As Reason for Breakup of Families	108

REGIONAL ISSUES

Proposals For Amu-Darya Delta Ecological, Economic Improvement [A.P. Yurits; OBNCHESTVENNYE NAUKI V UZBEKISTANE, No 8, Aug 87]	109
Uzbek Officials Fight Recognition of Disease Problem	114
Doctor's Work Denied for 17 Years [O. Lukyanchikov; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 12 Dec 87]	114
People's Control Committee Investigates [U. Maksumova; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 27 Dec 87]	120
Doctors Review Uzbek Health Care Shortcomings [A. Narziyev; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 10 Dec 87]	121
Uzbek Pharmacists Face Drug, Vitamin Supply Problems [Sh. Sagatov; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 11 Dec 87]	122
KiSSR Insensitive to Language Needs of Ethnic Germans [V. Kriger; SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA, 9 Jan 88]	123
Growth in Sudak Area Results in Water Supply Shortages [Yu. Yenov; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 23 Dec 87]	125
Dneprovskiy Rayon Residents Protest Chemical Plant Pollution [V. Shestakov; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 24 Dec 87]	126

**Fuller Text of Ryzhkov Interview for Swedish
Daily Published**

*18120052 Moscow NEW TIMES in English
No 2, Jan 88 pp 5-12*

[Replies by Nikolai Ryzhkov, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to Christina Jutterstrom, editor-in-chief of the Stockholm daily DAGENS NYHETER]

[Text] Question: In Sweden we have been following very closely the reform process in the USSR, which is generally referred to as "perestroika." Could you first make a general analysis of this "perestroika" and its causes and aims?

Answer: Perestroika is the process of revolutionary renewal of society and profound change in all spheres of life—political, economic, social and cultural. Formulated by the April 1985 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the 27th Party Congress, the concept of perestroika stems from the deep-going processes and real problems in Soviet society, and there is valid reason for its development.

Our goal is to quicken the pace of our progress, bring about a substantial improvement in people's well-being, steer socialist society to a drastically new level, and reveal the humanist nature of our system more fully. As the January 1987 Plenum noted, the policy of perestroika is a follow-up to the great accomplishments started by the Leninist party in October 1917. And it is not merely a continuation, but also a development and reinforcement of the main ideas of the revolution.

There are many reasons why perestroika has become indispensable. These include an economic slowdown, stagnation in many spheres, and mistakes and oversights by the country's leadership. As we say, there exists a mechanism that brakes our social and economic advancement.

One may ask: How has all this become possible? We have, naturally, been seeking an answer to this question ourselves by making an in-depth analysis of our past and our present. And it has become clear that the letup is rooted in the faulty functioning of socialist democracy and in the outdated, cumbersome economic mechanism that makes it impossible to harmonize the personal interests of working people with the interests of society as a whole.

Our socialist society has vast economic, political, cultural and moral potential. But we have been using them most inefficiently, and often wastefully. What are we going to do in the next few years to rectify the situation?

The period of ascertaining the causes of our problems is now over. We have worked out a comprehensive programme for restructuring the economy, the political

system and the social and cultural spheres. This programme has won the wholehearted backing of Soviet people and evoked a lively international response.

A second, more challenging and crucial period has begun as we have embarked on a full-scale effort to put our plans into practice. We believe that the future of perestroika depends on two closely interrelated trends in our development—democratization of every aspect of public affairs and radical economic reform. We have set out on this course that is reflected in the theoretical concept and programme for perestroika and we shall follow it.

To be sure, we are revamping our country and our society on a strictly socialist basis, not restoring capitalism. At the same time, we are prepared to draw on the experience of other countries, especially, of course, the socialist nations.

I would advise all readers of your newspaper who want to have a good understanding of what perestroika is all about, why we need it, what its purpose is and what implications it may have for the Soviet Union and the rest of the world to read Mikhail Gorbachev's recently published book "Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World." The author shares his thoughts about perestroika, the scope of change, and the complexity, importance and revolutionary nature of our time.

Democratization and Social Justice

Question: Previous attempts at reforming the Soviet economy in the 1960s and the 1970s can hardly be considered successful. Is there any reason to believe that current attempts of this kind will be more productive?

Answer: As I have already said, the sweeping economic change launched in this country is one of the two key components of the policy of perestroika. The word "attempt" you have used does not fit in here because the extent and scale of the current economic overhaul and those of the economic reform of the 1960s and the 1970s are incomparable.

The social and political conditions under which we are pursuing economic reform today are fundamentally different from the situation that existed in the economy and in the system of management in the preceding period. Then, the measures to streamline the economic mechanism were not complemented by an all-round democratization of society and the management sphere.

Those measures were incomplete and inconsistent. They did not reach deep into the upper echelons of management and did not gear all sections of the economy to strive for the best possible results and to apply economic levers of management. In those years we failed to blend the interests of worker collectives with the tasks set to enterprises. As a result, the mass of working people effectively stayed out of the process of change.

We have certainly taken into account all those miscalculations and blunders as we have undertaken the current reform programme. This reform is far-reaching and all-embracing in character and affects practically every aspect of life. It already has a legislative basis. In its development the reform relies on economic laws and interests which may be said to be given full effect for the first time under the socialist system of economic management. Finally—and that is the most important thing—one factor that guarantees that the current reform will not share the fate of the previous ones is the consistently unfolding process of democratization in the country. There will be no return to the past, there just can't be one, because people are actively involved in the perestroika effort.

Question: Leading Soviet economists, including Abel Aganbegyan, are for drastic reform in the pricing system, in particular for revoking most of the current subsidies on foodstuffs, rent and so on. What do you think of it? What economic and social consequences could such a reform have?

Answer: The restructuring of economic management I have mentioned above has made it necessary to also reform the price formation system as a principal component of the economic mechanism. It is essential first of all to review the prices used in settling accounts between enterprises and organizations in different economic sectors—industry, construction, agriculture, transport and communications. Without this it will be actually impossible to change over to the system of cost-accounting and self-financing on the principles of radical economic reform. As the reform is brought into effect, we shall establish economically more substantiated correlations of the prices of products of the extractive and manufacturing industries and dispel the deep-seated illusion of natural resources being inexpensive. The new prices will be aimed at promoting more rational uses of raw materials, feedstock, fuel, etc.

As to a review of consumer prices, it will affect the interests of the entire population and is therefore the sharpest socioeconomic issue of the price reform. As a result of the latter, more correct correlations of prices will be established for different kinds of goods and services, and this will make it possible to stimulate improvements in the consumption pattern on the basis of growth of goods production, their better quality, and higher incomes of the population.

The main condition which has to be ensured in introducing new consumer prices is not to allow people's standard of living to drop. Moreover, it is imperative not only to maintain the standard of living, but also to ensure a rise in it for certain categories of working people so that social justice will be implemented in full. All this will require special compensational measures. The subsidies currently allocated from the budget to cover the

difference between the production costs of a number of foodstuffs and their retail prices will be used to a considerable extent for this purpose.

In view of the great social and political significance of the price reform, it will be the subject of a democratic nationwide discussion.

It should be borne in mind when speaking of this issue that the social programme outlined by the party, which provides for further improvements in people's material well-being and cultural standards, will be carried out in full.

Overcoming Inertia

Question: Speaking in Khabarovsk in the summer of 1986, Mikhail Gorbachev said the reform process had its opponents believing that perestroika meant sapping the very foundation of socialism. Which opponents or what kind of opponent did he have in mind and what are their arguments? Could you also make a more general comment on resistance to perestroika?

Answer: The experience of perestroika, of its initial phase, makes it possible to draw the conclusion that Soviet people are clearly aware of the need for fundamental change in every field of life, for consistently following the policy of renewal and fully bringing out the tremendous social advantages of socialism. Soviet people strongly support the perestroika effort and are joining it ever more actively.

It is safe to say that a new moral and psychological atmosphere has been created in the country and there is no political opposition to the perestroika.

Socialism, as is known, removes antagonistic contradictions in society. But this absolutely true tenet may by no means be understood as a complete absence of differences between the interests of individual groups and sections of society, work collectives of individual enterprises and those of the national economy as a whole. These contradictions do exist and must be seen and taken into account in day-to-day activities.

Now that the process of perestroika is gathering momentum and cutting across into ever expanding areas of public life, it is, naturally, encountering certain resistance.

It should not be forgotten in the first place that under excessive centralism there have taken shape certain stereotypes and theoretical dogmas. Economic and social relations engendered by specific historical conditions were viewed by many as the true and only possible image of socialist society and any deviation from those dogmas was viewed as a departure from the principles of socialism.

Further, the armchair system of management swaddled up shopfloor initiative, prompted play-it-safe attitudes, blunted the sense of responsibility, and cultivated an atmosphere of indifference.

The force of inertia, as is known, is very powerful, and it may not be underestimated either in the social or in the economic spheres. It is perfectly obvious that the mentality and ideas of many millions of people cannot be changed radically at once. This will take time.

Another counteracting factor is conservatism. Many people are mistrustful of everything that is new and unaccustomed and, even if they do not resist it directly, they tend at least to take a wait-and-see attitude.

There is also another category of people. They are wholly for perestroika, but cannot yet work in the new manner, they have to learn how.

No less harm to perestroika can be done by avant-gardism, reluctance to reckon with objective processes, undue haste, and a striving to accomplish final results right away, right this very minute, although this would first require creating certain objective prerequisites and, of course, time.

Conservatism, passivity and avant-gardism are perhaps the main stumbling blocks that will have to be cleared out of the path of perestroika. And the most important thing in these efforts will be to further promote democracy, glasnost (openness), criticism and self-criticism, and work to educate the working people and foster a new public mentality. The faster and more effective this work goes, the better the results of perestroika will be in the economic field. So these two processes go together.

No Going Back

Question: Perestroika does not boil down to just economic reform in the Soviet Union. Perestroika also covers political and psychological change directly in people's minds. How would you respond to those who are not yet prepared to change their "inner structures" and say, as some readers do in their letters to newspapers: "Before determining our attitude to the ongoing reform and offering it any solid support, let's wait and see whether it strikes root"?

Answer: Such a complicated process as perestroika objectively involves a struggle between the new and the old. There are also people who are "contemplating."

We are telling those who are hesitating and biding their time that there will be no return to the past. This would mean finding ourselves in a precrisis situation again, with increasing stagnation in the economy and political affairs, social corrosion, spiritual callousness and apathy.

As Mikhail Gorbachev has said, "there's simply no other way. We may not retreat and have nowhere to retreat."

We are telling those who show uncertainty and indecision that it is only through perestroika, acceleration and renewal that we shall achieve a drastically new level of Soviet society and bring out the immense social resources of socialism and its possibilities as a system of real humanism serving and ennobling man so that he will feel in control as a contributing factor in society.

It is only in this way that a future of peace and well-being can be ensured for these and succeeding generations of Soviet people.

We are telling those who dillydally and lack initiative that they have fallen behind the requirements of the times. The objectives of perestroika can only be reached by thoroughly promoting the activeness and creativity of the masses through the effective involvement of everyone in realizing what has been planned. The human factor is the key to all change. Already now we can see real changes in people's minds, in their sentiments and actions. This is largely a result of purposeful explanatory work, vocational training and the very atmosphere of glasnost. Officials proving unable to actively translate the ideas of perestroika into life are making way for more competent and energetic people. This is facilitated to a large extent by the election of managerial personnel based on democratization in public affairs.

Lenin's Concept of Socialism and Stalin

Question: Perestroika means in many ways a divorce from the society whose foundation was laid by Josef Stalin before and after 1930 (excessive centralization of the economy and economic planning). Against the background of today's reform, what do you think of Stalin's role as the economic and social creator of society?

Answer: I would first of all like to stress that the foundation of Soviet society was laid under the guidance of Vladimir Lenin, and it is on this basis that today's society is still developing. In the period when Stalin was at the helm, a serious aberration—a departure from Lenin's principles—took place, resulting in the armchair system of party-and-state guidance over the nation.

The complex and thoroughgoing change in the management system in the 1920s and the 1930s was caused by both objective and subjective factors. The decisive role in that process was played by the vital need to quickly overcome the country's technological and economic backwardness, a need made ever more urgent by internal and external circumstances. It was possible to achieve a high economic growth rate only by mobilizing all material resources to the maximum in order to fulfil the set tasks and boost the share of accumulation in the national income. In point of fact, that was an economic system featuring the traits of a mobilization economy.

Excessive central control was further tightened during the war years, and also preserved during the period of rehabilitating the national economy after the war. That was an objective need.

But in the following years, when there no longer was such a need, the management system, alas, was not updated thoroughly enough to meet the new conditions of development.

In speaking of the nature of direction over social and economic development in the 1930s and subsequent years, and the role of Stalin, it should be said that the issue cannot be reduced to the activities of a single person. The whole package of measures that determined the structure and methods of economic management cannot be linked to one man, no matter how significant his role was. Observing the principle of a historical approach to establishing the truth, one should see and comprehensively analyze the entire range of objective and subjective factors behind the emergence of the system of running the economy that asserted itself in this country in the 1930s.

One should not ignore the path traversed by our country and its economy which has progressed in a historically short span of time from the wooden plough and underdeveloped industry to harnessing the atom and scaling the heights of space science and technology. But neither may we forget about the gross blunders, the deviations made in those years from the principles of socialism, and about the unjustified and unpardonable repression.

Question: In more general terms, don't you believe that perestroika, above all, in political and politico-psychological respect, presupposes a historical break with Stalinism? More specifically, can one expect the official rehabilitation, say, of the old Bolsheviks convicted at the Moscow trials in 1937?

Answer: We have a wise saying: "Measure thrice and cut once." You are talking about a historical break with Stalinism. But before deciding on surgery, one must know the precise diagnosis. With what, strictly speaking, should this break be made? It is no secret that the notions of Stalinism in the West do not coincide with our assessments of that period in the history of the USSR. If by this one implies violations of socialist legality or, say, the armchair economic management, then here we have both "measured and cut." But in the West, Stalinism is sometimes equated with socialism. In this connection let me repeat one of the key formulas of our perestroika: there must be more socialism.

Perestroika is a decisive repudiation of everything that is outmoded, erroneous, harmful and that holds back our further advances and impedes the full utilization of the potential which our society possesses. But perestroika relies on the sturdy foundation of the society built by the

Soviet people in the decades since the October revolution, and it takes into account and uses everything valuable created by the Soviet people under the guidance of the party.

Giving a principled and unprejudiced assessment of the personality of Stalin, we proceed from the premise that Stalin cannot be equated with the entire party and with the millions of ordinary people whose commitment to Lenin's ideas and the ideals of the revolution was not shaken in the most gruelling and tragic periods of our history.

Resolute and consistent steps to completely restore Lenin's concept of socialism and the Leninist style and methods of party work have been undertaken by the 27th CPSU Congress.

As far as the specific issues of rehabilitation for defendants at the political trials in 1937-39 are concerned, many of those people, as is known, have already been rehabilitated. They have been cleared of the slanderous, falsified charges and reinstated as honest persons. The process is continuing. It will take some time to take another look at all the circumstances of the illegal acts of repression in the 1930s. The party's Central Committee has formed a special commission for the thorough studying of all instances of illegality and arbitrariness in the 1930s and subsequent years.

A System of Incentives

Question: In connection with perestroika in the Soviet Union much is being said about the need for a greater personal responsibility in the economic field. This applies to both managerial personnel and the shop floor at government-owned enterprises and people working outside the state sector (cooperatives and individual labour projects). What kind of economic, social and psychological obstacles have to be surmounted for the whole generation of people used to centralized economic control to pluck up the courage to display such initiative? What precisely is being done to educate the entire nation in this respect?

Answer: I do not agree that we have a whole generation of people not daring to display economic initiative, and I could give many specific examples disproving this view. It is true, however, that the state's overly close guardianship of low-performance factories has led to certain categories of working people acquiring a sponger's mentality which sometimes develops into social passivity. This is why we shall indeed have to reeducate part of the people, inculcating in them a psychology of economic responsibility, initiative and efficiency-minded attitudes.

The prime need is to establish a powerful system of incentives motivating all personnel to show economic responsibility and to work fruitfully. This requires that

every worker should feel really in control in his workplace, collective and society as a whole. Socio-economic conditions are being created in the country under which this factor will come into full play, and the most important thing is democratization in public life and the changeover to the predominantly economic levers of management.

Worker collectives have been granted broad rights in planning production and social development, managing economic activities, and electing executives at different levels. These rights have been sealed in the Law on the State Enterprise. The rate of plant modernization and the extent to which social requirements are fulfilled have been made dependent on the performance of the given work collective. Such forms of organizing a remunerating labour (for example, the team contract system), under which democratism can be felt most directly in deciding on business matters and income distribution, are being widely promoted.

The economy is being geared to meeting social needs of a perceptibly greater degree, and resources are being redirected to satisfying the requirements of the social sphere. This reflects perestroika's general focus on man, his needs and interests, and makes it possible to use these interests fully as a factor for increasing economic initiative.

Great significance in supplying people's current needs flexibly and promptly is being attached to making extensive use of individual and cooperative labour projects. Their promotion by no means substitutes for the state sector and is meant instead to actively supplement it, especially where it is essential to reckon with regional conditions and use local resources in a greater measure.

These forms of work are quickly catching on and people are joining in readily. The country now has as many as 10,000 different cooperatives with a total of over 100,000 members.

Much significance is being attached also to the economic education of working people. The idea is to equip the broad masses of workers with economic knowledge enabling them to deal with issues likely to confront them under the new system of economic management.

The logic of all our actions stems from the fact that man, as the purpose of economic development and its principal motive force, is at the heart of perestroika and the entire economic policy. This is why the issue of activating the human factor goes beyond the bounds of enhancing the economic initiative of workers. The aim is to make certain that perestroika gives the working people opportunities for bringing out their aptitudes and talents, for a thorough development of the individual, and for elevating human dignity—all of which has not yet been known in the history of civilization.

Soviet-American Relations

Question: During the past few years and months the arms race and arms control have been the central issues of international relations, especially in regard to contacts between the Soviet Union and the United States. How do you see Soviet-American relations today and their prospects in the near future?

Answer: A review of the past several decades shows that throughout all the postwar years mankind has been looking for ways of checking the arms race and reducing arms.

Disarmament still remains a dominant issue in international relations, including Soviet-American relations. This reflects the reality of the present-day world in which huge stocks of both nuclear and non-nuclear arms have built up. Common sense has made it clear to us that we have entered a qualitatively new stage. Never before has mankind faced the choice to either perish or survive. In the past no war, despite the suffering and destruction it brought, endangered the very existence of humankind, the whole of our civilization. Today such a threat is quite real.

Humanity must also free itself of the arms burden to solve its global problems. A joint search for new economic order is needed which will take into account the interests of all countries on an equal basis. The way to the establishment of such an order lies, in our opinion, in disarmament for development.

An increasing amount of people have come to understand that a nation is unable to ensure its security through military-technical means—by its own efforts or jointly with its allies. The axiom "if you want peace, prepare for war" has become completely outdated. No longer valid is the dictum of Karl Clausewitz that "war is a continuation of policy by others, namely, violent means."

What is needed today therefore is a new political thinking based on universal human values and the firm belief that national security should not be achieved at the expense of others.

Only in this way can mankind be freed of the danger of self-destruction. In practical terms, this means the need to make the transition from the arms race to real disarmament. The Soviet-American INF treaty, signed during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States, was the first step in this direction, the first brake in the slide to nuclear war.

The Washington talks between American and Soviet leaders have also opened favourable prospects for a drastic cut in the strategic offensive weapons. This is a key issue in the Soviet-American relations and in halting the arms race. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it

would like the agreement on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons, under strict compliance with the ABM treaty, to be carried into effect at the earliest possible time.

Soviet-American relations have improved—they are more dynamic, mutual trust has increased. The agreements reached in Washington inspire hopes for further progress. We are firmly determined to continue improving our relations with the United States in every sphere. But this should not and could not be a one-way street. It is a two-way process.

The state of Soviet-U.S. relations is clearly important for the international situation as a whole. At the same time I want to remind you what has already been said many times: the Soviet Union does not see the world in the light of its relations with the United States. Our relations with other countries, both large and small, are likewise valuable.

Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf

Question: What are the prospects for the settlement of the Afghan conflict and how do you see the possibility of withdrawing Soviet troops from Afghanistan?

Answer: The Soviet Union wants to settle the Afghan question by political means and fully backs Kabul's programme for national reconciliation. The basic condition for settlement is, first of all, the ending of foreign armed interference in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan that would make the evacuation of Soviet troops possible.

The policy of national reconciliation is neither a slogan nor tactical manoeuvre, but an actual programme of practical measures to bring all Afghans together in the aim of ending the bloodshed and securing peace in their country.

Political settlement is not a remote prospect but an objective that can be achieved in the nearest future. At the representative Loya Jirgah, or great assembly held in Kabul late in November 1987, President Muhammad Najibullah announced the decision, reached with the Soviet Union, to pull out troops within 12 months. This period can be reduced, he noted, if further progress is made in national reconciliation. Already now there is no Soviet troops in 12 out of Afghanistan's 29 provinces.

Thus, you can see for yourself that, when talking about its political decision to withdraw troops, the Soviet Union back up words with actions.

We want to see Afghanistan as an independent and nonaligned state, friendly not only to the Soviet Union, but to other neighbouring states and to all countries of the world as well.

The Soviet Union is prepared to do everything in its power for an early and just solution of the Afghan problem. But I want to stress once more that settlement can become possible only if foreign interference in Afghan affairs is stopped completely.

Question: Would you comment on the situation in the Persian Gulf and on the Iran-Iraq war? What levers do the Soviet Union and the United States have to help bring that war to an end?

Answer: The situation in the Persian Gulf remains tense and fraught with further serious complications. Unfortunately, the flames of the senseless Iran-Iraq war have yet to be extinguished.

As is known, the UN Security Council has unanimously passed resolution 598. The Soviet Union is facilitating the implementation of this resolution and contributing to the UN Secretary-General's efforts for a peaceful political settlement of the conflict, which presents certain difficulties. In connection with this, the USSR is ready to consider the problem of taking certain measures against the party which refuses to fulfil resolution 598 to help the UN Secretary-General achieve his goal.

The concentration of naval forces of the United States and a number of other NATO countries in the Persian Gulf is not conducive to relaxing the dangerous tension in that region. Moreover, it is complicating the situation. As is known, the Soviet Union has proposed sending a UN naval force there. The implementation of this proposal, which does not infringe on the interests and rights of any country, would, I think, lessen tension in the Gulf considerably and facilitate to end the Iran-Iraq war.

USSR-Sweden

Question: It has been nearly 15 years since the last visit to Sweden by a Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin. The relations between Sweden and the Soviet Union have gone through several grave crises in this period. How would you evaluate these relations today?

Answer: I would like to stress first of all that our neighbouring countries have a rich, many centuries-old experience in relations. They have not developed smoothly the entire time. Indeed, nearly 15 years have elapsed since the visit of Alexei Kosygin to your country. However, I do not think that the Soviet-Swedish relations "have gone through several grave crises" in this time, although there have been periods of coolness and even light frosts.

It should be noted immediately that we are not to blame for these atmospheric phenomena. Swedish-Soviet relations are not developing in a void. At one time our

relations were adversely influenced by a general worsening of the international situation. Unfortunately, they have been and still are influenced by hostile circles, the adversaries of a good-neighbour policy with the Soviet Union.

Much harm to our relations was done by a campaign launched in the autumn of 1981 after a Soviet submarine had by accident sailed into Swedish waters, an incident which we sincerely regret. The repercussions of this groundless campaign are still heard today, although Moscow gave the appropriate exhaustive explanations long ago.

The Soviet Union has always sought to maintain good-neighbour relations with Sweden. Meetings at a high political level have become a feature of our postwar ties. In 1978, for the first time in the history of our bilateral relations, the Swedish king, Carl XVI Gustaf, paid an official visit to the Soviet Union. There have been regular exchanges of visits by the heads of our governments. Parliamentary ties and contacts between our foreign ministers have assumed a stable character.

The foreign ministries hold political consultations, and practical ties are maintained in various branches by the ministries of our countries. Mutually advantageous contacts in the fields of science, technology, culture and sports are quite extensive. Useful work is being done, in my opinion, by the intergovernmental Soviet-Swedish commission for economic, scientific and technical cooperation and by its numerous branches of working groups.

Trade and economic ties, based on the long-term programme for economic, industrial, scientific and technical cooperation in 1981-90 and on the long-term trade agreement effective till 1995, are also characterized by a certain stability. Although the Soviet Union's percentage in Swedish foreign trade is small, there are, in our opinion, large untapped reserves in this sphere.

Soviet-Swedish ties rest on a solid contractual basis. Many intergovernment and interdepartment agreements regulating our ties in various fields have been concluded and are working successfully. Several more important agreements are to be signed during my visit to Sweden in January 1988.

We remember well the official visit of Premier Ingvar Carlsson to the Soviet Union in April 1986. This visit enabled us to continue our personal acquaintance with the premier. We had first met under sad circumstances—at the funeral of Olof Palme, who had been assassinated.

At the talks in Moscow we agreed that a further expansion of Soviet-Swedish relations in political, economic, cultural and other spheres is beneficial to peace and security in Europe. We confirmed our desire to use the available opportunities for promoting the cooperation and relations between our countries and extending them to new areas.

The recent past has shown that we are successfully advancing along this correct path. In our opinion, the Soviet-Swedish relations are characterized today by a certain degree of dynamism, stability and good-neighbour policy. This is largely due to the fact that we hold identical views on a number of currently vital issues, first and foremost on the issue of averting the nuclear threat.

Question: The commander-in-chief of the Swedish armed forces regularly informs the public that violations of the country's territorial waters by foreign submarines continue. The national identity of the intruders could not be established during the past years. However, a great part of the Swedish public and media seem to believe, as before, that the Soviet Union is connected to these violations. What could you tell this part of the Swedish public?

Answer: I would like to tell this part of the Swedish public and, for that matter, all Swedish citizens that the Soviet Union has and had nothing to do with the above-mentioned violations, except the unpremeditated venture of a Soviet submarine into Swedish territorial waters in October 1981. The Soviet naval ships have been given clear instructions not to approach Swedish territorial waters, and they strictly abide by these instructions.

It would apparently be good for everyone concerned if what is actually happening in Swedish territorial waters is finally cleared up.

As for the Soviet Union, it has always respected the independence of Sweden, its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Security Concept and Northern Europe

Question: Security experts in the North European countries sometimes express fears that the American-Soviet INF agreement will increase tension in Northern Europe, especially in the Baltic area. What assurances can the Soviet Union give to dispel such fears, or what commitments can it make with this goal?

Answer: As you can see, the INF treaty is not fraught with the danger of the growth of tension in any region. On the contrary, it considerably reduces this danger. The signing of the Washington treaty is the first practical step in building a world without nuclear weapons. It is a truly historic event, a major new landmark in international development. The elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles and strict verification measures envisaged in this treaty accord with the interests of all nations, including those in Northern Europe, and enhance the level of security and trust on a global scale. The essentially new situation facilitates progress in many seemingly insoluble problems, including those affecting the North European region.

We also have fears that tension may increase. However, the reason for such fears is not the treaty but the intensified activity of certain military and political circles in NATO who are trying to disregard it. It is no secret that ways are being sought to "compensate" for the loss of Pershing and land-based cruise missiles by building up nuclear and conventional armaments precisely in the northern waters and air space. It is no secret either that U.S. officials recently held talks on this subject in a number of West and North European countries.

The Soviet leadership hopes that our partners at the Geneva negotiations will adhere to a realistic position devoid of any desire to gain unilateral advantages and consciously mislead their own people and world opinion.

Furthermore, I would like to stress that the Washington accord on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles is only the first step in unravelling the numerous Gordian knots of the arms race. The Soviet Union and the United States have already started talks on a 50 percent reduction of strategic nuclear weapons.

It is to be hoped that the Vienna review meeting of the Helsinki conference will at last draw up a mandate for further talks on confidence-building measures, security and disarmament in Europe. All this inspires optimism and indicates that the peoples and governments have serious intentions to create favourable conditions for a more stable and secure peace at a much lower level of nuclear and conventional armaments. We think, in particular, that disarmament measures on a global and European scale will put the question of establishing a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe on a practical level.

The qualitatively new situation that appeared in the world after the Soviet-U.S. talks in Washington can and should prove favourable to the growth of security and reduction of military activity in the North European region and the adjoining seas. Concrete Soviet proposals or, more precisely, a whole set of proposals for achieving this objective have been formulated in the speech delivered by Mikhail Gorbachev in Murmansk on 1 October last year.

This is our current programme of action. The Soviet Union is determined to advance towards a practical realization of this programme. We hope to see in the North Europeans partners interested in dialogue and cooperation, for we share the common goal—to actually make the North a region of peace and creative endeavour.

Delimitation Talks

Question: For a long time Sweden and the Soviet Union have carried on negotiations on delimitation in the Baltic Sea. It is believed in the West that the present uncertainty is most likely advantageous to the Soviet

Union from the standpoint of security and the fishing industry, and that for this reason Moscow is not interested in an early agreement with Sweden on the question concerned. How would you comment on this opinion?

Answer: The idea that Moscow is interested in continued uncertainty over delimitation in the Baltic Sea swings wide of the mark; someone has specially thought it up.

First, regarding considerations of security. What is in question is not the demarcation of frontiers or the acquisition or loss of territory. It is the delimitation of marine economic zones.

Second, regarding the interests of fishing. The argument that Moscow is not interested in the settlement of this question does not withstand criticism. On the contrary, the depletion of fishing resources in the disputed area as a result of the continuing rapacious activity of third countries has harmful consequences for the fishermen of the Soviet Baltic republics and, it should be assumed, for the Swedish fishermen too.

In short, the Soviet Union is highly interested in the fair delimitation of marine areas with its Baltic neighbour as soon as possible.

Question: The head of the Soviet delegation at the talks on delimitation in the Baltic Sea pointed out in an interview to DAGENS NYHETER last May that both the Soviet Union and Sweden have an international legal basis for their fundamental positions at these talks.

Do you think that Sweden recognizes in the same way the international legal basis of the Soviet position at the talks?

How, in the Soviet opinion, can a compromise be reached at the talks with initial positions of both parties being equal from the legal point of view?

Answer: The international legal position of the Soviet Union at the talks with Sweden on the delimitation of economic zones in the Baltic Sea rests on the principle of justice set forth in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. This principle envisages that all factors operating in the region of delimitation should be fully and comprehensively taken into account. The role of fishing for the population of the Soviet Baltic republics in the region subject to delimitation is an important factor in this case. It would be unfair to ignore the economic interests of the Soviet Union, and Sweden too, in the final delimitation of their economic zones in the Baltic Sea.

We believe that this complicated drawn out problem can be solved only by compromise. As is known, Soviet and Swedish experts are now looking for a mutually acceptable settlement. Let's wait for the results.

Question: During the 1980s Soviet scholars and political commentators have repeatedly criticized Sweden for its, as they claim, heavy dependence on Western, mainly U.S., civilian and military technology. What do you think about this criticism and, in the light of what was said above, Sweden's policy of neutrality?

Answer: I would like to say first of all that the Soviet Union respects the Swedish policy of neutrality. We are convinced that it is an important factor of peace and stability not only in Northern Europe but also on the European continent as a whole. The concept of neutrality drawn up in your country presupposes the desire to build defences by relying first of all on one's own forces. This is a domestic concern of the Swedes, their legitimate right to determine their security policy. In the meantime, Soviet scholars and political commentators are also free to give their views on domestic and foreign policies of Sweden.

Now about Sweden's dependence on foreign civilian and military technology. It is a well-known, actually existing and, to a varying degree, apparently inevitable factor in the present-day world with its developed division of labour.

It should be noted at the same time that the current certain dependence of Sweden on some of the West's hi-tech industries has been used to draw the country into the COCOM system. This, in its turn, impedes the growth of Swedish trade with socialist countries. In general, restrictions, discriminations and boycotts of various kinds—these hangovers of the cold war—run counter to the efforts of the world community for improving the international situation, the world economic situation, and infringe the interests of a wide range of countries.

Prospects of Business Cooperation

Question: What are the prospects of trade relations between the Soviet Union and Sweden? Will you, in the course of your visit to Sweden, discuss any concrete projects for cooperation and, if you do, what projects?

Answer: It should be noted first of all that in the postwar years Soviet-Swedish trade has been characterized by a steady growth. Among the important contributing factors are traditional economic ties and the geographic proximity of our countries. I think our countries have all the objective conditions for consolidating this tendency of growth in the remaining period of the 20th century and for carrying it over to the 21st century.

We are taking only initial steps in this direction. For instance, an agreement was reached on the joint construction of an agro-industrial complex in the Leningrad region during a recent visit to Sweden by a delegation from the State Agro-Industrial Committee of the USSR. Talks are being conducted on a number of other projects.

Vast possibilities exist today for an expansion of Soviet-Swedish cooperation. We are seeking to develop trade both by improving traditional exchanges and by introducing new progressive forms of cooperation. As you know, many Soviet ministries and a large number of big industrial amalgamations have been allowed to conclude deals directly in the world market. They can establish direct business ties with Swedish firms. We hope this will favourably influence both the volume and quality of our commercial ties.

It should be said, however, that in the matter of establishing joint ventures the Soviet Union expected more initiative and enterprise on the part of the Swedish business circles than we see today. I personally know many Swedish businessmen. They are very enterprising people who are willing to cooperate with our country. It can therefore be supposed that some psychological barriers have arisen in their approach to joint ventures, and these barriers must be removed as soon as possible.

To a certain extent, this was possibly explained by the fact that "white spots" impeding a broad expansion of joint ventures remained in our legislation until recently. This is understandable because joint ventures is a new form of cooperation for us too. Therefore, in September 1987 the Soviet Union adopted new decrees providing more flexible conditions for the operation of joint enterprises. This form of cooperation has a substantial potential capable of appreciably enhancing the level of trade and economic ties between our countries.

During my visit to Sweden I shall try, jointly with its leaders, to give fresh impetus to relations between our countries on the whole. In the course of planned contacts we shall also discuss the concrete issues of trade and economic relations, in both traditional commercial ties and in the use of new forms of cooperation.

/9604

Kamchatka Obkom Plenum Proceedings Viewed
18000142 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Dec 87
p 2

[Article by IZVESTIYA special correspondent Yu. Balakirev: "Starting With One's Self: Notes From the CPSU Kamchatka Obkom Plenum"]

[Text] Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy—When the scheduled speaker stayed at the rostrum, exceeding his time limit, he was not interrupted. As P. Reznikov, Kamchatka Oblast party committee secretary, remarked, "One cannot put a stop to criticism." And the criticism that resounded was serious.

"Many party organizations are for the present exercising insufficient initiative," said V. Santalov, first secretary of the Elizovskiy CPSU gorkom, citing conference information materials and labor collective meetings. "It is not the communists but non-party members who sometimes

set the tone of a collective, as was the case in the Nachikskiy Sovkhoz. Administrators and supervisors more often demonstrate leadership in restructuring rather than the secretaries of party organizations, as we might like."

The statement touched upon a central nerve, connecting all current issues of the long peninsula. If the main themes of restructuring come together today in the party committees and primary organizations, where should each communist be? To this rhetorical question, reminiscent of Chapayev, a blunt response was given—wherever the fate of the major issues is decided. But far from all communists are to be found in the thick of things. The reason for this, in the opinion of those who spoke, is a lack of personal example provided by members of the obkom buro; there is no lack of long-windedness and sharp words, but verbosity does not take the place of real assistance. R. Galimova, who works at the Oktyabrskiy Fish Canning Plant, cited her role as a member of the obkom in a spirit of self-criticism by saying the communists are not playing a leading role at this enterprise.

"There is only one way to progress," Galimova declared. "The role of the election aktiv must be increased. In the first place we, the members of the obkom, leaders and workers alike, are called upon to figure out how to influence the hearts and minds of the people. I don't think the buro is sufficiently concerned with increasing the activity of members of the obkom. We should more often be kept informed, and we should more often be conferred with on basic issues of developing the oblast, rather than having already adopted decisions set before us in the form of accomplished facts. Obkom secretaries and oblast organization leaders often come to the fish plant, but they meet with us in the election aktiv rarely, and when they do it's in passing."

Much was said about the work style of the obkom staff. Those who spoke established unequivocally that the roots of many chronic mistakes are precisely here. Staff workers have formed the bad habit of thinking of their desks as control towers; they are predisposed to monitor the operations of others rather than look after themselves. Each step of the way taken by gorkoms and raykoms is scrupulously watched and regulated.

"The system of supervision in the oblast is very far from perfect," declared V. Kucherenko, first secretary of the Ust-Kamchatskiy party raykom. "The role of instructor and superintendent sometimes resembles the task of the rooster in the well-known fable who would crow even when the day was not dawning. Come to Petropavlovsk, go directly to the obkom, and walk around the departments asking, 'Do you have any questions about our rayon?' If there is no record of complaints, there are no questions."

L. Lelchuk, head of the Kamchatka Oblast [missing phrase], observed that obkom secretaries and buro members have not yet managed to overcome a disparity between actions and words. They maintained, for example, the necessity of strengthening school party organizations, which were overloaded with so-called attached persons, making them older and diminishing their vigor and integrity. Yet the department doing the obkom's organizational work, headed by A. Yaglo, by their directives practically precluded the possibility of taking into the party the best teachers. Was this a special case? On an even broader scale, said Lelchuk, rigid regulations regarding sex, age, and nationality at times so bound their hands that the natural aptitudes and political characteristics of people faded into the background.

Even P. Reznikov, first secretary of the Kamchatka party obkom, heard critical comments directed at him. They were made about the level of work by the obkom regarding suggestions from the floor as well as about critical observations and resolutions by the buro.

I will permit myself a small digression. Leafing through the files of KAMCHATSKAYA PRAVDA containing the reports of plenums of past years, one detects a perceptible difference, particularly with the period prior to the start of restructuring. Never before perhaps has there been heard from the rostrum criticism so intense and so piercing as at the present time. And the fact that it is understood by everyone in the hall to be a natural manifestation of glasnost is an obvious sign of progress. However, even though up-to-date terminology was woven into the buro report, it proved to be quite conventional in conception. With this conventional structure of the buro report A. Yevstifeyev, first secretary of the Bystrinskiy party raykom, expressed his disagreement.

"The plenum agenda has changed," he said, "but the content of the report remains unchanged—what has been fulfilled and what has not been fulfilled. And that content—who has and who has not fulfilled the plan—has scarcely been restructured; as it turns out, it is yet to be restructured. And setting about with one's own two hands to carry out our party work, and thinking it out for one's self, has not yet come to pass. I am speaking of reforming the management of the economy—this is the most serious test of our wisdom not only in stimulating but in organizing it. But our previous plenum, too, was concerned with restructuring. Yet neither then nor now have we spoken of the process of restructuring and how to develop this process. Today it is incumbent upon the party oblast committee to take the following approach: Do as I do."

The principle of personal example was staunchly supported by G. Yermysenko, head of the Kamchatka Logging and Lumbering Enterprise, who spoke as follows:

"As a member of the obkom, I am not satisfied with the fact that I work from plenum to plenum—that is, I participate only while plenums are in session. I have no particular assignment. The election agency ought to be playing a much more active part."

Thirty persons addressed the plenum. To say that all of the speakers were distinguished by the strong stand they took and a drive to determine their particular roles in this new phase of developing the peninsula would be stretching a point. Tones of yesteryear resounded. There were still signs of bowing and scraping before superiors and of a desire to dump responsibility on somebody else's shoulders. There are still some people who have not given up looking upon the party committee as a *deus ex machina*, acting from afar to patch holes in the economy. Inertia persists even in a weightless state. At the same time, it is of importance that there is already an immunizing agent at work to protect us against falsehood and attacks by parasites.

The report anticipated a certain slackening in the rate of restructuring, particularly with respect to party activity. There was no place in it for analyzing the personal contributions of each obkom buro member in democratization and economic renewal. Last names were used, of course, but in such a context as this: "These serious shortcomings are attributable to the fact that comrades Lvov and Boltenko did not exert proper influence upon improvement..." or "The persistence of these shortcomings is to be explained by the fact that Comrade Gerashchenko, CPSU obkom secretary, and Comrade Tokmantsev, chairman of the Kamchatka Industrial Committee, have not attained adequate coordination." Such flat formulas will not work in restructuring; they have instead a retarding effect when they take the place of a creative and constructive understanding of the matter.

The agenda of the plenums now taking place in the country provides an opportunity for the party aktiv to comprehend its role at this complex and crucial stage in the reconstruction process. A personal response is required to the critical issue of the day: how to attain changes for the better in as short a time as possible. The communists of Kamchatka have great interest in the personal examples of their leaders, no matter how far away on the mainland they may have been born. It was noted in speeches by plenum participants that much that is new has been revealed by party organizations in the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Latvia, and in Leningrad, Sverdlovsk, Chelyabinsk, Krasnodar, Omsk, and other regions of the country. What has been seized upon from this experience for use under conditions the Far North, what new offshoots have been found by buro members in their creative search, and what sort of personal achievements or failures may have occurred off the beaten track—that remains "under wraps."

There is a thought expressed by Lenin that might have been forged for the present moment: "The key to the situation now is for the avant-garde not to be afraid to

work on itself, to refashion itself, openly acknowledging its inadequate state of preparedness and understanding." To begin with one's self is extremely difficult, as party plenum participants of Kamchatka Oblast frankly admitted. There is, however, simply no other way.

12889

BSSR CP CC Discusses Failings in Agriculture, Other Sectors

18000178 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 16 Dec 87 p 1

[BELTA report on the BSSR CP Central Committee meeting: "Restructuring: Time for Actions"]

[Text] A new phase of restructuring connected with the practical realization of the revolutionary transformations in all spheres of our society's life outlined by the Party has come. The time has come to pass a strict examination for efficiency and ability to turn the bold ideas into concrete, visible actions. Success of this great and difficult task will depend on how well the Party organizations will be able to open and activate the creative potential of collectives, to assure in practice the leading role of communists, and to help each toiler to realize that he himself is a real, interested master.

This was the theme of discussions which took place at the BSSR CP Central Committee's meeting, where the rates of fulfilling the current year tasks and measures for assuring the proper pace of work for the branches, enterprises, and organizations of the republic since the first days of the next year were examined. Secretaries of Party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms; chairmen of ispolkoms of oblast, city, and rayon soviets; managers of ministries and departments; and responsible personnel of the BSSR CP Central Committee apparatus, Presidium of the BSSR Supreme Soviet, and the republican Council of Ministers, participated in this meeting.

The 1st secretary of the BSSR CP Central Committee Ye.Ye. Sokolov opened the meeting.

Secretaries of the BSSR CP Central Committee N.I. Dementey, Yu. B. Kolokolov, and V.A. Lepeshkin made their reports.

It was noted that the economy of the republic, in general, is developing dynamically, and that reliable preconditions for accelerated movement forward are created. For 11 months the volume of industrial production increased by 6.6 percent, and the labor productivity increased by 6.3 percent, which is higher than planned and taken as socialist pledges. Tasks concerning freight transportation, retail goods turnover, paid and communal services, and a series of other indicators, are being fulfilled.

Workers of the agroindustrial complex prior to December had fulfilled the annual plans for selling main types of products to the state, had substantially reduced their

costs, and increased the production efficiency by almost 4 percent. This was the result of wide implementation of intensive technologies, and new forms and methods of organizational and economic work. Certain positive shifts exist in the construction complex activities.

However, stagnation is still being overcome slowly, and forces of inertia and complacency are still strong. This is first manifested in relations with partners and fulfillment of contractual obligations. For 11 months, plans for production deliveries are not fulfilled by all oblasts, many towns, rayons, and the republic as a whole. One hundred twenty-nine industrial enterprises are indebted to their consumers by not delivering 169 million rubles. The number of such collectives went up in Vitebsk, Gomel, and Minsk oblasts.

In the agricultural sector of the republic a wide mixture in productivity of all cultures can still be found. Seventy-five collectives harvested less than 1.5 tons of grain per 1 hectare; 225 collectives obtained around 10 tons of potatoes per 1 hectare; and 104 collectives produced less than 0.2 tons of flax per 1 hectare. These figures represent one-half, and for flax one-third, of the average amount for the republic. At the same time, when the total growth of meat and milk production is being observed, 740 collectives reduced meat production, and 345 collectives produced less milk. The main reason for this, according to the meeting's participants, is poor quality managers, tenacity of obsolete methods of management, and passive and inert attitude of Party committees toward the facts of either lowering the previously achieved level or treading on a spot.

In order for builders to fulfill their plans, they must put in service in the 2 remaining weeks 45 percent of the annual volume of fixed capital, almost one-quarter of housing and daycare centers for preschool children, and tens of clubs and palaces of culture.

The attitude toward health care facilities as being second-rate projects, which was formed in many years, is being changed rather slowly. As of now, 60 percent of hospitals and more than one-third of outpatient care centers are not put in service. In Vitebsk and Gomel oblasts all hospitals under construction are not ready for services, and a hospital for infectious diseases and nursing home for elderly and invalids are under the threat of not being completed in Minsk. Serious lagging behind the schedules of health care facilities is taking place in Grodno, Mogilev, and Vitebsk oblasts.

A large part of the blame for the difficult situation formed in this branch should together with the builders and customers be shared by the ispolkoms of local Soviets, Party gorkoms, and rayons, which did not take sufficient organizational measures to overcome obstacles and "narrow places" in the work of construction "conveyor"; and did not exercise the necessary persistence in

widely spreading the experience of the best collectives of the republic and the country, and fastest implementation of effective methods of managing.

The participants of the meeting paid special attention to preparing the transfer of the majority of working collectives to work under conditions of full cost accounting and self-financing, which will take place at the beginning of next year. Simultaneously, the USSR Law on State Enterprise (Association) comes into force. The speakers stressed that it is very important to carefully analyze and creatively use, taking into account the concrete conditions, the experience of those enterprises, which already work the new way. The first results show that at the majority of these enterprises the interest in the results of labor had increased, and the main labor indicators had dynamically increased. Thus, at these enterprises all production increases were achieved due to increase in labor productivity while the number of workers was decreased. Also, expenses are reduced, and the contractual obligations are better fulfilled.

At the same time, the new mechanism seriously punishes for carelessness and bad management. As a result, a series of enterprises did not fulfill the tasks with regard to productivity growth and profits. It one more time confirms the fact that the new system of management does not give an effect automatically, and that the economic levers by themselves will not bring the desired result. An everyday, persistent, and detailed work in using them knowledgeably is necessary, and a complex approach to the solution of all problems is required.

During the meeting the attention of the leaders of branches, Party and Soviet authorities, was pointed to the necessity to deepen the full cost accounting, to disseminate it through the lower level collectives: shops, sections, and brigades, and to implement the collective contracts. The most urgent and the most demanding task of the Party committees, as the speakers noted, is the forming of new economic thinking of the cadres. Their economic education must be substantially improved, and it must be carried out in a close connection with the practical work under the conditions of self-financing.

The Party committees and working collectives should tightly control the preparation to work under new conditions; skillfully generalize the experience of the best collectives; make public any fact of poor management and wastefulness, and indifferent attitude toward the work; mobilize people for categorical fulfillment of the plans of the year as it ends and for the struggle for the high quality of work. One should judge the carrying out of restructuring based on concrete results rather than words.

The USSR General Prosecutor A.M. Rekunkov dedicated his speech to the problems of legal relations and strict adherence to the law under conditions of restructuring the economy. Speaking about the role of the Law

on the State Enterprise in bringing the forms and methods of managing the economy in accordance with the modern requirements, he stressed that this document must become literally the norm of life of each working collective and a reference book of all managers and Party workers. Without knowing the processes taking place in economy, and it is impossible to work productively with the collectives and inside the collectives.

Under the new conditions of managing, the role of the legal service of enterprises and ministries is becoming more important. The legal service must more actively and persistently in order to defend the interests of toilers, take upon itself the control over fulfillment of contractual obligations, and more strictly assess the activities of economic managers.

There are many things which must be done in order to increase the quality of products and bring them to the highest level. We cannot continue to accept a situation, when each year products which cost tens of millions of rubles go into reject. There are still many collectives especially in construction which show false production data. The number of "carriers" is not decreasing especially at the enterprises of meat and milk industry and food industry. Drunkenness is going down slowly, and the scale of moonshining is growing. Party and soviet authorities, and civic organizations must more persistently solve these problems, increase the educational role and influence of collectives, and assure the skillful use of economical and administrative and legal measures.

The BSSR Minister of Interior Affairs V.A. Piskarev dedicated his speech to combining the efforts of Party, labor unions, Komsomol organizations, general public, and law protecting bodies in preventing law violations, providing legal education for youth, and removing the conditions contributing to commitment of crimes, including those in the sphere of economics.

It was stressed at the meeting that today only hard and purposeful work of each Party organization and each communist can provide a significant output. Exactly the practical result becomes the main criterion of assessing the Party participation in restructuring.

Solution of complex, large-scale tasks in economy and social sphere will require tremendous efforts on the part of the Party organizations and working collectives. Therefore, as never before, the importance of discipline and personal responsibility of the cadres and each individual communist is growing.

Under the conditions of restructuring, strict demands must be set forth toward those who are guilty in bad management resulting not only in material, but also political and moral losses to our society. We must increase the demands toward the cadres and all communists for fulfilling their obligations and presenting the pure and honest image of a Party member. Restructuring and discipline are inseparable.

The results of the meeting were assessed by the 1st secretary of the BSSR CP Central Committee Ye.Ye. Sokolov.

Comrades V.I. Boris, V.G. Yevtukh, N.S. Igrunov, V.F. Kebich, M.V. Kovalev, M.I. Lagir, G. S. Tarazevich, Yu.M. Khusainov, and V.V. Gurin participated in the work of the meeting.

13355

Guryev Obkom Plenum Reported

Shortcomings, Successes Noted

18300111 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 15 Dec 87 p 2

[KazTAG report by G. Groyser and K. Kadelov: "Restructuring for Each and Every Person—A Report from the Guryev Oblast Party Committee Plenum"]

[Text] At a plenary session of the Guryev Oblast Party Committee, a proposal was made in the report of the obkom buro to discuss a number of specific questions. Among them: How effectively is the renewal process in the oblast being supervised? Are buro efforts providing a creative impulse? Are tangible results being obtained from strengthening order and discipline and improving working and living conditions for the population?

These are timely questions. Preparations for the the plenum have been made, as never before, under circumstances of dealing with real problems and a maximum amount of glasnost. Meetings of obkom buro members with labor collectives, the secretaries of leading party organizations, and economic planners are things of the past. Under the heading "Towards the Forthcoming Party Obkom Plenum," responses by workers to a special questionnaire have been published in oblast newspapers. An analysis of public opinion has been of assistance in drawing up the main topics of the plenum report, which was previously under the direction of obkom members. At party meetings and party committee plenums the communists have given objective evaluations of the activities of their election management organs. Those in the vanguard of restructuring have received support, and even those who have been holding it up and exhibiting passivity have been singled out by name.

The mounting demands that have been made upon the party organization secretaries, for example, in charge of Uralkasprybvod, Construction Work Train Number 163, and the sewn goods and clothing repair factories have turned out to be beyond their capacities. They have been relieved of their elected positions.

It was emphasized at the July (1987) plenum of the CPSU Central Committee that the restructuring process must begin with one's self. The obkom buro, it was noted by speakers, is trying to set an example of improved style

in party work for lower-echelon organizations. Secretaries and buro members have begun to attend more frequently labor collective meetings and gatherings of citizens; occasions for the open exchange of ideas and a critical approach to the evaluation of current matters are being firmly established. Personnel problems are being resolved with extensive publicity. Thus more than 450 persons have been elected by labor collectives to managerial positions. Workers have expressed a loss of confidence in 12 managers, including Kh. Baybosynov and B. B. Mogdalyuk, the former directors of such major enterprises as Inderskiy Borax Mine and the Guryev Power-Driven Plant.

Previously, the effectiveness of party work was basically determined according to results in terms of industrial production by enterprises and organizations. Of course, the demand to fulfill the plan is no less strong today, but there has been a sharp rise in responsibility for resolving social issues, such as the food supply, providing housing, and improving medical, commercial, and domestic services. Many oblast residents, responding in questionnaires and in letters, have noted such changes for the better as increasing sales of poultry, milk, and butter, which have come about as a result of growth in the productivity of local livestock farming and improving the performance of poultry farming and processing enterprises. The mobilization of internal resources has helped to increase storage capacity by 50 percent and to cut losses in the transport of agricultural production.

The critical nature of the food problem, however, has still not been addressed. The main reason for this is the low profitability of the farms. The collective contract and cost accounting are frequently introduced only in a formal sense. On the eve of the plenum, in reply to an inquiry by questionnaire, the party committee secretary of the sovkhos Kommunizm Zholy in Dengizskiy Rayon, S. Mazhitov, noted that not one of the party obkom secretaries had been to the remote pasturing areas for livestock farming.

The report of the obkom first secretary, A. A. Kulibayev, noted that over an 11-month period 65 percent more housing had been put into operation than during the same period the year before. Housing construction, previously at a standstill, is now moving ahead. The republic Housing-91 program, however, still has not fulfilled its assigned tasks. Unfortunately, some party organs, such as the one in Guryev Oblast, for example, are operating in the old manner, and instead of using political methods of leadership they are taking upon themselves the functions of local soviets. The result? The capital construction department of the gorispolkom has completed only a third of the annual housing construction program.

The obkom and especially Second Secretary V. N. Ustinov, it was said at the plenum, has not succeeded in bringing about a restructuring of the psychological attitudes of housing construction leaders, who until now

have been unable to make the transition to a regular schedule of operations. No criticism in this respect is attributable to a supposed shortage of building materials. The oblast possesses a wealth of wall stone, non-cement adhesive materials, and natural bitumen.

In taking the floor, Second Secretary V. N. Ustinov was unable to respond constructively to the justified criticism. He simply repeated facts and judgments contained in the official report, pronounced certain generalizations about his determination to put an end to shortcomings, and in doing so exceeded the time limit for speaking. Is it worthwhile wasting time on empty discourse instead of on basic preparations for participating in the work of the plenum? After all, verbal improvisation is not an end in itself.

Many economic leaders still have not rid themselves of passive self-complacency. How else, for example, can one explain the recent breakdown of the Guryev Heat and Electric Power Plant? Or the disorderly state of the sidings at the Kulsary railroad station, blocked up with unloaded freight cars—where nevertheless a night shift has not been organized.

The people of Guryev are proud of the fact that with the discovery of the Tengiz deposit and others the oblast is now one of the major regions for the extraction of oil and natural gas. The lack of efficiency on the part of certain managers, however, is still holding back the exploitation and refining of this natural wealth. How much these cases cost! Millions of rubles have now been spent on the construction of an experimental testing plant for the extraction and refining of crude oil, but no attempt has been made in over a year to put it into operation. The explanation might seem to have substance. Gaseous sulfur dioxide cannot be utilized and, furthermore, the crew is not prepared to work with hazardous materials. But if no attempt is made, how will a way be found to resolve this problem? Then how is one to begin? Sooner or later the extraction of oil will get under way at Tengiz, and the low qualifications of the workers can then result in much greater losses.

The response of each worker to the requirements of the new stage of restructuring is particularly essential at the enterprises that since January have been engaged in making the transition to full cost-accounting and self-financing. There are 34 of them in the oblast. At only 17 of them, however, have specific measures been worked out for providing organizational and technical operations under current conditions. The financial conditions of only 10 of them can be called sound. And what are the people relying on who manage the associations of the Guryev Fish Industry, the Chemical Plant, the Railroad Construction Materials Association, and other enterprises, which have a shortfall of installed equipment valued at 72 million rubles? In the year ahead a substantial part of the cost of above-norm stocks of commercial value is supposed to be returned to the budget.

Many primary party organizations have still not undertaken to monitor the economic conditions of lower production elements and to teach each worker about basic features of the transition to cost accounting and self-supporting production. It should be remembered, of course, that without the active participation of rank-and-file members of the collective, and without being aware of their own roles in restructuring, the situation could get even worse.

The plenum was sharply critical of leaders who failed to make use of the full potential for satisfying public demand for goods and services. At a small number of facilities for producing consumer goods only the simplest sort of manufactured goods are produced. Goods made out of local or recycled materials seldom show up for sale at the counters. At the same time, these leaders have left the practice of individual labor activity to fend for itself; only slightly more than 300 people are engaged in it now throughout the oblast. The population is justly indignant about the low level of public catering, public health, and the lag in carrying out school reforms.

Critical comments at the plenum were directed at F. A. Novikov, a member of the obkom buro and chairman of the oblast executive committee. It is essential for him to make bolder use of the powers conferred on him by the local soviets, not only for improving living conditions for the people but also for resolving problems of integrating the assimilation of the region's rich supply of raw materials and for overcoming a narrowly parochial approach to this matter.

The process of restructuring is proceeding slowly even with regard to ideological work and international and patriotic training. True, a certain stimulus has been detected with respect to political and economic studies and atheistic propaganda. But even here remnants of routine mechanical work and inertia, along with a preoccupation with appearances instead of affecting the consciousness of the masses, especially youth, still have not been entirely eliminated.

There are inadequacies as well in the mass information media. They lack a sufficiently analytical approach and consistency in presenting issues. In the rayon newspaper KASPIY TANY, for example, reports were published recently of serious oversights at the Kolkhoz imeni Amangelda. Yet appearing below, in a box on the same page, was a report that this farm had fulfilled the plan ahead of time, which was published without commentary of any kind.

Restructuring is a fundamental duty of each person regardless of the position he holds. In criticizing the secretaries and other responsible workers of the party oblast committee, the speakers noted passivity, too, on the part of the ordinary workers who had been selected as obkom members. The statements of G. A. Sutyagina, a chemical plant laboratory worker, and B. M. Tanrova, a fisheries worker at the Kolkhoz imeni Kurmangaza in

Balykshinskiy Rayon, have not always been substantive or to the point. They have apparently forgotten that they were chosen to be in the party organ for other than purposes of "representation" and that communists are entitled to demand of them searching and well-founded views in discussing any issue.

Joining the discussion, G. A. Sutyagina acknowledged that she did not always take part in discussions of issues that were difficult for her. Nevertheless, the outstanding worker said, not only she but other obkom buro members voted on issues, in effect, guided by the opinion of the first secretary. Was he really always right?

Arbitrary, bureaucratic tactics are still present in the leadership style of First Secretary A. A. Kulibayev, it was noted in the speeches. He is taking upon himself too many administrative duties, such as overseeing the construction of greenhouses and food supplies for citizens; whereas matters of political and educational activity are often passed over. The first secretary frequently visits the Tengiz Oil and Gas Complex, which is of vital importance to the oblast, but for the most part only to accompany illustrious guests. Why not have an unhurried meeting with the labor collective, if only on the occasion of a Political Day?

The restructuring of the work style of the party obkom staff has not been carried out to completion. The flow of papers of various kinds "from above" has diminished, but the quantity of phone calls with demands for immediate information "in no less than an hour" has increased. This sort of behavior, more prevalent than before, is hindering the activities of the lower party organs.

The plenum devoted considerable attention to problems concerned with the extension of intra-party democracy. Increasing the authority and responsibility of the lower organizational links is not fostered when enterprise managers on inspection rounds call them to account before the party obkom. In Makhambetskiy Rayon the cases of a significant number of communists upon whom penalties had been levied were not reviewed by the primary party organizations. Instances were cited of people exploiting the extension of democracy for selfish reasons.

Ya. Ismagulov, a school teacher of history, had previously been chosen as chairman of the Pamyat Ilich Kolkhoz in Dengizskiy Rayon. Since he was not familiar with economics and obviously was unable to cope with his new responsibilities, after a few months he was obliged to "retire." The conclusion to be drawn is that certain party organizations have not yet learned to function properly under conditions of democratizing the life of society and to implement policy with sound conviction and vigorous organizational effort.

The plenum outlined measures for overcoming shortcomings and for increasing the militancy, dynamism, and initiative of communists in speeding the restructuring of the oblast's social and economic development and bringing about an improvement in ideological and educational work. Specific recommendations were made for strengthening intra-party democracy and for improving voting procedures in the election of party committees to be set up to plan for the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

G. V. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee, addressed the plenum.

Participating also in the plenum were G. M. Polyakov, a senior official of the CPSU Central Committee; K. A. Abdullayev, deputy chairman of the KaSSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic Gosplan; and V. I. Yefimov, director of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee Administrative Organs Department.

Kolbin Reviews Leadership Tasks

*18300111 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 17 Dec 87 p 2*

[KazTAG report of Speech by G. V. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee to the Guryev Oblast party obkom: "Basic Tasks of the New Stage of Restructuring"]

[Excerpts] As previously reported, G.V. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee, addressed a plenary session of the Guryev Oblast party obkom, which was engaged in discussing a report by the obkom buro on the leadership of restructuring.

At the present time, the speaker said, reports such as this one by the election organs of the primary party organizations are being heard in plenums of raykoms, gorkoms, and obkoms throughout the republic. Care must be taken that discussion of these reports does not acquire a character of sloganeering. In the process of preparing for these party undertakings, an energetic search should be made for new approaches and for putting into practice specific measures of restructuring, so that the communists gathered at these party forums can share and enrich one another's experience and define key aspects of the work to be done at the second stage of the restructuring process. As of 1 January 1987, 87 industrial enterprises in Kazakhstan were operating under full cost-accounting and self-financing, including five under the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building; five under the Ministry of the Automotive Industry; six under the Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems; nine under the Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry; one under the USSR Ministry of Light Industry, and 60 under the KaSSR Ministry of Light Industry; and the

Ust-Kamenogorsk Galvanized Lead Combine. In addition, as of 1 July 1987, all trading and consumer cooperative enterprises in the republic had been converted to the principles of full cost-accounting and self-financing.

In 1988 all machine-building enterprises of the union ministries, together with the enterprises of the oil, gas, and chemical industries and of ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, will begin to operate according to the new system.

In addition, nine ministries under the jurisdiction of the KaSSR Council of Ministers will be operating under conditions of full cost-accounting and self-financing: the Ministry of the Forestry Industry, the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, the Ministry of the Fish Industry, the Ministry of Motor Transport, the Ministry of Communications, the Ministry of the River Fleet, the Ministry of Construction, the Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work, and the Ministry of Highways. In the republic Ministry of the Forestry Industry only one enterprise is undergoing conversion to the new system—the Petropavlovsk Factory of Handicrafts and Souvenirs.

All agricultural, industrial, and other kinds of organizations within the agro-industrial complexes of Kustanay, Chimkent, and East Kazakhstan oblasts are also converting to full cost-accounting and self-financing effective 1 January 1988

As a result, the proportion of industrial enterprises operating under conditions of full cost-accounting and self-financing in 1988 amounts to 50.8 percent in terms of the total volume of commodities produced, and amounts to 57.7 percent in terms of the total number of people engaged in the production process. We should have all the remaining enterprises ready to operate under the new conditions in the third year of the Five-Year Plan, so that the economic incentives of management go into effect more swiftly and efficiently.

Now, on the eve of the day when the provisions of the Law on State Enterprises (Associations) go into effect, we should clearly envision which organizations will be converting to the new conditions of operating and where, and which ones will undertake appropriate preparations. It is necessary not only to have a sound understanding of the basic, underlying provisions of the law, but to be able to figure out the reasons why something is not functioning properly at the enterprises that have made the conversion to self-financing, and to be able to analyze the real economic condition of those enterprises to which the jurisdiction of the law extends as of 1 January.

Twenty-four enterprises are making the transition to the new conditions of management in Guryev Oblast with the start of the new year, among them the industrial associations Embanefit, Tengizneftgaz, and Guryevybprom, the Plant imeni Petrovsk, and the Inderskiy Borax

Mine. Organizing the economic training of the skilled workers in these enterprises is one of the urgent tasks of the party's obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms.

It is no secret that even certain managers have an inadequate grasp of their specific duties under the new conditions. I would like therefore to recount briefly the principal provisions which entail changes in the thinking on the part of the leadership, including party, soviet, and economic managers as well as members of the labor collectives.

Operating on the principles of full cost accounting and self-financing means, first of all, that the enterprises will be conducting their productive and social activities through proceeds of the sale of goods (labor or services). Even material costs will be paid for out of these proceeds. Profit or income serves as the over-all indicator of results on the part of management.

The functioning of an enterprise under conditions of full cost-accounting and self-financing is brought about in accordance with the principle of socialist self-government. In this connection it should be noted that centralized administration, to which not only those in management but members of the collective were drawn for years, under conditions of the extension of democracy and of putting the Law on State Enterprises into practice undergoes substantial modification. In the first place it has a beneficial effect on the practice of electing leaders on a competitive basis. As we know, the managers of enterprises, of the subdivisions of associations, and of industries, together with those who manage shops, departments, sections, and farms, are chosen by the process of election. The labor collective soviet of an enterprise must also be chosen for a two-year or three-year period.

The conversion to self-administration entails a good deal of organizational activity on the part of party and other social organizations. At the present time labor collective soviets are functioning at several enterprises. For the present, however, we lack clear indications of the influence of these social organs on production managers with respect to developing their sense of enterprise, the desire to make maximum use of available resources, the developing of the industrial potential in the interest of raising the quality of output as well as of the collective, and the increasing of volume for greater enterprise income. On the contrary, many soviets continue to function in a formal way as in the old days, viewing with indifference the meager exploitation of resources, and exhibiting no interest in turning out products for which there is greater demand and a wide market.

Cost-accounting income, in accordance with the provisions of the Law on State Enterprises, is to be used exclusively by the labor collective and is not subject to withdrawal. It is allocated for the development of production, and it goes into the labor payment and material incentive fund; it is also to be used for construction of

housing and social and cultural projects, their maintenance, and for sanitary measures, as well as for public cultural undertakings and the satisfaction of other social needs.

As of 1 January, enterprises will be authorized to sell, exchange, rent, or provide without charge in exchange for the temporary use of a building, installation, equipment, means of transport, inventory, raw materials, or any other material valuables, and also to write off any fixed assets that are worn-out or obsolete.

In this connection, at the present time the workers of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee and the republic Council of Ministers, together with party and soviet organs, are looking for industrial sites that are not being utilized and insistently demand of those in charge of these areas that either they see to it that they are properly put to use or that they transfer these areas to other enterprises.

The contents of a state order are approved by USSR Gosplan and a USSR ministry. With respect to consumer goods and paid services, in addition to state orders of USSR Gosplan, ministries and departments, the contents of a state order are approved by the union republic Council of Ministers. This procedure is supposed to be observed both by enterprise managers and the leaders of party and soviet organs locally. This requirement is not being fully complied with today. It is being overlooked because we lack enough consumer goods. The rate of production, for example, in Guryev Oblast is lagging considerably behind the average for the republic. The output of goods per ruble of the wage fund here does not exceed 50 kopecks, and for enterprises under union jurisdiction this indicator amounts to only 2.5 kopecks. But, of course, there are reserves, and not a few of them! Thus, back in 1984, one of local enterprises was commissioned to construct and put into operation in 1988 a workshop for producing goods valued at 2 million rubles a year. The party obkom and oblispolkom, however, were not able to realize this reserve and are now postponing the schedule for turning over this workshop to the end of the Five-Year Plan. Is this any way to respond to current requirements?

It is necessary to analyze the financial position of enterprises, the relationship between the level of profitability achieved and the norm, as well as fulfillment of the plan in terms of profit, the use of their own working capital, and the presence of extra, above-norm stocks of commodities, valuable materials, and finished products. It is necessary to study in depth the reasons for existing unproductive losses, including penalties, fines, forfeits, and other disbursements; the unprofitableness of all production and particular types of products; the service sphere; and the condition of debtor and creditor indebtedness. All managers of enterprises and their industrial subdivisions are obligated to analyze these matters well and all workers in collectives should assimilate these

economic categories. In accordance with the results of analysis, a program of measures should be drawn up right now, prior to the start of the new year.

Since 1 January 1987 in the republic 38 enterprises have changed over to state inspection. An analysis indicates that the growth rate of industrial production immediately went down in several of them, and in a number of cases non-fulfillment of deliveries according to contracts reached the point of disrupting state plans.

Even the collective of the Guryev Chemical Plant—the one enterprise in the oblast where state inspection has been introduced—is firmly entrenched as one of the enterprises that are lagging behind. Since the start of the this year they have failed to deliver 2.2 million rubles' worth of production.

Now a new group of enterprises is preparing to switch to state inspection. This problem cannot be left without party care and attention. Only painstaking explanatory work organized on a daily basis in the labor collectives can resolve this problem without further loss of business.

Now that the style and methods of party work are changing, and restructuring is entering a new stage, it is out of the question for the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee, the gorkoms, raykoms or primary party organizations to operate through pressure tactics, bald administrative edicts, or special calls to report to the party committees. Every summons, every use of pressure, of course, is based on coercion, which precludes the possibility of those in subordinate positions finding non-standard solutions or using their own initiative in dealing with administrative problems. It is essential to so arrange things that each person who deals with productive or social tasks takes responsibility for the final result and is able to approach existing problems with interest and enthusiasm. That is why a knowledge of how to deal with people, how to unite their efforts, and help each person to find his proper place in the restructuring process is increasingly assuming importance in party organizational activities. The most important thing now in the work of the party is to lay special emphasis on political and organizational methods of influencing people.

At this level, however, the restructuring is going slowly. The system of political and economic studies, for example, is far from being used in the best way possible as an effective means of influencing the economy. It would seem that the processes of democratization and radical reform of the management of the economy would compel party organizations to bring about a lively improvement in party and economic studies, but this has not been the case. The proper restructuring of ideological work has not taken place even in connection with implementing the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee entitled "On the Work of the Kazakh Republic Party Organization in the International and Patriotic Education of the Workers."

The grain problem continues to be critical. From one Five-Year Plan to the next, although the target has continued to be gross grain deliveries of 29-30 million tons per year, Kazakhstan has not fulfilled planned deliveries of grain to the state. In fact, the average annual gross yield of threshed grain during the 10th Five-Year Plan amounted to 27.5 million tons, and during the 11th Five-Year Plan amounted to 21.3 million tons. This means that extraordinary measures are required to resolve this problem. In this connection party organizations of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, together with raykoms, gorkoms, and obkoms, face the problem of involving all industrial enterprises in making ready a machine and tractor fleet immediately for spring field and harvesting work. It is necessary to issue orders to them to take part by direct contracts in readying the machine and tractor fleets for next season so that all repair work will be completed prior to 1 April 1988.

At the same time, through the resources of the enterprises of the agro-industrial complex, the kolkhoz and sovkhoz repair services, and the former agricultural equipment associations, as well as industrial, building and various other organizations located on the territory of the oblast, it is necessary to carry out not only the repair work but to reconstruct the reapers of grain combines so as to increase the size of their field coverage from four to six meters. Along with these repair operations there is the task of renewing the combine fleet by acquiring new Yenisey, Don and Niva combines, which have 6-meter coverage, and trucks for the transport of grain and other agricultural products. It is necessary to have in readiness the required transport and available tractor fleet, to arrange for the production of 1,500 KSS-2.6 silage-harvesting combines, while contending with an array of other urgent problems.

Another vital task consists of improving the yield of intensive techniques insofar as they apply to the cultivation of grain crops. Actually, for three years now the republic has not received the planned yield from these techniques. Moreover, the added amount from their application is supposed to reach 3.5 million tons in 1988. We have cogent examples of this possibility. In the Vedenovskiy Sovkhoz, for instance, in Kokchetav Oblast, the total return from these fields with intensive techniques and crop rotation exceeded 30 quintals per hectare. If the State Agro-Industrial Committee, together with its local organs and the party organizations, manage to attain such results on every farm, then according to the most conservative estimates this will let us secure at least a million more tons of grain.

If we are to discuss in terms of specifics the food resources of Guryev Oblast, it is noteworthy that there is available here a large potential for the development of horticulture and the growing of vegetables and melon crops. Our neighbors in Astrakhan Oblast provide a good example. In a region of soil and climatic conditions no different from ours, they have had notable success in providing their own people with home-grown fruits and vegetables.

The meat-packing industry lags in the republic. For the slaughter and processing of livestock it is necessary to transport animals over long distances, and they are taken in large quantity to other union republics. Occasionally, the meat-packing combine does not accept the livestock, or it keeps them too long, and all this taken together results in big losses of meat supplies. In connection with this the task has been set, in line with the objectives of agriculture and the consumer cooperatives, to provide a capability for slaughtering an additional 144 tons of meat per shift. To do this it will be necessary to so concentrate efforts at the meat-packing combines, cold-storage facilities, slaughter-houses and refrigerating plants earmarked for construction that these facilities are ready for use by the start of the season.

Large losses are allowed to occur owing to a failure to fatten livestock. Losses from delivery of below-weight animals this year alone in Guryev Oblast have amounted to more than 220,000 rubles.

There has been no basic change brought about by intensive methods of management in raising the productivity of livestock and the quality of livestock produce. Increasing the productivity of meat and milk is being accomplished, as before, at the expense of increasing the size of the herds.

Over 11 months of this past year the average live weight of cattle delivered in the oblast has gone down by 3 kilograms. The efforts being made at stock breeding and herd reproduction are not at the level they should be. The number of new lambs and foals is below that of last year. There have been an increased number of losses of cattle, horses, sheep, and goats due to disease.

In the area of livestock farming it is necessary to develop in every possible way brigade and family contracts. It is no secret that the added weight of kolkhoz and sovkhoz herds which have been given out to kolkhoz and sovkhoz workers for fattening on a contract basis is twice the indicators achieved by these same workers when the fattening is done as a collective enterprise. This means that there is not the right incentive. And, of course, there are ways to solve this problem, and they must be sought diligently both by the farm managers and the party organizations.

Now, with regard to urgent tasks of social development. As you know, the task has been set to increase next year the volume of production of goods for the people by 25 percent. This additional growth was previously set for the entire Five-Year Plan. To reach this goal, not within the five-year span but in the year ahead, it will be necessary to construct in the republic, within as short a time as possible, an entire complex of subsidiary branches, consisting altogether of 60 prefabricated modules (with 1,500 meters of productive space), and to fully staff and equip these production units, so as to have them operating within the year at full strength. It is necessary to assign 12,000 people for this undertaking. This task

should be carried out in the course of December so that commencing with the new year there will be a perceptible increase in the output of goods for the people within the field of light industry. These undertakings are going on in Alma-Ata, Semipalatinsk, Eastern Kazakhstan, Tselinograd, Kustanay, and in a number of other areas.

Special care must be taken to exploit all available production areas in enterprises under various jurisdictions for consumer goods, while at the same time speeding the process of building light structures for special workshops to accomplish these goals.

Much remains to be done in dealing with the housing problem. Let me say at this point that Guryev Oblast is the only place in the republic where the Housing-91 program is proceeding slowly. Only 80 percent of the annual housing volume has been put into use this year. The lag occurs principally around the city of Guryev where only half the planned amount of housing has been put in use. The development of cooperative and individual housing in the oblast continues to be inadequate.

The erection of building projects for social purposes has not been given a proper amount of attention. In the settlement of Kulsary a school has not so far been put into operation, and a kindergarten was completed only amid threatened disruptions. Generally, development of social amenities in this settlement has been progressing far from smoothly. There are not enough shops, dining halls, or health facilities.

Operations at construction-materials sites are proceeding poorly. Because of an acute shortage of expanded-clay aggregate and wall materials, the capacity for constructing workshops with local gravel is at only one third of its potential, and the plant for producing bricks of sand and lime is operating at only half of its potential.

Efforts to improve the operational capacity of construction industry enterprises are progressing unsteadily. Output of precast reinforced concrete is at 60 percent of capacity; brick production at 40 percent of capacity; and the operations of the old house-building combine are at 70 percent of capacity. As for the capacities of the newly introduced reinforced concrete plant, the expanded-clay aggregate plant, and the new, prefabricated house-building combine (DSK), they are slow in coming up to full-scale operation.

Party, soviet, and management organs in the oblast must act to stiffen demands on the part of leaders of the construction organizations, enterprises, and farms for unconditional fulfillment of planned tasks, and they must bring about a concentration of efforts to assure fulfillment of the Housing-91 program. With the methods used in the case of the Ust-Kamenogorsk Galvanized Lead Combine, every possible effort should be made to develop the field of individual housing construction.

There can be no doubt that a successful solution of all the problems outlined will depend to a decisive degree on the level of organizational work attained by party, soviet, union, and management organs at this second stage of the restructuring process. The work that is going on today with the cadres constitutes the principal task. Those who clearly fail to provide leadership, who do not show the qualities of practical judgment and political wisdom, who are unable or unwilling to apprehend the restructuring process, may be replaced by us—indeed, they must be replaced by us—with competent and capable organizers. After all, we are now in our third year of restructuring, and we can see very well who is committed to this effort, who is less than committed, and who stands in opposition, defending previously held positions.

12889

Tselinograd Obkom's Handling of Perestroyka Inadequate

18300109 Alma-Ata KAZAKHTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 87 p 2

[Article by K.Zhoynbekov, SOTSIALISTIK KAZAKHSTAN correspondent, and I.Yavorovskiy, KAZAKHTANSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent, from Tselinograd: "By the New Standards: Tselinograd Party Obkom Bureau Reports on Directing Perestroyka"]

[Text] This party obkom plenum, if judged by the standards of the years past, was unlike previous ones in its form, content and the method of preparation to it. It discussed the report of the party obkom bureau on managing perestroyka.

The speech by the obkom first secretary A.G.Braun raised the following question: does the work of the party obkom, its secretaries and the organization charged with managing perestroyka meet the new criteria? And it also provided the answer: No, it does not.

Another important point of the speech needs to be pointed out. It maintained that one thing only can be the main criterion of judging the work of any party committee: namely, real changes for the better and tangible results in the economic, social and spiritual spheres. It was as though the bureau offered obkom members an instrument to honestly measure their activity. It must be said that some of the party committee members have not yet rejected obsolete stereotypes. This, incidentally, was underscored by a few speeches that were of the usual kind. They contained neither analysis nor evaluation of the work of the obkom bureau, its secretaries and departments. Couched in generalities, they went only so far as to list shortcomings in one or another social sector, without attempting to find their causes. Had such speeches prevailed, the discussion could have become useless and pointless. However, such speeches were rare.

In this respect, the bureau must be given its due: as though foreseeing this possibility, it not only critically evaluated its work in the report, but went further than that.

Ahead of the plenum, the bureau had used the mass media to encourage the oblast's workers to share their views on perestroyka's progress and how well party committees, including the party obkom, direct it, and to express their suggestions and wishes how to improve it. Replies were numerous. They contained suggestions, wishes, and constructive criticism, and not only of the bureau or obkom management as a whole, but of specific individuals: obkom secretaries and department heads. The most interesting of them were summarized and distributed to obkom members.

In addition, in four of the oblast's rayons — in Alekseyevskiy, Astrakhanskiy, Vishnevskiy and Tselinogradskiy — questionnaires were used to survey the public opinion on, among other things, various aspects of perestroyka. Much useful information was gleaned from the preliminary exchange of opinions on the problems and the directions of perestroyka at informal meetings with the partkom's secretaries and other officials, managers of enterprises and organizations, exemplary workers, veterans, students, and young workers.

Thus, the bureau approached its report with an extensive material that, incidentally, will be helpful in future work as well, since when survey results were summarized, they uncovered some areas where the oblast's party organizations are clearly falling behind. All this permitted a real discussion of real problems.

If one wished, one could find many positive, as they say, aspects in the work of the obkom management, in directing both the economy and the social sector. Indeed, they exist.

For instance, the agricultural sector has improved significantly. Suffice it to mention that the oblast achieved ahead of schedule the targets of the first two years of the 5-year plan for production of the main varieties of agricultural output: of grain, meat, milk, eggs and wool. This year's plan was also fulfilled early. Moreover, grain production rose 15 percent, meat 9 percent, milk 11 percent and eggs 8 percent. Output quality has also improved. This led to significant improvements in the food supply for the population.

Some positive trends have emerged in construction. New production facilities at the Kazakhselmash plant have been completed three months ahead of schedule, storage facilities for 10,700 tons of fruit and vegetables have been built, space for 22,000 heads of cattle has been constructed, among other projects. But the most impressive improvements have occurred in residential construction. The year's residential construction plan was fulfilled back in September, with 400,000 square meters of residential space completed, half as much again as in

the previous year. As a result, 7,500 families improved their living conditions, which means that the list of those waiting for an apartment at the start of this year was cut by 20 percent. We could talk about other positive results as well. Yet, today both the requirements and the evaluation standards have changed. And if the situation were viewed with the higher standards in mind, we would have to talk more about shortcomings — which is, of course, what took place at the plenum.

Let us take industry. It was unprepared for the tough targets set by the 5-year plan, and the obkom was unable to take charge in any real sense of perestroika in this extremely important sector of the economy. Just one fact: the output of industrial enterprises fell short by 18 million rubles, with one in three failing to provide contracted products.

In the construction industry, the capacity is being spread too thin, the number of construction sites continues to increase. At the same time, the funds for the construction of schools, child care facilities, hospitals, vocational schools and cultural centers are not fully used. And in residential construction, not all is going uniformly well.

As usual, there are problems in agriculture. Just one example: 42 and 18 collectives, respectively, failed to fulfill the 9-month plan for meat and milk production, and in 35 of them meat production actually dropped.

Change is too slow in the service sector. Conservatism, lack of initiative, laziness and outright indifference pervade retail trade, services and other sectors whose function is to care for the people.

These are all consequences, but what are the causes? There are many of them, but a large portion of the blame lies with the party economic leadership. This was discussed at the plenum by the Atbasarskiy and Kurgaldzhinskiy party raykoms' first secretaries K.K. Karbayev and S.K. Azhibayev, among others. Reproaches were directed at the obkom's departments and secretaries in charge of various sectors. The participants of the discussion pointed out that they still reject democratic managerial practices and underestimate glasnost and the possibilities inherent in the new economic structure. This occurs because in the past criticism of obkom management never went any higher than department heads. The managerial style whereby officials pass down orders has not yet been eradicated. Party committees still practice it, as do department staffs. A complaint was voiced at the plenum that party officials, managers and experts, especially those from the oblast agricultural committee, often visit working collectives not to provide practical assistance but to uncover negative phenomena for which they then can shout at people. Such criticism is unproductive. There are many masterful practitioners of this art, but the art of disseminating positive experience and the art of organizing business is known to few. This has been proven by the way the system of collective contracts is

being implemented. Without this system modern production is unthinkable; yet, its implementation is often superficial. And in agriculture, it is apparently thought sufficient to present "exposure" numbers.

The obkom bureau was severely criticized for not working enough with its staff, from the managerial personnel, including obkom management, down to ordinary employees. It is true, staff policy shows new trends. Instances of a formalistic approach, promotions based on personal preferences or reshuffling of incompetent managers from one managerial post to another have been reduced. These practices are being replaced by democracy, glasnost, openness, evaluations based on business qualities. This year, some 60 managers have been democratically elected by workers, and 29 voted down. These have been dismissed from their positions.

However, new trends are slow to reach the masses. And, as is well-known, an idea that has not taken hold among the masses remains nothing but a fruitless idea. The following figures were revealed at the plenum: the above-mentioned survey found that 43 percent of workers do not see the possibilities opened up by perestroika, and 40 percent have no clear idea of their own participation in it. This is a serious drag, indicative of mistakes in the organizational and educational work of party committees and their grass-root organizations. They have not yet rejected the stereotypical approach and obsolete cliches.

The bureau does not sufficiently rely on its core, i.e., the obkom members. Many of them only attend plenums. E.I. Engraf, foreman at the Vishnevkiy Concrete Railroad Tie Plant said that his plant had been visited by obkom secretaries twice, but they found no time to meet with him, an obkom member, or with the local party secretary. "Sometimes you do want to do something but you just don't know how," he complained.

The next 2 or 3 years will be decisive for perestroika. Large-scale economic and social problems will have to be solved while reforms will be undertaken in economic management, ideology and culture. These changes will involve ever-widening masses. Only with their assistance these goals could be reached. The plenum adopted a resolution aimed at improving perestroika management.

C.V. Urzhumov, KaSSR Communist Party Central Committee secretary, spoke at the plenum. V.V. Vavilin, CPSU Central Committee Instructor, participated in the work of the plenum.

12892

Azerbaijan CC Implements CPSU Decision to Close Institute

*18300080 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian
1 Dec 87 pp 1-2*

[Unattributed report: "In the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers"]

[Excerpts] The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers have examined measures to implement the CPSU Central Committee's decree "On Serious Shortcomings in the Activities of the Azerbaijan Institute of the National Economy imeni D. Buniatzade," and the course of restructuring in the system of higher and secondary specialized education in the republic.

The decree adopted states that the CPSU Central Committee's Politburo, in its session of 24 September 1987, after considering the matter of serious shortcomings in the activities of the Azerbaijan Institute of the National Economy imeni D. Buniatzade, provided a principled appraisal of the existing situation at the institute, agreed with the proposal of the USSR Council of Ministers to eliminate the higher school, and demanded fundamental restructuring of the work of party and soviet agencies and the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and all executives of higher and secondary specialized educational institutions in the republic, and the adoption of fundamental measures to radically improve the training of specialists for the economy. The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers, fully and completely acknowledging the criticism contained in the decree of the CPSU Central Committee's Politburo, have adopted it for guidance and implementation.

The decree of the USSR Council of Ministers on this matter notes that over the course of a number of years party and government agencies have been receiving a large number of letters and complaints concerning the unsatisfactory state of affairs at the Azerbaijan Institute of the National Economy imeni D. Buniatzade, and checkups have uncovered the most flagrant violations of the established procedures for admitting students, an impermissibly low ideological and theoretical level of instruction, and the weak professional training of the specialists graduated by the institute. A substantial number of graduates have a poor grasp of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and insufficient orientation in questions of the CPSU's theory and practice at the present stage. The institute has not been fully ensuring the accomplishment of its main task—the training of specialists with a higher education.

The higher school's physical facilities and equipment are in a state of neglect, and it lacks up-to-date laboratory equipment and instructional equipment. A substantial number of the instructors do not provide a high quality of instructional and educational work, since they have lost their connection with research and have lost their qualifications. Phenomena of stagnation in the higher school's work have given rise to an unsatisfactory moral and psychological atmosphere in its collective. Scholarly unscrupulousness, violations of pedagogical ethics and labor discipline, nepotism, protectionism and other abuses have become widespread. The institute's executives have permitted malicious violations of state discipline, the manifestation of unprincipled behavior in

work, an uncritical attitude toward the state of affairs, formalism and false show. The USSR Council of Ministers has called the attention of Comrade G. N. Seidov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers, to the fact that for a long time a tolerant attitude was shown toward major shortcomings in the work of that institute. The republic Council of Ministers is instructed to consider the question of the personal responsibility of executives of the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education for the shortcomings that have been committed in work.

The decree of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers points out that the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and the rectorate and party committee of the Azerbaijan Institute of the National Economy imeni D. Buniatzade failed to draw the proper conclusions from the November 1985 decree of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, "On Serious Shortcomings in the Work of Azerbaijan Institute of the National Economy imeni D. Buniatzade in Implementing the Decree of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers 'On the Further Development of the Higher School and Enhancement of the Quality of the Training of Specialists,'" and failed to carry out the necessary set of party political and organizational measures for improving the educational and upbringing process and scholarly work in light of the requirements of the 27th Congress and the CPSU Central Committee's January and June (1987) Plenums.

Comrade R. E. Mekhtiyev, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, also has manifested a tolerant attitude toward major shortcomings in the work of the Azerbaijan Institute of the National Economy imeni D. Buniatzade and other higher and secondary specialized educational institutions, and a lack of exactingness toward executives.

The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers have adopted for guidance and implementation the 24 September 1987 decree of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, "On Serious Shortcomings in the Activities of the Azerbaijan Institute of the National Economy imeni D. Buniatzade," and the corresponding 24 September 1987 decree of the USSR Council of Ministers on the elimination of the aforementioned institute, as well as the decision that has been made to establish in Baku a branch of the Leningrad Finance and Economics Institute imeni N. A. Voznesenskiy with instruction in day, evening and correspondence forms.

The Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education (Comrade A. N. Abbasov) has been instructed to carry out the closing of the Azerbaijan Institute of the National Economy imeni D. Buniatzade according to established procedures. In accordance with a 30 October 1987 order of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, it is to provide for

the rational placement of students from the closed institute and their transfer for the continuation of their education to the Baku Branch of the Leningrad Finance and Economics Institute imeni N. A. Voznesenskiy and other higher educational institutions in the country.

The Azerbaijan SSR State Planning Committee and Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education are ordered to submit, to the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and the RSFSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, proposals concerning the range of specialties at the newly opened Baku Branch of the Leningrad Finance and Economics Institute imeni N. A. Voznesenskiy and concerning plan indices for the admission of students in these specialties and rational proportions among the training of personnel in the day, evening and correspondence programs, as well as proposals concerning regularization of the structure and improvement of the quality of the training of economists in the republic and the elimination of the serious disproportions and shortcomings noted in the USSR Council of Ministers' decree, with a view to the complete satisfaction of the Azerbaijan SSR economy's need for specialists in economics with a mastery of present-day methods of economic management.

Together with the RSFSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and the Leningrad Finance and Economics Institute imeni N. A. Voznesenskiy, it is necessary to carry out the certification of professors and instructors from the closed higher school and determine the possibility of further utilizing these employees in pedagogical work.

A commission consisting of Comrades A.T. Rasi-zade, F.D. Rustambekova, A. N. Abbasov, K.N. Ragimov, F.G. Abdulla-zade, A.G. Kerimov, and F.A. Khaspolatov has been set up under the republic Council of Ministers to provide assistance in the job placement of the employees freed in connection with the closing of the Azerbaijan Institute of the National Economy imeni D. Buniatzade, with a view to ensuring their use in the economy in their specialties in accordance with their qualifications and work experience.

The executives and party and Komsomol organizations of the branch that is being established are instructed, in accordance with the tasks of restructuring the system of higher and secondary specialized education, to provide for the radical improvement of the quality of the training of specialists and a healthy moral and psychological atmosphere in the collective. The next examination session is to be carried out under conditions of high standards and principles and broad glasnost.

The attention of the collegium of the republic Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education is called to the irresponsibility and lack of initiative that have been displayed, as well as the pro forma approach that was shown to improving the work of the Azerbaijan

Institute of the National Economy imeni D. Buniatzade, and major shortcomings in the organization of higher and secondary specialized education in the republic.

A reprimand to be recorded in his permanent work record has been issued to Comrade K. G. Aliyev for his weak guidance of the Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, major shortcomings in the training of specialists for the economy, and the creation of an atmosphere of a mutual lack of exactingness during his tenure as Azerbaijan SSR Minister of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education.

A severe reprimand has been issued to Comrade R. B. Feyzullayev, member of the CPSU and first deputy minister, for shortcomings in the organization of higher and secondary specialized education, the slackening of oversight over the observance of procedures for admissions to higher schools and the assignment of graduates, and cases of unscrupulousness among professors and instructors.

Comrade E. A. Nazarli, deputy minister, has received a reprimand and been relieved of his duties for serious shortcomings in the organization of secondary specialized education, the low level of the professional and ideological-theoretical training of specialists, and the failure to take steps to eliminate shortcomings in the work of the republic's secondary specialized schools.

It is noted that Comrade F. G. Akhmedov, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers, deserves severe punishment for major shortcomings in the work of the Azerbaijan Institute of the National Economy imeni D. Buniatzade, shortcomings which were committed in developing the physical facilities and equipment of higher schools and secondary specialized schools, the failure to take prompt steps to regularize the structure of the training of specialists for the economy, and cases of failure to observe the established procedures for the admission of students and assignment of graduates. However, considering the petition submitted by him, his request to be relieved of his duties in connection with his health-related retirement on pension has been granted.

Note is taken of the lax work of the Department of Science and Educational Institutions of the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee, which tolerated major shortcomings and negative manifestations in the work of the republic's higher schools and secondary specialized schools, failed to take specific steps to radically improve the quality of the training of specialists for the economy, and failed to exercise the necessary oversight over the admission of students.

It is deemed necessary to strengthen the Department of Science and Educational Institutions of the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee, and comrade R. D. Mamedov has been relieved of his duties in connection with his transfer to other work.

The attention of Comrade R. E. Mekhtiyev, secretary of the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee, is directed to major omissions in the organization of higher and secondary specialized education, and he is ordered to take vigorous steps to eliminate shortcomings in the activities of the republic's higher schools and secondary specialized schools.

The party obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms, the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, the Ministry of Health, the State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports, other ministries and departments having educational institutions, and the executives of higher schools and secondary specialized schools are instructed to discuss this decree and develop and implement a set of measures for eliminating the shortcomings noted in it, paying special attention to the following:

- raising the professional responsibility of the rectors of higher schools and directors of secondary specialized schools, and the secretaries of primary party organizations for the level of training of specialists, the content of educational, upbringing and research work, the quality of the instructional staff, and the state of physical facilities and equipment. To carry out the regular certification of professors and instructors and other personnel of higher schools and secondary specialized educational institutions.

- creating in student collectives an atmosphere of intense creative work in mastering knowledge and an atmosphere of principle and high standards; developing student self-government and the initiative and independence of students in resolving the main issues of instruction and upbringing; improving the educational process and developing in future specialists up-to-date economic thinking and the habits of managerial activity under the new conditions for the functioning of the branches of the economy;

- focusing the efforts of professors and instructors on improving the educational and upbringing process and increasing the productivity of higher-school research;

- introducing a system for long-term vocational guidance and improvement of work in selecting and attracting to educational institutions the most worthy and well-trained young people with a bent and calling for their chosen specialties.

8756

Kurgan-Tyube Obkom Criticized for Indifference to Cadre Incompetency

18300103 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 22 Dec 87 p 2

[Article by V. Matonin and L. Makhkamov, SOVETSKAYA KULTURA special correspondents: "The Consequences of Neutrality; Notes from the Kurgan-Tyube Party Obkom Plenum"]

[Text] "For serious deficiencies in work, it is proposed that former First Secretary of the Kabodiyenskiy Party Raykom Turdiyev be excluded from membership..."

Obkom First Secretary A. Kasimov who was presiding looked out at the audience and said: "Does anyone have any comments, proposals or objections?"

The Plenum was cautiously silent. Its participants were also silent when after Turdiyev the proposal was made to exclude from oblast committee membership Kurgan-Tyube gorkom former First Secretary Sadullayev, Kolkhozabad Party Raykom former First Secretary Dodabayev, and former oblagroprom deputy Chairman Sharipov for their lack of principle in cadre selection, bureaucratic show, and reduced demands.

It was on this organizational note that the plenum of the Tadzhikistan Kurgan-Tyube Party Obkom, which was discussing the buro report on management of perestroika concluded its work.

It is no accident that we focus on this seemingly procedural moment. Almost everyone speaking out in the discussion pointed out in one way or another the acute cadre problem and its difficult consequences. We might add that as a rule the topic of discussion was the role and place of the management cadres in perestroika not because they are obvious, but because their example—decisiveness, principle and honesty—inspire the masses. Yet neither in the obkom buro nor in the discussions was this varied problem which presents difficulties for the oblast analyzed. Rather, it was merely stated. A good chance for collective critical interpretation of the state of affairs was allowed to slip away, and this means that new errors are not excluded. Yet the "Report of the Tadzhikistan Communist Party Central Committee Buro on Work in Managing Reorganization in the Republic", which was published long before the obkom plenum, contains lines which should make the party active membership stop and think carefully. Here is what it says: "...the Central Committee buro has repeatedly had to address work with the cadres by the Kurgan-Tyube party obkom, since it had serious shortcomings which were exacerbating the situation in the oblast. There were a great many letters received about the shortcomings in the work of a number of managers and their personal indiscretions. However, the obkom was not able to give a proper evaluation of these instances and to interpret them from the standpoint of reorganization..."

We must admit, that the report facilitated a rather calm "course" of the discussions. The day before, we acquainted ourselves with the materials of several of the preceding plenums and compared them with the current one. We got the impression that the names of the farms and rayons changed, the numbers and dates changed, yet the content remained the same. The "newness", probably, consisted of the following: the abundance of names—secretaries, obkom buro members, directors of oblast organizations—all of whom were told, and all in the subjunctive, "to render more aid, to take exhaustive

measures, to show initiative and persistence"... Everything else in the report—its concepts, conclusions and proposals—turned out to be traditional, following the customary, established scheme.

This is also confirmed by the following line. Publishing its report well ahead of time in the oblast newspapers, the buro reported that in the days of plenum preparations it "received many responses and proposals from on site". We too wanted to become acquainted with them. But alas! In most of the sections they simply lowered their eyes in embarrassment. There was no feedback. The stack of letters did not and indeed could not make a difference. That means the report did not worry either the communists or the active membership and did not deeply touch their hearts and minds. Recently, problems of ecology and problems of the cadres in a number of sectors of the agro-industrial complex are becoming ever more alarmingly apparent. But, unfortunately, in the report all this was diluted and drowned out in a multitude of other, sometimes secondary and immediate problems.

What are the reasons for such a fearful attitude toward these blatant problems? Where does such cautiousness and extreme diplomatic etiquette come from when we speak of party and principle accountability for disruptions of the standards of party life, for slipshod work, for irresponsibility, for a heartless attitude toward people, for bureaucratism and pretentiousness? Why is cadre policy spinning its wheels? These problems are deeply rooted. Aren't they the essence of the position of the buro itself, when impulses from above determine the corresponding attitude below? In reality, how many ominous and strict speeches have been presented at plenums, buro and various other meetings and conferences regarding the shortcomings in work with the cadres? Resolutions were adopted which self-critically evaluated the "serious shortcomings" and gave "particular attention to further improvements"... But what has come of them in real life?

Let us return to Turdiyev, whom we mentioned at the beginning of this article. We might say he is a legendary personality. His "activity" in the position of party raykom first secretary had become notorious far beyond the rayon boundaries. He would not tolerate any objections or accept any advice. And it is not surprising that the raykom buro—a collective organ—turned out to be merely the right hand of the man "himself". His personal "placement and training of the cadres" led to a situation where many management positions were occupied by people who were incompetent, lacked initiative, or had no moral right to lead a collective. It was impossible to approach such "proteges". They were reliably guarded against criticism. But even if some clouds did happen to gather over one of them, they were effectively dissipated by the "Turdiyev umbrella". In 1985, misappropriations and shortcomings were discovered at the rayon communications center. The matter was handed over to the court. In the meantime, A. Rakhmankulov, the director

of the organization, was ratified as an instructor in the party raykom. No sooner had they built a case against communal enterprises combine Chief I. Ramazanov than he, too, turned up in the raykom apparatus. And all this was at Turdiyev's personal insistence. There is an entire array of such examples—including the acceptance of relatives into the party and the destruction of circulation copies of the rayon newspaper.

Who knows, maybe Turdiyev would still be "managing" the rayon party organization to this day if the Tadzhikistan Communist Party Central Committee had not become involved. We might add that Sadullayev too, the first secretary of the Kurgan-Tyube gorkom, was also dismissed according to the results of an investigation by the republic's communist party Central Committee. To this we must add the replacement of management in most of the rayon's oblasts, strengthening the rayon party committees and the rayon soviet ispolkoms. Time-servers, "showmen", and inert managers have given way to thinking and energetic people. We might be happy: the purification process is gaining strength, the cadre corps at all levels is becoming stronger. But let us not be hasty. The changes which we have just mentioned have taken place once again at the initiative of the republic organs.

But what about the obkom? What is its position? It is not examined in the report. The regular "portion" of self-criticism did not extend to an analysis of the tendencies, a study of the phenomena, a self-critical review of practices, and a development of specific conclusions for the future. It would be stretching the point to say that those who spoke out filled this gap. Moreover, some speakers, having gotten up to the podium, decided to report about themselves, to flaunt their achievements, to expound upon the shortcomings of "superiors" or "subordinates", but not their own. But times have changed! This is why oblagroprom Chairman Yu. Kucharov had to put aside his prepared speech and answer the audience's questions on acute topics. After all, the mark-ups, "showmanship" and cadre failures are all within his jurisdiction.

Yet it seemed to us that at times the obkom members expressed their opinions on this matter more frankly and definitely in the lobby during breaks. Again this is a contribution of the past, the days gone by, when every critical word uttered from the podium had to be weighed as if on a pharmacist's scale, and retribution could be expected for a careless word. As it turns out, not everyone is yet ready today to hold an open and direct discussion about the problems which have become acute. And again it is the buro itself which gives the lessons of the "permissible and the unlawful", the lessons of lack of principle. "We associate many of the shortcomings in the activity of the agro-industrial complex with the unsatisfactory work of the former buro member and party obkom secretary F. Karimov," we read in the report. How so? After all, a year ago Karimov was dismissed from his duties as obkom secretary in connection with his transition to economic management work, as stated

in the plenum materials. And now it turns out that he, to put it mildly, was not doing a good job! Where is the truth? Why do we need to be coy, comrades! The primary party organization of the obkom apparatus reprimanded F. Karimov for misdeeds he committed back when he was first secretary of the Shaartuzskiy party raykom. But the obkom members don't know about this, just as they don't know what the real reason for such an unexpected turn of events was. Particularly since F. Karimov remains to this day a member of the party obkom.

Lack of precise definition and halfheartedness of decisions always leave room for conjecture and gossip. The above-mentioned example is no exception.

Numerous turnovers in the management cadres are a persistent need, not personnel reshuffling. This point was stressed by many. But here is the remarkable thing. They do remove the transgressors, but somehow remorsefully. For example, T. Dodabayev and T. Turdiyev were dismissed from their duties as first secretaries with strict party reprimands. Yet they remained members of the obkom for 9 more months.

A clear-cut, synonymous position on the part of the obkom buro toward those who have undermined the work is important not only for the objective evaluation of the "activity" of those who have left, but even more importantly—for training and work with the new cadres.

There were also really sharp remarks made at the plenum which did not spare the customary decorum. I. Bulich, S. Mukhitdinova and S. Ganiyev cited the names of the "unsinkable" nomenclature workers. They spoke about the authority of the obkom buro member and about the problems which are arising today in their full scope in connection with the transition of enterprises to new economic methods of management. However, the matter-of-fact and frank reflections of these communists turned out to be beyond the scope of the plenum, since they were given the floor "at curtain time", after the rather amicable proposals of the audience to "sum it up". It's a pity that the party discussion did not begin with them.

Yes, this plenum shed light on many unresolved and difficult problems on the path of reorganization. And we must tackle them today—energetically, persistently, and in a goal-oriented manner.

12322

Information Report On Eighth Georgian CP CC Plenum

18300146a Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 20
Dec 87 p 1

[Gruzinform article: "Information Report on the Georgian CP Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The Eighth Plenum of the Georgian CP Central Committee was held on 19 December. Gorkom and raykom first secretaries, secretaries of party committees

enjoying raykom status, ministers, chairmen of state committees that are not part of the Georgian CP Central Committee and Auditing Commission, chairmen of city and rayon councils of people's deputies executive committees, chairmen of territorial-interbranch and agroindustrial associations, heads and secretaries of party committees at large enterprises and organizations, trade union and Komsomol workers, activists in the fields of science and culture, and representatives of the mass media were invited to the plenum.

The plenum examined the tasks facing republic party, soviet, and economic agencies attending the changeover, beginning in 1988, of enterprises to operation under conditions of complete cost-accounting and self-financing.

Georgian CP Central Committee First Secretary D.I. Patiashvili delivered a report.

The following people took part in the plenum deliberations: Z.A. Chkheidze, chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers; A. Yu. Pavshentsev, Georgian CP Tbilisi Gorkom secretary; O.G. Zukhbaya, chairman of the Abkhaz ASSR Council of Ministers; N.O. Nadaraya, second secretary of the Adzhar Obkom of the Georgian CP; Georgian SSR Minister of Finance D.N. Dvalishvili; M.A. Gokhelashvili, second secretary of the Georgian CP South Osetian Obkom; Z.D. Chivadze, director general of the Tbilisi Elektrovostroitel Production Association; N. Ya. Kukhianidze, produce grower at the Maglaskiy Sovkhoz, Tskhaltubo city zone; T.V. Kunchuliya, first secretary of the Georgian CP Makharadzevskiy Raykom; A.L. Mirzoyan, milling machine operator at the Tbilisi Stankostroitel Production Association and chairman of the work collective council; Georgian SSR Minister of Consumer Services K.T. Saliya; O.F. Maysuradze, Georgian CP Lagodekhskiy Raykom first secretary; Georgian Trade Unions Council Secretary Z.A. Kvachadze; N.I. Kakhishvili, director general of the Tbilisi Mion Scientific-Production Association; Georgian SSR State Committee on Prices Chairman M.A. Mergelishvili; Z.Sh. Kadzhaya, first deputy chairman of the Kutaiskiy City Soviet of People's Deputies Executive Committee and head of the interbranch territorial association; Georgian SSR State Agroindustrial Committee Deputy Chairman A.D. Gasanov; V.A. Pateishvili, chairman of the board of the Georgian republic bank of the USSR State Bank; Georgian SSR Minister of Light Industry B.Z. Makashvili.

The plenum adopted a resolution on the question under discussion.

The plenum also examined an organizational matter.

A.A. Blrtsyan was relieved by the plenum of his duties as editor of the newspaper SOVETAKAN VRASTAN in connection with his retirement, and was thanked for his many years of productive work in his position.

V.V. Baybrut was confirmed as editor of SOVETAKAN VRASTAN.

The plenum advanced Z.A. Labakhua, deputy chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers, from the ranks of the candidates to the position of Georgian CP Central Committee member.

The plenum expelled S.B. Stepanyan, former Akhalkalakskiy Raykom first secretary, from the ranks of the

Georgian CP Central Committee for failing to conform to statutory requirements regarding admission into the ranks of the CPSU and for gross errors in the selection and placing of personnel.

CPSU Central Committee sector head V.F. Karachkov and CPSU Central Committee official B.A. Malkov took part in the plenum activities.

**Readers Advise Newspaper on Topic Preferences,
Glasnost**

18300063a Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA
in Russian 12 Nov 87 p 4

[Meeting conducted by S. Zapolskaya, SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA correspondent; and N. Ryabova, head, Department of Soviet Construction; Kyzyl-Kiya, Osh Oblast; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA introduction]

[Text] At the Kyzyl-Kiya Mine imeni Leninskiy komso-mol, there was a meeting between editorial workers and readers. During the course of the candid discussion, observations and preferences were expressed which will be taken into account in drawing up the model for the 1988 newspaper. Today we are publishing excerpts from a number of speeches made during the meeting.

**L. Zhokin, trade union committee chairman, Mine
imeni Leninskiy komso-mol:**

SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA focuses a great deal of attention on agriculture. Much more than on industry. And as for our industry, the coal industry, the newspaper doesn't give it any attention at all.

What am I interested in most of all? Youth topics, specifically the connection between young people and the older generation. People with a lot of life experience and work experience are not as generous in mentoring as they were (we can tell this from books and old newspapers), for example, 30 or 40 years ago. Many of them are merely spectators, growling at young people from time to time.... Or does it just seem that way to me? I think this is a topic for the newspaper. Let me remark that it is not a new one. There was a time when a lot was written about mentoring, and now for some reason they are not writing about it at all.

What else interests me in a newspaper? Everything that tells about people. I like materials that you can pick up something useful from, something you can copy and use at your own enterprise. The only thing I don't like is the way you journalists portray leading workers. You make them much too perfect. I or anyone else who works with one of them knows that he is no angel, he has shortcomings and makes mistakes too. So it is necessary to show him as he really is: a living person, not an icon. An intelligent glance from the side won't hurt anything, even if it is critical.

S. Kondrashov, miner:

All the newspapers now are raising global problems. Probably this is a good thing, it is necessary. But is it really impossible to get down also to the, so to speak, minutiae of our lives? For example, how and where to spend a day off with the children? Many miners take their little children to Fergana to play on the swings and merry-go-rounds, because our town does not have even

these simple entertainments. I am not even talking about school holidays—during that time the children have nothing to do with themselves at all.

Or the work of consumer services. When will there finally be some order in this area? I think this topic, like the topic of organizing leisure time, should never be off the newspaper pages.

Yu. Aruchidi, paramedic:

Man does not live by work alone. In the newspaper pages, I look for a great variety of interesting information and, frankly, I rarely find it. We would like to know how people live, not just in our republic but also in the other 14. It is interesting to know about manners and customs in foreign countries as well. This is why newspapers exist at all, to expand the horizons of their readers. The pages of SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA tell inexcusably little about international life. Your coverage of sports and children's education, I think, is inadequate. Education is of particular concern to all of us, because all of us are parents, and in addition to having to do a good job at work, we are obliged to bring up our children to be good people.

Once SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA published several legal sketches of "kings" of the gas pumps. It was memorable. But what changed? As before, the gas pumps work poorly, the quality of gasoline is worse than anywhere else, it is difficult to put gas in a private car, and even state-owned motor transportation is standing idle—there is no fuel. I propose that the newspaper get involved with this issue.

**Z. Khudayberdyev, deputy chairman, mine
administration trade union committee:**

I am a constant reader of SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA. Recently the newspaper has changed remarkably, it has become more interesting. Nevertheless, you write too little about human beings, about the things which concern them. There is too little, in my view, which touches on the problems of families and human interrelations.

Central Asia is a sharply defined region, frankly, there are still many holdovers in our traditions, there are even openly harmful customs which are in no way compatible with the Soviet way of life, with a communist world view. And who if not the republic party newspaper should carry on a constant discussion of this (not just from incident to incident), and persuade people away from outmoded views. The newspaper is a collective organizer, so you should organize people to live by modern, soviet ceremonies and traditions, don't let yourselves be shut up in the old, outdated little world. For this we need bright, positive articles about the organization of weddings, name-giving rituals, inductions into the army, coming of age days, and simple rules of good tone during meetings with guests and relatives.

I would call the housing problem Problem No 1. How is it being resolved in our republic and in others—we seek the answer to this question in the newspaper pages. We need experience which can be copied.

Just one more observation: SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA often publishes critical articles but forgets to inform us about measures which have been taken. A newspaper is simply obligated to carry every case which it begins to a conclusion, and to inform its readers of the results.

A. Ashkalov, miner:

Currently much is being said about social justice, about social equality. But in real life, so far I don't see any of this. No matter what you say, the differences between leaders and workers exist. A chief goes on vacation—his vacation wages are given to him that same day, and he is offered a pass to a vacation resort or spa, and then he doesn't have to stand in line in the stores.... For some reason, the newspapers don't write very much about this.

I. Kolbayev, party committee secretary, Kyzyl-Kiya Mine Administration:

Probably my opinion will go against the grain of what is generally accepted today. It seems to me that we should not do so much fishing around in the past, dragging out to light things that happened 10 years ago. More should be written about the present, about everything good which enriches our country and our socialist society. I fervently believe in the power of the positive example. Tell more about good people and their doings—articles like these have a great educational effect, they inspire optimism. Speaking of the leading worker, it is not necessary to limit yourselves to his labor achievements alone. More value than ever before is now placed on personality, and on civic and social activity. It is not enough simply to do well on the job, we also need to take a look at what sort of person the leading worker is in the social life of the collective, in his family, at home. Money and good wages are important, of course, but I believe that moral incentives have been, are, and will continue to be of greater priority.

SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA has remarkably activated the topic of internationalist education. More openness is required in this issue, the rough edges which (as every one of us knows) exist in life should not be smoothed off. The greater the candor, the greater the clarity will be. For some reason, questions of international relations are discussed in the newspaper pages mainly by representatives of the intelligentsia. Why not ask the opinion of workers and peasants on this matter? They could talk simply and accessibly about their everyday life, which has been going on for more than one decade in the multinational collective—these would be examples of true internationalism. Take our mine, for example. Our people have good traditions of collective and family

relations, and there is no language problem—about 7 percent of the Russians speak fluently in the Uzbek and Kirghiz languages, and everybody knows Russian.

The editorial office is planning next year's publication now. We would like to read frank, businesslike articles by the leaders of sectors, ministries, and departments concerning how the production which has been entrusted to them is being restructured, what has already been achieved, and what has not turned out, and why. It would be good if the pages of SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA also saw articles by workers in the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, and Council of Ministers, which would treat specific sectors of the republic's production.

12255

Ways To Improve Quality, Usefulness of Kirghiz TV

*18300063b Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA
in Russian 24 Nov 87 p 4*

[Article by I. Layliyeva, candidate of philological sciences: "Reserves of the Television Genre"; first two paragraphs are author's introduction]

[Text] Kirghiz Television Broadcasting is changing for the better—this is obvious. New people have come, a new time has come, and republic television broadcasting, it seems, has at last awakened from its long hibernation and stagnation. But it still has far to go before it reaches the level we would like.

Even these perhaps fairly subjective observations are dictated by the desire to see our television broadcasting be more professional, more entertaining, and this is precisely why they contain much more criticism and reprimands than praise and glorification. Of course, republic television broadcasting cannot compete with the programs of Central Television Broadcasting, no one is demanding this, but more dynamic, more contemporary, I think, it could be. And it should be.

Certain individual programs are boring and provincial. It is clear that they are put together by people who have little concern for what they are doing. Really, it is no good to show pictures and give monotonous commentary on them frame by frame.

It is no good, one would think, to conduct reportage from an art exhibit, showing meanwhile not the pictures, but the face of an individual who tediously explains the merit of one canvas or another, in which we are unable to be convinced, since it is completely impossible to see them from behind his back. We have to take his word for it.

It is strange to see the lid from a candy box instead of opening credits. Still more tasteless is the envelope with the two little roses, pasted on a piece of cardboard—the

opening shot for the musical program "On Monday, at the End of the Working Day." In that case, why not stick on, somewhere at the side, a dove with a ribbon in its beak, on which is written something like this: "Dear viewer, I await your response as a nightingale does the summer." That would be genuine kitsch. In addition, such shots last a fairly long time, sometimes for several minutes, in order that we may thoroughly study them, and fully enjoy the fantasy and the mastery of the studio artist. But is it worthwhile to so thoughtlessly, extravagantly squander valuable television time? After all, it might be possible to show something more interesting: to announce a new film, show, or exhibit, or to provide announcements and publicity at the end.

Television rubrics are boring and monotonous, and there are few new, original programs and series in republic television broadcasting. Many titles duplicate the titles of programs on Central Television Broadcasting. If television workers are having difficulty thinking up a title because of some such circumstances, then they could perhaps organize a contest of television viewers which, incidentally, Central Television Broadcasting does fairly often.

Republic television broadcasting, unfortunately, has none of its own "brand name" programs which viewers look forward to impatiently. It is impossible for one program to please everyone, the divergence of individual preferences should be taken into account. The main thing is a large variety. One person loves "In the World of Animals," another—"Incredible But True," and everyone watches "Cinepanorama." It is a pity that we do not have our own "stars," whose high professionalism and whose brilliant personalities among television leaders would guarantee a correspondingly high level of the programs on which they appear.

Senkevich, Kapitsa, Drozdov—these are people who, first of all, thoroughly know their jobs, and therefore they are superlative leaders of their programs. In each of them is the reflection of an extraordinary personality; they are personifications. In republic television broadcasting, the single exception to the featureless standard is, perhaps, A. Cheremushkina, whose competence, interest, intelligence, and severe style arouse the viewer's respect and trust. Her programs are mature and pointed, and brilliantly current. It would be difficult to name anyone else. Although there are unexpected finds, accidental, so to speak, such as occurred in an interview with Yu. P. Platonov, first secretary of the board of the USSR Architects Union. The interview was conducted by G. Konduchalova, also an architect, which probably is the reason that the level of the conversation was so high; one felt that it was an interesting conversation going on between specialists concerning something which is of concern not only to architects but to many, many other people as well—about the environment in which man lives, the appearance of our cities and villages, which are still fairly blemished by featureless and ordinary buildings.

On the whole, Kirghiz Television Broadcasting has one big, global shortcoming—it avoids the sharp corners, it does not mention the problems which are worrying everyone. What is this—a position or an unwillingness to run into unpleasantness? Neither the one nor the other gains any sympathy. For example, on the Central Television Broadcasting program "Living Nature," Ch. Aytmatov speaks with pain and bitterness of the approaching tragedy of Issyk-Kul. Kirghiz Television Broadcasting, though, keeps silence. But after all, it would be a bit late now to sound the alarm, gather together "round tables," and organize discussions. This is what happened with the Aral Sea. It is just as meaningless as pouring water back into a well which has gone dry. Perhaps I am too harsh, but the problem exists and with every day it is becoming worse. The lake is becoming catastrophically shallow, and this affects all of us. If television is one of the effective means of having an impact on people's consciousness, then this capacity it has should be used. Isn't that true?

As of now we have no program which is worthy of representing Kirghizia in the all-union television arena. Of course, we are not Leningradites, we are not Balts, and so forth, but how many cloying, sugary programs prepared by Kirghiz Television Broadcasting can be shown on Central Television Broadcasting? It is either holiday concerts or parades. I don't have anything against concerts, but they don't say all there is to be said about life in the republic, and moreover there is a sense that one and the same concert is repeated from year to year: Minzhilkiyev, Sartbayeva, Dzhumakhmatov. What, do we have no one else?

Incidentally, we also have no permanent program devoted to the problems of developing Kirghiz Soviet literature—one of the original representatives of the multinational Soviet literature. There are only sporadic meetings with the same two or three authors each time, and even that, as a rule, only on the event of some anniversary. But the questions facing literature are the questions facing life, for literature is nothing other than a reflection of objective reality. This is exactly why Central Television Broadcasting is organizing a meeting with Ch. Aytmatov in Ostankino and holding a heated discussion of "Plakha". Kirghiz Television Broadcasting, however, maintains a proud silence. And how long will it continue?

It is simply staggering, the extent to which we do not value that of which we can truly be proud, and how we extol that which is absolutely insignificant, at bottom. The representatives of Kirghiz Television Broadcasting speak with quivering delight of the Kirghiz stage, the very fact of whose existence raises doubts. Let's call a spade a spade. The concept of the "Kirghiz stage" does not exist in nature, and it is not worth trying to prove the opposite, pointing to the amateur collectives, which are depressing with their wretchedness and primitivism, and frequent absence of elementary musical culture and taste, with a quaver in the voice passing themselves off as

representatives of stage art. How they must laugh at us, the Kazakh and Uzbek television viewers, who have their own stage in actual fact, and their studios do not try to pass off what is wished for as real life.

I apologize for the perhaps excessive harshness of my judgments. They are dictated by only a single desire: that the programs of Kirghiz Television Broadcasting are something which people want to see, that from time to time they switch channels from Central Television Broadcasting to our program.

But just so that everyone and everything does not seem completely negative, I can say that positive changes are especially noticeable in the work of youth programming: new programs have appeared, and likable young people who have a better sense of the spirit and trend of the times, which is, however, only natural. For youth in general it is characteristic to strive toward everything new and progressive, stagnation and inertia of thinking are foreign to it, restructuring is easier for it.

Much is being said these days about the problems of internationalist education of young people, but the best impression of all is made not by declarations, appeals, and phrases, but by real actions, and vital contact and brotherhood among people. This is exactly why the youth-programming show "Intercontingent-87" has turned out to be successful. The sweet, inspired faces of children: Bulgarians, Germans, Cubans, Russians, Mongolians, and Kirghiz; their laughter, songs, cooperative work, and their genuine friendship and direct interaction. The unforced and "unstaged" nature of such television subjects are best able to reach the hearts of those to whom they are addressed, and this way guarantees success.

And finally. LITERATURNAYA GAZETA each week provides brief reviews by its "experts" of the television programs of Central Television Broadcasting. Critics, writers and dramatists determine the best and worst program of the week. IZVESTIYA, for its part, devotes a whole page each Saturday to the work of television. It is called "Television and Us." The newspaper publishes the critical opinions of its readers, announces programs, and ponders the problems of developing television. In our republic, similar work is being done by the weekly KYRGHYZSTAN MADANIYATY. Why couldn't SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA create a similar rubric, under which it could publish the opinions of readers, their wishes and observations, and the thoughts of "experts"? A small rubric such as this would be a good service to our television, and that means to all of us.

From the Editors:

In publishing these remarks, we invite all our readers to express their own opinion about the programs of Kirghiz Television Broadcasting: what is remarkable or brilliant

in it, what is inadequate, what things are television journalists failing to cover, what specific things could be done to improve television broadcasting?

12255

Armenian Journalists Review Perestroyka Progress in Media

18300064a Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian
15 Nov 87 p 1

[Armenpress report: "Restructuring and the Press"]

[Text] The press should constantly bear in mind the needs of the people, their spiritual interests and the high duty of employees of the mass information media—serving the people. In order to fulfill this noble mission, they are obligated not only truthfully to reflect the thoughts and aspirations of the people, not only to carry the word of the party to them, but also to struggle so that this word can be put into practice. To do this, journalistic collectives themselves must be restructured and their activity must be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the party, with the spirit of society's revolutionary transformation. A practical conversation on this subject took place at a joint plenum of the boards of the Armenian Union of Journalists and its Yerevan organization.

Ye. Manukyan, chairman of the board, Armenian Union of Journalists, and editor of the newspaper SOVETSKAN AYASTAN, presented a report on "Restructuring and the Press" at the plenum.

V. Danilov, department head of the newspaper KOMMUNIST, A. Simonyan, editor in chief of the journal PO LENINSKOMU PUTI; R. Khasapetyan, department head of the newspaper GRAKAN TERT; G. Gervorkyan, editor of the Leninakan newspaper BANYOR; S. Gasoyan, editor of the rayon newspaper NAIRI; and K. Nikogosyan, editor of the rayon newspaper ASHTARAK, participated in an exchange of opinions on the report.

It was noted in the report and speeches that the organs of mass information, the work of which is inadequate in terms of consistency, boldness, principle-mindedness, critical attitude and feeling of the new, were justifiably criticized at the July Armenian CP Central Committee Plenum. These shortcomings have also contributed to the fact that restructuring in the republic is not progressing and that matters are going poorly in economics and, in particular, in the ideological and moral spheres.

Meanwhile, the republic's journalists are still not implementing measures on restructuring with the necessary goal-directedness and are not addressing the problems of the social sphere and questions of activating the human factor with proper competency.

The plenum considered the first-priority tasks of the board of the republic's Union of Journalists, of the primary journalistic organizations and of every employee of the press to be the active and uncompromising struggle to implement the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the January and June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenums, the revolutionary restructuring of the life of Soviet society and the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development. It is necessary to decisively overcome manifestations of stagnation, old thinking and old ways of action, and actively seek out and assert new approaches and the corresponding spirit of the times, of revolutionary transformation and restructuring.

Journalists should focus their efforts on the most important trends of the republic's economic development, social life and the solution of problems arising under the conditions of broadening democracy and glasnost, and should actively speak out against that which flouts human rights and neglects human interests.

The plenum turned the attention of the board of the Union of Journalists and the primary journalistic organizations to questions of perfecting the skills of journalists. It is necessary to educate mass information media workers in a spirit of high ideals, of communist morality, principle-mindedness and responsibility for the practical results of their work. Only in this case will the press be able to fulfill its duty to the party and the people.

L. Kirakosyan, deputy head, Armenian CP Central Committee department of propaganda and agitation, participated in the plenum.

13362

Armenian CP Wants Improvements in Ayastan Publishing Work

18300064b Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
25 Nov 87 p 1

[Excerpts, "In the Armenian CP Central Committee"]

[Text] Meetings of the Armenian CP Central Committee Buro and secretariat were held. Having examined the results of discussion of the resolutions of the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum in the gorkoms and raykoms of the Armenian Communist Party and the republic's primary party organizations, the Central Committee Buro noted that the discussion of the resolutions

of the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum had become a great political event in the life of the republic, an important stage in the implementation of the directives of the 27th Party Congress and the fundamental restructuring of the style and methods of party and state leadership.

The work of the "Ayastan" publishing house, of ArSSR Goskomizdat, in producing sociopolitical literature was examined. It was noted that the publishing house performs certain work in the production of the classics of Marxism-Leninism and the most important party and state documents.

However, many topical themes are not finding proper reflection in the literature being produced, and work to publish books devoted to the problems of restructuring and acceleration and of changing the style, form and methods of the work of party committees and organizations under contemporary conditions, is being implemented extremely slowly. There are serious shortcomings in thematic planning. The publishing house has not succeeded in fully excluding books which are not highly topical from its plans. Moreover, the quality of editing and translation of books and pamphlets is unsatisfactory. Proper attention is not being paid to the artistic formulation and printing fulfillment of mass political literature.

The Central Committee Buro, having turned the attention of ArSSR Goskomizdat and the "Ayastan" publishing house to the presence of serious shortcomings in their work, directed them to undertake decisive measures to eliminate said shortcomings. The practical production of literature on the urgent problems outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress, by the April 1985 and January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenums and by party and governmental resolutions, must be ensured. The selection, placement and education of cadres must be improved and cadre stagnation must be eliminated. Young, promising specialists with high professional training must be more actively recruited. The publishing house's structure must be perfected in striving for its full accordance with the tasks of the practical preparation of high quality books and pamphlets which take contemporary requirements into account.

Other issues of the republic's social and cultural life were also considered.

13362

Period of Collectivization, Impact of Perestroika Pondered

18300093 Moscow NOVYY MIR in Russian No 11,
Nov 87 pp 150-188—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Article by Igor Klyamkin: "Which Street Leads to the Temple?"]

[Excerpts] Was Ignat Sopronov a Trotskiyite?

What was meant by "a break with utopia" was the transition to the NEP. The Change of Landmarks advocates thought that the new economic policy would lead not only to the revival of economic life but also to the gradual degeneration of Bolshevik power. They hoped that economic concessions would inevitably be followed by political ones. And thereby the October Revolution would turn out to be the gates to the liberal temple. The Change of Landmarks people were mistaken, as were the representatives of other political tendencies who had cooperated with the Bolsheviks counting on what they believed were inevitable political concessions. Among those who were mistaken, in particular, were the former Mensheviks who wanted for Russia not Western liberalism (without Western philistinism), like the "Landmarkers" of all periods, but socialism, which alone was capable of curing people of philistinism and all other bourgeois ills, but which was supposed to grow out of capitalism and parliamentary liberalism and come after them, and not instead of them.

All of those who looked at their country through European eyes, again and again trying to fit on it the suit that had been cut by Western history, were mistaken.

Through these eyes the NEP looked like a street that, albeit distinctive, was familiar in some respects: all the European revolutions had in one way or another ended with the satisfaction of the peasants' economic demands. As for collectivization, it could only seem an adventure, a complete break with all historical experience and the laws derived from it. According to those laws it came out that an uprising by Soviet peasants was inevitable. It was anticipated, and everyone who considered himself a "democrat" prepared for it.

Most likely, the time has come to take a look at that time, too.

We know very little about it, much less than about more remote times.

We know—it is written in the textbooks—that heavy ideological (and not just ideological) battles were waged on our "street" during that period of a critical turning point, that there were victors and vanquished in those battles, and that monuments were built to the former, and not even grave markers have always been left for the latter, while only their names remain, with their most "renegade" statements engraved on the victors' pedestals for the edification of their descendants.

All the rest has been "expunged."

But we have also been able to find out that the victors were not saints, either, that they chopped a great deal of wood in building our "street," and that what they built, although it was suitable in its time for life and provided the forces to defeat the most powerful enemies, now must be restructured. That street really has not yet led to the temple, but to move forward it is necessary to know a little more. Before "striking it out," it is necessary to figure out, all the same, whether it was possible to circumvent that street. Were there other designs for "street building," and if there were, who rejected them and why, and how should one regard those designs?

In 1930 a book titled "Bolshevism in an Impasse," written by Karl Kautsky, the esteemed elder of European Social Democracy, came out in Berlin. Along with it under the same cover was a large article by Fedor Dan, leader of the Menshevik organization abroad, titled "The Problems of Liquidation" (of Bolshevism). And now, reading today their extensive discussions of "what must be done" by the Social Democrats in the event of a victorious peasant uprising in Soviet Russia (that was the actual title, borrowed from Chernyshevskiy, of one chapter in Kautsky's book, one cannot escape the feeling: they are writing about collectivization and its possible consequences, i.e., about that which had never happened anywhere, while they are concerned most of all with finding suitable analogies from French history.

Kautsky seeks the prototype of Stalin in it and settles on Napoleon. Of course, the author makes the qualification that they are not similar in all respects and in some respects are dissimilar: however you look at it, the prototype wore an emperor's crown. But that, so to speak, is an isolated detail. The main thing is that in both cases there is a regime of personal dictatorship and no democracy, and no political liberties. That is, in both cases you have a counterrevolution. Collectivization is its last act in Russia, taking away the land from the peasants that they won during the revolution. And therefore a peasant uprising is more than likely, and it should turn into a new people's revolution, which will sweep away the "Stalinist dictatorship."

And what will replace it? What will replace it is what was begun but not carried through to its conclusion in February 1917: universal suffrage, a Constituent Assembly, a parliamentary republic. Kautsky explained that the program he proposed was advantageous to everyone: the worker, the peasant and the member of the intelligentsia. People understood this in the West, so they would understand it in Russia, as well. They should understand it. It was no use for the Soviet worker to cling to his illusory privileges in relation to the peasant: democracy would give him incomparably more, and only it could lead him to "genuine" and "free" socialism, and

not to "state slavery." And for all these reasons the Russian Social Democrats, i.e., the Mensheviks, should be prepared to lead the democratic revolution in their homeland.

Fedor Dan knew his country better and understood: using that design you would build nothing in Russia in 1930; there, the radiant temple drawn by Kautsky from Western reality seemed like a gloomy prison, if not worse. After all, the Soviet worker had not yet forgotten, Dan notes, that the White Guards had called him to fight under the banners of democracy; after all, the slogan of the Constituent Assembly and parliamentary republic had been used during the years of the Civil War to cover an utterly undemocratic counterrevolution; after all, in 1918 the Mensheviks had been compelled even to withdraw that slogan, although it fully accorded with their political convictions. After all, the fate of the Constituent Assembly had already shown how little concerned the peasants were with everything pertaining to the state system: they were interested in the landowners' land, and not political freedom. After all, "the fervent and thoughtless policy of the Bolshevik dictatorship still finds in the working class and, especially, among young workers tens if not hundreds of thousands of selfless people to carry it out, people who are ready for self-sacrifice, people who fanatically believe that by not only torturing others but torturing themselves they will lead humankind to socialist liberation." After all, a Russian woman student who left Soviet Russia writes in a German newspaper that she is resolutely opposed to communism, that she was not admitted to a Soviet higher school because of her "bourgeois origin," but she remembers "with envy" Soviet young people "who forget all the troubles of the present day in dreams of the happy communist future," young people "who have a goal, who have an ideal to the service of which they give all their energies." How unlike them are the internally devastated and ideologically vacuous German university students.

Dan calls on "our much-esteemed teacher" to return to the sinful land. He takes the liberty of reminding his highly learned opponent that Russia is not France, but Russia. How can Stalin be compared to Napoleon? Bonaparte headed a party of order which, having destroyed political liberties, at the same time legislatively codified the revolutionary gains of the peasants and the interests of bourgeois ownership in general. But Stalin is doing just the opposite! Instead of reconciliation with the peasantry, he "is entering into the most acute conflict with it; instead of affirming ownership—he is returning to the most flagrant, almost 'war-communist' infringement of it; instead of order—he is stirring up the entire country and introducing uncertainty, alarm, excitement and chaos into all relations."

Can all that be similar to Napoleonic France?

It seems that Dan understands the unusual nature of events taking place in Russia and their dissimilarity to anything the West had ever experienced. But no, even he

looks at his country as a second edition of European history, and even he cannot get by without French analogies. Stalin is not Bonaparte; he is more like a Robespierre (!) who has stayed too long in his historical place. The Bolsheviks—justice requires that they be acknowledged this service—have said the decisive word in the fight against the White restoration; without them it would have been impossible to overcome it, and in this regard they are similar to the Jacobins. But it was not the Jacobins with their terror who summed up the French Revolution, and it was not they who brought the country out of chaos into order, but Bonaparte. And although the Bolshevik dictatorship has lasted not two years but already 13 now, the results of the Revolution have not yet been summed up. And if collectivization leads to an uprising of the Soviet countryside, Russia will repeat France and a Russian Bonaparte will replace Stalin! He will return the land to the peasants, codify the right of ownership with appropriate laws, and they, the peasants, need nothing more; they want economic freedom and are indifferent to political freedom, and therefore under the boot of any Bonaparte they feel more than tolerably well, and they are even prepared to carry him in their arms.

Granted, Dan was not ecstatic over such an outcome, considering Bonapartism to be a counterrevolutionary regime, and he did not call for its establishment. And for the same reason he did not regard a peasant uprising with any enthusiasm, believing that it was necessary to find the way to a parliamentary, and not Bonapartistic rule of law.

I am not writing a history of the Menshevik emigration, and therefore do not intend to set forth in detail everything that Dan thought on this matter. What is important to me is that today's reader who reflects on the fate of our historical street be able to see clearly: everyone who opposed the Bolsheviks in the name of "democracy" could, at best, imagine them as useful janitors of history sweeping the old reactionary trash from the street and freeing a place for a new structure based on civilized European designs. They attached no significance to the fact that in Russia there was no foreman such as the Western bourgeoisie, that was capable of managing the construction in a liberal style, nor to the fact that its tasks had been assumed by the working class, which was inspired not by liberal but by socialist designs, nor to the fact that the vast majority of the street's inhabitants were peasants who only several decades ago had left serfdom and were not so much bourgeois or petit bourgeois as patriarchal and communal in their customs and spiritual makeup and, in any case, differed from French small farmers of the times of Napoleon Bonaparte.

They attached no significance to that but believed in the "law," which sooner or later would triumph. But it triumphed neither in 1905, nor in 1917, nor in 1930.

According to the "law," the response to collectivization should be a peasant uprising that would overthrow the Bolshevik regime. Therefore, it was expected even by

those who did not link their political plans with it, as Fedor Dan did. The uprising did not happen. Moreover, collectivization not only did not weaken, it strengthened the "Stalinist dictatorship."

In such cases, to speak of the inaccuracy of political calculations is to say nothing. Here it is appropriate to speak of a theoretical catastrophe: what was considered a universal "law" was declared outside the law in Soviet Russia, and the illegitimate kolkhoz turned out to be the law! In the trial of 1931 practically the main motif in all the speeches by the accused Mensheviks was: we didn't think that collectivization could end with a victory for the government and strengthen it; that was not supposed to happen, but it happened, and all our theoretical predictions were wrong.

But what happened in the late '20s and early '30s? Why did collectivization, which seemed senseless to many people, prove possible?

That, one may say, is the question of questions. Without answering it, we will not answer a great deal else.

Here, for example, in the magazine *NAUKA I ZHIZN* (No 4 1987), G. Popov, a specialist in management, relying on material in A. Bek's novel "Novoye naznacheniye" [The New Appointment], reflects on the Administrative System that was created in the prewar decade. It is a very interesting article; it is not surprising that it has attracted the attention of a wide public. The author does not simply write about the shortcomings of the administrative methods of management but reveals to us the internal mechanism of the whole System. We see that everything in it is logical and thought out, that every part, every screw has its special designation, that all its "subsystems" are well meshed and adjusted to one another, and that nothing in it is accidental, including such odious and sinister figures as Beria (the "subsystem of fear"), because fear and personal devotion are the two main principles, the two laws, the two foundations on which the whole System rests.

For the first time in history, in my opinion, G. Popov approached the Administrative System not as a critic of errors and abuses by individuals who stood at its head but as a special "object of investigation." The System had its accomplishments, and they were considerable, because within certain limits it was effective. It also had its serious breakdowns and failures, which became more frequent with the passage of time, because it was not well suited for a certain range of tasks. Abuses of power and arbitrariness are attributed to it, but at least they are not alien to it.

That relatively small article is a large step toward meeting our history, a jump from the childish adolescent "cross out/ write in" to the adult "understand." But one question is left unanswered in the article. More precisely, it is not even raised. And it seems to me that it is the most important.

The Administrative System is a system of management. It constitutes the upper stories of the social building. But even they are not hanging in mid-air; after all, below them there are other stories and even lower—the foundation, the base. What sort of foundation is it?

I think that the answer must be sought in the time of collectivization. Without it, it would have been impossible to complete the construction of the Administrative System, just as it would have been impossible to accomplish industrialization. That was when the selection of new administrators and executives and their broad influx into the System began: collectivization itself demanded them. Who was raised to the surface by that gigantic wave, and from what depths? Who filled the ranks of the sergeants and petty officers, the junior and senior officers of the administrative apparatus, and who replaced those who proved unfit for it?

I won't say that this is a new question. Albeit on the level of the "sergeants," it has nonetheless been raised. But it is often raised in an upside down fashion. And looking at matters upside down, you not only will not cover a lot, there is a lot you won't think of.

One after another, the "village" writers who in recent decades began the artistic cultivation of the fallow land of collectivization came to depict the type of the malicious enthusiast who was ready, in the name of the "common cause," for the most evil deeds. But why did it work out in such a way that these "devils" and "petty demons" often turned up on top and became the bosses of the industrious, strong and reliable muzhiks? Why was it the good-for-nothing, lazy and envious Ignat Sopronov (from Belov's "Kanuny" [Eves]) whom destiny favored, elevating him to the status of uyezd representative, representative of the regime to which he had rendered no more service than to his fellow villagers, which is to say, none at all? Why did the worst receive the right to command the best, and why did the best acknowledge their right to do so, albeit without enthusiasm, and submit to them?

The peasantry of 1928 could not answer this difficult question, and they left it to us as their will. And what about us? We, in order to make our work easier, are beginning to quietly turn it upside down. And having turned it upside down, we find that it now looks much more familiar: not **why** did Ignat Sopronov end up on top, but **who was to blame** for the fact that he did.

A seemingly insignificant change, but what a relief for the mind! All the actors in the historical drama are known and named, so choose the one you find most unpleasant and pass the descendant's righteous verdict!

Thus, someone recently labeled Ignashka Sopronov and all the other Ignashkas like him as Trotskiyites. They, of course, could not read Trotskiy or know what he called for and what he wanted; they could do their dark Ignashka's deeds in the countryside, known by the name

of "excesses," even after their ideological inspirer had been expelled from the country, but in spirit and deeds they were absolute ultra-leftist Trotskyites. Believe me: I did not invent this argument, and I am accurately conveying the author's idea, which he set forth in a book about Vasilii Belov. If I do not give his name, it is only because he, unfortunately, is no longer alive; the reason I remember and am analyzing his opinions about our history is that they—also unfortunately—are alive and have their supporters.

Various people act in history. Some understand its requirements better, others worse; some win out, others suffer defeat. But is it possible to understand anything about it—history—is it possible simply to talk seriously about history, without studying it and without looking into what its actors, including the "negative" ones, wanted and what they called for?

This also pertains to such a figure as Trotsky.

Among those who have been "crossed out" he, as we know, is the most "crossed out." That accorded with the political situation at the end of the 1920s: at that time Trotsky was the most powerful and influential among the opponents of the government policy. But in what way is he dangerous now? Why is it impossible to read even his prerevolutionary works without special permission? There is no good sense in this intensified protection, but there is a great deal of bad sense. What makes bad sense is fear before one's own history. Any forbidden fruits make bad sense. Incompleteness of information makes bad sense.

In the 1950s and 1960s the stenographic records were published of party congresses at which, as we know, Trotsky, among others, spoke. But so far not a single case has been registered in which the reading of these stenographic records turned the reader into a Trotskyite. On the other hand, what a lively interest in the past, what a thirst to understand it, they evoked in the young people of that time!

Just recently Mikhail Shatrov's play "Brestskiy mir" [The Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty] was published in NOVYY MIR. In it Trotsky appears for the first time as a character with the right to speak. We find out the details of his position, and we hear him defend it. One can argue about the extent to which this work is beyond reproach. But one thing is indisputable: what we are shown is not "the rout of Trotskyism" but a dialogue with him that is lively and filled with drama. We are shown history.

And what can be more important than that? The present-day reader knows very well who "routed" whom and when. But he wants something more. It is important to him to figure out for himself who was right and why. He wants a clear notion of the course of the ideological and

political struggle, and not just to know its outcome. He wants to hear the voices of all the authors and actors in the historical drama. So let us not prevent him but, if we can, help him.

Trotsky, of course, was an "ultra-leftist." But his ultra-leftism was quite different from Ignashka's. I will even risk saying that Ignat Sopronov was further left than Trotsky. But look what sort of thing happens! He was to the left of the "ultra-leftist," but he stood firmly on his feet, while the "ultra-leftist" chattered away uselessly. It was because of its ultra-leftism that Trotskyism was routed, but the further-left Ignashkas were destined to live a long life as masters of the situation and to turn into Ovechkin's Borzovs, who have been pressed but not entirely crowded out to this day.

But wherein, then, is the difference between the "ultra-leftist" Trotskyite and Ignashka? Isn't the author of the aforementioned book "Vasilii Belov" right when he says that Trotsky was characterized by an enthusiasm for administration and for issuing commands, and by a bureaucratic attitude toward the masses? He is right, of course; one can read about that in Lenin. But isn't Ignat Sopronov distinguished by the very same, scarcely attractive qualities? Yes, he has plenty of those qualities. So what is the difference, and why was Ignashka further left than the most leftist?

In order to better understand the situation, let us turn our attention to the strange discrepancy that strikes one in reading the book "Vasilii Belov"—or more precisely, the chapter about "Kanuny." The chapter examines the events of 1928, while all of Trotsky's statements that the author wants to use to prove the Trotskyism of Ignat Sopronov are taken from 1920! Why is this the case? Aren't there any "ultra-leftist" quotations from a later time? Of course there are: after all, the Trotsky-Zinov'ev "left deviation" occurred in the middle and not the beginning of the '20s. There are quotations, but they are "not to the point." The author, it seems, senses that—one must give him his due. And the fact that he seeks the sources of the future Ignashka "excesses" in 1920 and not, say, in 1925 is also not without perceptiveness. But what comes out as a result?

He cites, say, an extensive excerpt from Trotsky's speech at the Ninth Party Congress where he talked about the "militarization of labor," and he draws a "frightening" conclusion: that is what the Trotskyites were preparing for the Soviet people and the Soviet peasantry—they were preparing for them the fate of the indigenous population of South Africa, which is under the guardianship of the "White minority." But why is that the case? After all, that is untrue, and the untruth, even if it pertains to our enemies, has never yet served the righteous cause. The untruth lies not in the quotation itself but in something else that is more important. The quotation is accurate: what was, was. I can even add something. It was proposed, for example, to turn Russia into a "huge army of labor," and it was said that all

attention had to be shifted "to questions of labor discipline, to questions of labor armies," and that these armies, along with volunteer work days, must be regarded as "the implementation in various forms of socialist and communist labor," and that the main question on the agenda was "the militarization of the economy and the use of military units for economic purposes."

Just who proposed all this?

In the first three cases the words in quotation marks are taken from Lenin's works. In the fourth case—from the resolution of the Ninth Party Congress on the tasks of economic development, a congress which, as is known, also took place with the Lenin's participation, and he was acquainted beforehand with the aforementioned resolution.

There is nothing unexpected or strange in all this. Because in 1920 the desire to organize the economy on the army model was the norm, and not a deviation from it. Is it really necessary to recall that the economic policy of that time was called "war communism" and that the proposal to revoke it came at the time not from Lenin but from his opponents? If you want to say that even in that time Trotsky's enthusiasm for issuing commands and ruling by administrative fiat was excessive, you will be right and will find an authoritative ally in the person of Lenin. But what you mean is not that at all!

Let us go further. Was Trotsky an "ultra-leftist" in the period of the NEP, or more precisely—in the mid-1920s? Yes, he was. The words "left deviation" pertaining to the Trotsky-Zinovyev bloc accurately convey the essence of the matter. In what did the leftism of Trotsky and those who shared his views consist in that period? In the fact that they proposed to "take" the money necessary for industrialization from the peasant by raising the prices for industrial goods and sharply increasing taxes on the countryside, having in mind, moreover, not just the richer kulaks but also a substantial part of the middle peasants. But Trotskyite leftism had a clear boundry that it never crossed. That boundry was the NEP. The members of the opposition did not propose either to repeal it or to replace it with something else. Already abroad, Trotsky was extremely contemptuous of collectivization, believing that most of the kolkhozes ought to be broken up, since they were unprofitable.

When the author of the book "Vasily Belov" discusses the sinister role that the Ignashkas were destined to play in the Soviet countryside, he has in mind the period of collectivization and later times. But is it really so difficult to understand that in the post-NEP countryside the "excesses" committed by the Ignashkas were incomparably further to the left than anything that could be imagined during the NEP? That they are much more reminiscent of the methods of "war communism," and

that for that reason to classify Ignat Sopronov after the fact as a Trotskyite means to introduce a new dose of confusion into a history that is confused to start with?

Ignashka has no relation whatsoever to the "deviations" of the 1920s, because both the "leftists" (Trotskyites) and the "rightists" (Bukharinites) were for preserving the NEP and against mass collectivization. So if you suddenly discover in documents from the 1930s that people learned, from two adjectives—"rightist" and "leftist"—that were opposite in meaning, to make one adjective ("rightist-Trotskyite," i.e., "rightist-leftist"), do not look for any special resourcefulness or, conversely, lack of resourcefulness of the political mind in that. "Rightist-leftist" was not the verbal fruit of a sick imagination but an actual fact, because in relation to the political regime that was established and consolidated after collectivization, the former "leftists" became the "rightists." Because neither considered the socialism that was built in the 1930s to be socialism. They did not consider it socialism, because it did not accord with their ideas about the new society, and they had not yet thought their way to such a simple harmonizing of the ideal and reality as the verbal combination "real socialism." They did not consider it socialism, because they thought that only the industrially developed West had yet managed to create the appropriate preconditions for it, while they did not exist in backward, peasant Russia.

In many, very many, respects they differed from those who imagined socialism and the movement toward it in the spirit of Fedor Dan or Karl Kautsky—above all, by virtue of their hostility toward and impatience with liberalism in any form: everything that pertained to "parliamentarianism," "democracy," "liberty" and other terms from the Western political lexicon, they regarded at best as a verbal shell and at worst as the intrigues of the class enemy. But in the eyeglasses through which they regarded events in their country, one lens remained European. Through it, collectivization looked like the same adventure fraught with the potential for political catastrophe as it looked through the two lenses of Kautsky and Dan. But since the catastrophe did not occur, no members of the opposition, in contrast to Ignat Sopronov, were destined to become long-time residents of our national street.

The street was being built to the left of them. The former "leftists" and the former "rightists" turned out to be to the right.

But didn't the "leftists," even before that happened, look on the world through glasses with different lenses? And didn't one lens get in the other's way, dulling the vision and smudging the perspective?

Take Trotsky himself. In 1917 he joined the Bolsheviks, because he realized that the revolution in Russia, with its weak bourgeoisie, which was bound by a historical chain to the landlord who was hated by the peasants, could only be victorious if it was a proletarian revolution. But

he also believed, and in this regard was by no means alone, that the Russian Revolution, while accomplishing national tasks, should at the same time be the spark that would ignite the flame of world revolution, and that that, in turn, would help backward peasant Russia accomplish a task that it would not accomplish on its own—to build a developed socialist economy.

But in the mid-1920s Western capitalism began to stabilize. It became clear that in the near future it was impossible to expect the world revolution and, therefore, help in building socialism from the more developed countries, but what could be expected was economic and military pressure. Thus the main political and theoretical question became the question of “socialism in one country.” And that was the base on which the decisive ideological battles of the mid-1920s were fought.

The fundamental newness of the question is indicated by the following detail alone: in April 1924 Stalin had not yet decided to answer it with a categorical “yes.” But by December of the same year his tone had changed, and Stalin’s “yes” was unequivocal and adamant.

Trotsky and many with him answered with an equally unequivocal “no.”

“Socialism in one country,” he argued, was a “closed economy,” was “national restrictiveness.” You couldn’t fool history; from a backward country you couldn’t leap immediately into a socialist paradise. It was necessary to develop productive forces, and in order to do so it was necessary to join the world market and the international division of labor, to train specialists and workers, to travel abroad for that purpose and study there; it was necessary to judge the level of economic development not in terms of quantity, comparing it to prewar 1913, but in terms of quality, comparing it to the highest Western achievements. Yes, but the capitalist market, after all, could swallow and devour the weak Soviet economy! It could, who disputed it? But if one acted intelligently, there were chances of holding out, and what we needed was just to hold out, because all our hopes were in the European revolution. And what if it was not happening and would not happen for a long time yet, and if capitalism was stabilizing? It could not fail to happen. That would mean the death of all our theoretical notions. If capitalism was viable, if it was capable of developing its productive forces further, that meant that our ideas of imperialism were wrong, which meant that it would not lead to decay—which meant that we had arrived too early!

But what followed from that? That it would be necessary to go back?

There was no answer.

One eye saw Soviet Russia, and the other cast a side glance in the direction of Europe. The eyes diverged, the future was losing the clarity of its outlines, and its

contours were getting blurred. In order to describe movement toward it, more and more question marks and subjunctive-mood verbs were needed. But those marks and that mood are the least suitable for political programs.

Fine, Trotsky was asked, but how are we, all the same, to hold out? How can we prepare ourselves for possible intervention? Trotsky and his supporters answered: of course, we must begin industrialization. And the faster the better. We need accelerated industrialization (within the framework of the NEP). “Superindustrialization!” At whose expense? At the expense of the countryside. And if the countryside does not want to pay the bill? If it doesn’t give anything? And if we start to take it, won’t we destroy the entire economic mechanism of the NEP? After all, we depend on the kulaks’ grain! And if we raise the prices on industrial goods, won’t we drive away the poor who cannot pay, on whom we rely first and foremost? And the workers too—after all, they buy goods, too?! Raise wages? And with what money?

No, it did not add up. The main bet was staked not on our own but on others’ forces, on the European workers. Any other bet was declared to be “national restrictiveness.” But the “unrestrictedness” that was proposed in its place led to a national impasse. Trotsky did not guess either what was going on during his time on the Western “street,” or what needed to be done on his own.

Antonio Gramsci was right when he said that Trotskyism was “superficially national,” and that its Europeanism was no less superficial.

“Socialism in one country” was a slogan of survival, of self-preservation, of national defense. It was a slogan that made it possible to combine the idea of socialism with the idea of national independence and with a sense of national dignity that was deeply rooted in the people.

To our general misfortune, that combination was frequently carried out by methods that were deficient from not only the moral but the criminal standpoint. Granted, it also sometimes happened otherwise, especially in critical days and hours for the country: in a speech addressed to participants in a parade on Red Square on 7 November 1941, Stalin, calling for the defense of the socialist homeland, recalled the names of “our great forebears” and appealed to national patriotic traditions. However, the combination of the two ideas had begun long before that and was realized for the first time in Lenin’s slogan “The socialist fatherland is in danger!”

But something else also happened. It happened—and quite frequently—that in places where the two ideas were joined everything rumbled and gnashed intolerably, and to this day those sounds, reaching our ear, evoke a feeling of nightmare and echo with shame and pain.

Read through the stenographic accounts of the trials of the second half of the 1930s (they were once published, although I shall not attempt, of course, to judge their completeness and reliability), and as you read note how Vyshinskiy insistently and methodically keeps striking the same point, how important it is to him to prove that the accused—Bukharin himself, or someone else—is not simply an opponent of the government's course and the party's policy, but that he is unfailingly linked to the German, Japanese or some other foreign intelligence service. An enemy of socialism, and an enemy of the Soviet regime—that was not enough. An enemy of the people—that, too, was insufficient. Only the word "spy," which touched the national feeling, ensured the people's justification of any accusation and verdict. Remember that even Beria turned out to be a "British spy"!

You read and remember all that, and you shiver. Especially since you yourself once believed that foreign intelligence agents might be present for many years at the helm of state. Yes, the word "repentance" is fully appropriate. But before repenting, one still would like to understand: why did we believe that? And of what should we repent? Of the fact that we are we? But we were not born 50 years ago, and not even 70. At what point does one begin counting sins? With Muscovite Rus? With Peterburg Rus? Or with the Soviet 1930s?

I know, and have heard from many people: it was wrong; the NEP should not have been curtailed; that was a gigantic mistake for which we are paying to this day. To speak otherwise about that time today is risky: excommunication from progress will not take long, just as being classified among the ranks of the defenders of administrative antiquity will not. And therefore, once again: would it have been possible to preserve the NEP?

If you answer "yes," you will have to transfer yourself to that time and tell how you would solve the problems that arose in the second half of the 1920s following the conclusion of the restorative period.

You will have to consider that industry could not satisfy the ever-growing peasant demand for its products. Since the money earned for grain and other agricultural products was not matched by goods, the sale of grain was losing its meaning, and people started withholding grain. And those who first of all began holding back grain were those who had more money and grain, that is, the most prosperous strata of the countryside. But since the share of grain provided by those strata to the market was extremely substantial, the grain-procurement difficulties that the state encountered proved to be extremely significant. In other words, the economic mechanism had worked loose and was misfiring. It was already necessary to resort to stepped-up administrative regulation of that mechanism in the course of grain procurements, which threatened to destroy it conclusively and was creating a tense atmosphere in the countryside. In order to increase the amount of industrial goods, it was necessary to technically reequip enterprises, and to do so new ones

had to be built to manufacture the new machinery and provide metal for it. But the NEP mechanism was not producing the money for industrialization. The profits received from industry were meager compared to the grandiose scale of its tasks. In order to increase profits, prices could have been raised, as the "leftists" proposed, but it was impossible to raise prices; to the contrary, they were constantly being lowered in order not to give advantages to the prosperous groups of the population and not to spoil relations with the urban and rural majority, which could not afford high prices. But for that same reason the Bukharin group's proposals to raise grain prices, which until then had also been lowered, were also rejected.

Tell how you would untangle that whole ball of problems, which thread you would grasp. And do not forget, either, that you are responsible for the country's defense capability, and that you have to be concerned with creating the most modern military hardware, which requires huge outlays and will not provide any income in return. And do not try to make your task easier with arguments of the sort that it is necessary still to try to figure out from whom the war threat was coming at that time, whether it was all that great, and whether some people were not using references to it to cover up their own dark intentions and deeds. Even if there is not an immediate threat, not a single statesman is in his right mind can wait for it to arise in order to only then undertake the creation of a military industry.

Not from a single political figure of that time who stood on the NEP platform have I found persuasive answers to the questions, "how?" and "at whose expense?" that kept coming up at the time. If you believe, as some of those figures did, that industrialization would have proceeded more successfully without the unprecedented destruction of proportions between industry and agriculture, and between heavy and light industry, try to prove it. But even if you don't find a solution in the past and think one up with hindsight, all the same, don't hide it. It is very important for the understanding of our history.

But if we have nothing to say, then let us master ourselves and not be ashamed to say: it was the strongest who were victorious then, and no one besides them could have been victorious, because at that time there was no other "design for the buildup" of our street that was capable of competing with collectivization. To admit that is by no means to condemn those who thought otherwise at the time. Moreover: the position of many of them looks more attractive today than the position of the victors. The point is only that the correlation of historical forces favored the latter and not the former. And nothing else. But knowing the subsequent fate of our peasantry and agriculture, it is difficult to reconcile oneself even to that. Therefore, the hand that is obedient to reason educes an affirmative answer, but the heart still agonizes and agonizes over the unanswered question: but

maybe everything could have been different? Sober reason is implacable: no, it couldn't have been. But how one wishes for it to be wrong!

Yes, everything was decided by the correlation of forces. But why was it such, and not otherwise? Why did the majority of the peasants reconcile themselves to collectivization, which placed the foundation under the building of the Administrative System? Why did they overturn all the forecasts and laws according to which everything was supposed to end with the downfall of the Soviet regime? Why?

Let us recall the scene of the dispossession of a kulak in Andrey Platonov's just recently published "Kotlovan" [The Foundation Pit]. Let us recall the eerie, totally unstoppable dance performed by the village that has just sent its former fellow villagers floating down the river to nowhere. Eerie, because we know what happened afterward. A dance at one's own funeral! But that is what happened. And that is an answer to the question that interests us. Most of the peasants reconciled themselves to collectivization because they saw the kulak as their enemy. Because they had not had time to become "bourgeoisified," were not ready for a competitive struggle in the market, and had feared its destructive spontaneous force since prerevolutionary times. Because they had just barely emerged—or, more precisely, were only in the process of emerging from a patriarchal and small-scale economic system. Because the idea of collectivization in some way reminded them of the communal collectivity with which they were well familiar and which was close to them.

One could also say the opposite: if the peasant had preferred collectivization to the kulak, if he had been prepared to classify and had often classified the strong middle peasant as a kulak, if he had given his blessing to the removal from the village of those who were most prosperous and adapted to a free market economy, the most "bourgeois" part of the population, then he, the peasant, was by and large prebourgeois. That is what overturned all the forecasts and refuted all the "laws" according to which collectivization was supposed to lead to a political catastrophe!

And yet there were, after all, old books in which one could read that the path from the peasant commune to socialism was not such an anomaly but a perfectly natural thing, something which was more understandable to the patriarchal peasant than to the "bourgeoisified" one. That can be read in Chernyshevskiy. Marx, answering the questions of Vera Zasulich, reflected and wrote a lot about it. Granted, both Chernyshevskiy and Marx saw socialist collective agriculture in a somewhat different light than what came about in our country in the 1930s. But right now I am not talking about that, but about the fact that the predisposition of the prebourgeois peasant toward collective agriculture was greater than that of the bourgeois and petit bourgeois peasant.

The majority of Russian peasants were unlike European ones. Therefore, they did not behave in a European way. And if they had been like them? Then no activists and no agents would have made them do what Andrey Platonov told us about. Then something similar to Fedor Dan's prediction would have come about: the bourgeois and petit bourgeois countryside would have put forward its own military dictator, a Russian Bonaparte. And there would have been a new all-Russian slaughter, because the bourgeois countryside could exist only with a bourgeois city, and the Soviet worker had already begun to forget about the time in which he had been hired to work for the capitalist.

I cannot imagine any sort of third outcome of the struggle of that time. Nor, correspondingly, a way out of the NEP. You can? Very well. That means there is something to discuss and something to debate. And that is not all that little.

It remains to figure out Ignashka. Why were people of that sort so frequently cast up to the surface?

Sometimes it is written: what could be done? It often happens that not the best people are tools of historical necessity. That resembles an answer, but it is not an answer. Why, then, is historical necessity so indiscriminating in its choice of servants?

In order not to get lost in a forest of philosophical abstractions, we had better return to the countryside at the end of the 1920s, which was experiencing and patiently enduring Ignashka's rule.

It is said that there exists a "rural cosmos." People also speak of a "peasant universe." I do not want to dispute these expressions. I will allow that they make a certain sense. But no matter how great and significant the peasant universe might be, it extends only to the village outskirts, and beyond that it ends. In order for this "universe" to become part of the country, it has to be linked in some way with other such "universes" and with the city, as well. They may be joined either by the market or by state employees, or by both together. After collectivization took place, the market fell away, and the state employees remained, and the need for them was considerable. Who could undertake that work, even if one supposes that everyone would have been taken?

Try to imagine that a strong and industrious middle muzhik, all of whose thoughts are about his farm, his land and livestock, thoughts without which he would no longer be himself, agreed to take Ignashka's place. Could you imagine it? I cannot. Here, on the land, everything is familiar and understandable to him; here he is a proprietor and knows what depends on him and what does not; here you have your own responsibility for your job: if you do it well, there is plenty in the home, your children are clothed and fed, and your fellow villagers respect you; if you don't, it's just the opposite.

And as for the "common cause" that occupies Ignashka, he understands very little. The relations of the patriarchal or semipatriarchal peasant with the word "common," if it pertains to something beyond the village outskirts, are complicated. It is hard to explain to him that there can be laws in life that operate behind people's backs, as it were, regardless of what they themselves think and feel. Therefore, when someone tells him about the "common cause" or some other "common," he can only wave his hand, like Kuzma Barakhvostov from that same Vasiliy Belov's "Bukhtiny vologodskiy" [The Bukhtins of Vologda]. Barakhvostov, a good stove repairman, ends up in the other world and sees the most absurd thing he could imagine. People are sitting and endlessly thinking, and what they are thinking about is incomprehensible: "First come the simple thoughts. After that, with the development of the head, begin thoughts about those thoughts, and then general thoughts. From all the general thoughts comes one that is the most general, the absolute supreme. From it, you begin everything all over from the beginning, in the same direction."

It is incomprehensible to the normal stove repairman Kuzma Barakhvostov why it is that in people's heads that sort of thing happens and moves back and forth: from "the most universal meaning to the universal, from the universal to the general." Setting up a stove, taking a smoking break, cutting wood—that is clear, there there is living meaning and pleasure. But the "general-universal" That, most likely, is how the other world differs from this one.

In order for Kuzma to see meaning in the senselessness, he must become a producer selling his goods in the market, which will explain to him in a popular fashion that there are laws that do not depend on him, Kuzma. Then, left to his own devices, he will sense that for his tranquility and certainty he also needs laws written on paper, laws which also do not depend on Kuzma and are the same for everyone, i.e., "general-universal."

But for the time being the "common" or "general" is only the "common cause" before which you have nothing but duties and no rights, so that even the poorest of the poor, even if he does get inspired by it and respond with the ardent feeling we call enthusiasm, or in a cooler and more moderate, but fairly stable fashion, it will not be for long: he will figure what is what and start looking for "his own business."

And so it is with Kuzma Barakhvostov: he served at first as a kolkhoz hauler, hauled silage to the livestock section where his wife Virineya was among the leading milkmaids. They spent days and nights together with 16 cows with calves and did everything for them that they could, and as a reward Virineya received a note of commendation in a wall newspaper and trips to meetings, and together with Kuzma—a pile of workdays, "empty" ones, of course, and Kuzma had to plane down and hang

a little shelf on the wall so his wife would have somewhere to put her teeth when the bread ran out and she got in a querulous mood on that account, and Kuzma himself had to apply to be a stove repairman, that is, to find himself work that would be needed by his fellow villagers and provide him, Kuzma, with a support in life and a provide life itself with some justification.

Ignashka Sopronov may take up the "common cause" because he has no business of his own. There is nothing to attach him to the land or to his fellow villagers, who do not even consider him a muzhik. He is rejected by his own milieu, and he looks for a way to free himself from it entirely, and that is where the Administrative System finds him; it needs precisely such people, who depend only on it and feel no dependence on those who they stand above. The System's watchword is "the common cause," and it is good if you serve it with faith in its righteousness, but if there are no holy servants, Ignashki will do, just so he catches on that the "common cause" does not like people to reason about it but likes it when they perform without reasoning, and even more than that, likes the devotion of every lower servant to the one higher.

The Administrative System and Ignashka need one another, and they will find one another.

The muzhiks, of course, do not guess that the world where Sopronov has landed lives its own special life, unlike ordinary life. What they see is not the System but Ignashka, and looking at him, they judge not the System (the regime), but how Ignashka serves it.

But if they had known and could have understood a little more, their knowledge would in no way have helped them. It could not change anything. If they themselves had ended up in the Administrative System, they would have had to either accept its terms or get out of it while the getting was good. And it cannot be said that it was only the Ignashkas who ended up in it and stayed on in it; it also found among those same peasants people of a different magnitude, elevated them and put them at the head of economic branches and construction projects, armies and navies, and under their leadership victories were won that would do honor to the greatest military commanders of all times and peoples. But first and foremost the System demanded and gave rise to conscientious executors of orders who were capable of carrying out instructions from above unquestioningly and at any cost, without hesitating in the face of arbitrariness and lawlessness. And those people reconciled themselves to everything. Whether they wanted it or not, the peasants of 1928 and many subsequent years had to tolerate Ignashka's rule over them, because it signified none other than the "general order," to which they had nothing else to oppose, since they knew no other tie between the peasant and the nonpeasant island "universes."

And until they did know it, they would tolerate Ignashka's arbitrary rule without losing faith in the truth of the regime, and they saw the truth of the regime in the fact that there, at the very top, was something on which everything was held and kept from falling apart, "one most general, most supreme thought," but not a thought by itself, but a thought in the head of a living person, who alone thought for everyone and answered for everyone, and who, if he knew, would certainly have long ago driven away all the good-for-nothing Ignashkas.

You say that words about the "most supreme thought" also seem alien, like something from the other world, to Kuzma Barakhvostov. In reply to that objection, I can remind you that Kuzma went to the other world once his peasantry was already behind him, although he could become a city dweller only through his children, but not himself.

While a peasant remains a peasant, the thought of a "supreme thought" cannot become senseless. And that means that the "general-universal" sits in his head, and it does so firmly and solidly, but it absolutely must be personified: inaccessible, it must be accessible to contemplation in portraits, must be the writer of articles that set forth the most important, "most supreme" thoughts, and must be a speaker on the radio in the most important moments with the most important words: it is the living embodiment of the law and higher justice.

So long as the peasant thinks that way, so long as all talk about a different, more abstract and impersonal "general-universal" is incomprehensible and uninteresting to him, so long as, in his mind, everything flows from the highest point of the pyramid and everything flows together to it, so long as the incessant circulation from many "simple thoughts" to the one supreme thought and back seems to him to be a living, albeit invisible reality and not otherworldly delirium, so long as all of this has not been displaced from his mind to another world, so long as all this is life and not the vague recollection of something that has long ago left it—until then the Administrative System has a dependable foundation, until then all the Ignashkas on which the System rests will be perceived as alien to it, people who have crept into it accidentally and who do their dark deeds under the guise of the common cause only because it is not yet known there, at the very top. Until then no trials are frightening to the System: the peasant will go to fight if it is necessary, and he will fight like no one else and overcome enemies who have never been conquered by anyone.

So what are we to do now—justify everything and once again compose hymns of praise? And are the innocent victims no longer victims? And the lies and the cynicism—was all that necessary? And all that, did all that come from the people, and is it therefore not subject to judgment? And is there nothing to repent—was everything correct, everything normal?

These are questions you cannot brush aside.

Two years ago I read in *VOPROSY LITERATURY* (No 6, 1985) an interesting article by L. Vilchek titled "Down the Stream of Village Prose," in which the author reflects about those same things and approximately in the same vein as I do. The author argues that collectivization was inevitable, and that two different economies could not peacefully coexist for long. The truth, writes L. Vilchek, was not only on the side of the rural muzhiks who experienced all the burdens and consequences of that breaking up, but also on the side of the state: "its name was necessity." There are always two truths: the truth of Peter and the truth of Yevgeniy from Pushkin's "Bronze Horseman", and the one cannot triumph over the other, "the resolution of the conflict between the two truths lies through tragedy."

At first glance this seems logical and persuasive. Nonetheless, it is wrong. Absolutely wrong!

It is impossible, intolerable to equate the two truths. If the equation is true, it means the end of everything. Then everything is nothing, and all is for naught.

One turns the handle of the historical meat grinder, and Necessity itself, his majesty the Interest of the State, guides his hand. He has his own truth. The other is inside the meat grinder; he is ground through it, and there is no place to hide from his cries; you can, at the most, only soothe your conscience with the consoling words: "Be patient, my dear Yevgeniy, you can do nothing, but we know that you have your own truth!"? Is it possible for these words to be uttered, to be spoken out loud?

No, two truths are an untruth.

Peter is the tool of necessity, and Yevgeniy is his victim. Peter is great, and Yevgeniy is small. But the truth is on the side of Yevgeniy, on the side of the one who suffers. And on no one else's! Because otherwise Yevgeniy's truth is the truth of the manure of history, of cannon fodder, and nothing more.

It is good that we are beginning to turn toward history and want to understand it and not just to "strike out" events that we do not like and the names of the people who are to blame for them. We are just beginning, and there is already a danger: the danger of overdoing it! Otherwise understanding imperceptibly turns into justification, into rehabilitation. As long as we are convinced that there were two equal truths, we have one foot in the past and have not left it, and nothing will lead forward to overcoming it.

Therefore, as far as the Truth is concerned, let us admit it only for the millions of nameless Yevgeniys. Therein lies the only hope that humanity will want to and be able to part with the meat grinder used as a tool of progress. Therein lies the only guarantee that, in answering the

question, "why?" we will not forget the question, "who is to blame?" and will be able to distinguish tragic blame from criminal blame and see where the former turns into the latter.

To overcome the meat grinder without "striking it out" from the past but fully recognizing its role and its incompatibility with the Truth—that means to repent. Only let us not give ourselves over very long to the pleasant contemplation of our own purity but take up the mundane business of cleaning our street and building it up anew.

In Place of a Conclusion, or In Place of a Beginning

What we are presently experiencing and designating by the word "restructuring" is unlike anything in our past. So far, it seems, we are still under the hypnosis of the familiarity of the words we have long known: "introducing the accomplishments of the scientific and technological revolution," "improving technology," "carrying out modernization." It doesn't sound all that "revolutionary," and hardly anyone has gotten used to the thought that nothing of the sort has actually ever happened on our national street.

The shifting of industry to a new technological basis has always been a difficult job in Russia. At the beginning of the last century the country had decent factories, and the products of many of them enjoyed recognition in the world market. But in the middle of the century Russia found itself thrown far back, as the Crimean War showed. In a half century the West had managed to carry out an industrial revolution. It was necessary to set out in pursuit, to do away with serfdom, and to give at least some space to economic initiative, but—it was not until after three revolutions, in the '30s of our century, that it was possible to complete the industrialization of the country.

But what needs to be done now is incomparable with what was finished before the war. I have in mind not even the fundamental newness of up-to-date technology but, above all, the scale and methods of the current "second industrialization."

In the 1930s the task came down to creating several industrial branches capable of ensuring the country's defense capability and satisfying the population's most elementary needs. Life has shown that such a task could be accomplished by administrative methods, by carrying the centralization and politicization of economic management to their limit. It was possible to accomplish by having a gigantic (three-fourths of the population!) peasant home front on which, as the result of collectivization, it was possible to shift a substantial part of the expenses necessary for industrialization. It could be accomplished by using not very skilled and relatively undemanding workers, most of whom were yesterday's peasants and who were tolerant of disciplinary pressure. It could be

accomplished by having available a special variety of work force—one that was large and almost unpaid and could be easily transferred to any region of the country, to any point of urgency.

Today it is impossible to use anything from that long-ago experience. Anything!

Supercentralization will no longer help; peasant Rus has become urban; there are no special detachments of unfree but mobile manpower; and there is no new employee, and one cannot be rapidly trained, no matter how we accelerate.

Today, 70 years after the October Revolution, we must clearly recognize that we are going through an absolutely new stage not just in Soviet but in national and world history.

Nonetheless, the only way to tomorrow is from today and yesterday. By overcoming them, not casting them aside. To say, "the street does not lead to the temple" means to strike it out without writing anything in its place. On what rocket and from what point should we start now in order to make our way to the temple for sure?

People talk about the new thinking. What is it? It is thinking in the form of dialogue. Are we prepared for it? Or put it this way: did the past two decades, in which we turned to the traditions and sources of our national culture, prepare us for it?

In some respects, yes, but for the most part, no.

The chief result of our going to the sources is the following: prerevolutionary spiritual culture has entered the public consciousness through its various voices, and a great deal that had been stricken out has been restored and received the rights of citizenship and found ardent followers. But in the process, thinking has not changed; it remains the old, monologic thinking! Of course, there cannot be any dialogue if there is no one to participate in it, if everyone agrees with each other and those who disagree remain silent because they are not allowed to speak. But if the participants have been chosen and all have received the right to speak and have even sat down to the same round or nonround table, but in doing so each hears only himself, having made up his mind in advance that the others have nothing to say, what sort of dialogue can there be?! There will be many monologues, each of which claims to offer the final truth and to be turned into some new monologic "ism."

After all, one bold person turned up, started to summon others to his ideological banner, and unfurled the flag for all to see; on that banner was written—"Dostoyevskiy-ism"! I did not make this up: such a thing happened in one of the recent countless books about the great writer.

So, I would formulate the the general result of turning to prerevolutionary history as follows: monologue has been replaced by a polyphony of soloists and choral groups that do not hear one another. That is a step forward, but not such a significant one; what's more, it is not without its losses.

The situation is even worse with post-October history. Here everything is still monologic in the most primitive sense, the voices of the participants are inaudible. Except for the victors, all have been deprived of the right to speak.

To restore the history of the country's spiritual culture as an intensely dramatic dialogue among different traditions and trends, as the history of searches and errors, struggle and triumph, and not just "routs," means to restructure attitudes, and that means thinking in a new way. That is because we think about the past the same way we think about the present, and vice-versa: we regard the present day the way we regard history. If the new is reduced exclusively to selecting some ideological tradition in history and replacing all the others with it, that will manifest itself in relation to today's affairs. And that will be the old thinking in a new key.

Why is monologue bad? Because reality itself is polyphonic; various people and groups of people want to speak out about their interests, which do not always coincide, and everyone must be allowed to speak in order to find out whose voice is stronger and purer, who can be made a soloist who will not suppress the other voices but set the tone for the whole chorus. If you simply want to replace one monologue with another, the suspicion arises that reality does not exist for you: after all, you still must prove that one of its many voices, the one that you have detected and singled out among all the rest, is the main one, and that the content of life is expressed more fully and profoundly in it than in all the rest. Reality, to speak in a scholarly fashion, has its law of development, which makes its own way independently of your and my deferences and preferences, and you do not want to know anything about it. That means that you have the same sort of relations with the "general-universal" as Kuzma Barakhvostov.

The loss of a notion of the social law—that, perhaps, is our greatest spiritual loss, without the recovery of which it is difficult to conceive the new thinking.

What has happened is, at first glance, the direct opposite of what should have happened. After all, all the booklets that we have read since childhood and all our "official" ideology are based on the notion that there are laws of social development that are independent of people's will and consciousness. That is one of the basic ideas of the revolutionary democrats, one which they borrowed from Hegel and used in their own way. That is the basic idea of Marxism. And here that idea remains alien to us, and we all have not gotten so far beyond Kuzma Barakhvostov.

Because it is as though the society in which we have lived was not subject to any laws. Of course, in the textbooks the laws were present where they were supposed to be. When at the beginning of the 1950s some participants in an all-union economic discussion thought their way for a second time to an idea that was popular in the 1920s, according to which there could not be any laws under socialism that operated independently of people's will and consciousness, Stalin firmly objected: No, there are laws. How could there be no laws? But in time it started to become clear that the laws Stalin had in mind were seemingly not laws at all, since they did not talk about what existed and why it was that way and no other, but more about what should be. It should be not the way it was under capitalism, but just the opposite.

If the law of capitalism was the derivation of surplus value, which went into the pockets of the bourgeoisie, the law of socialism was the satisfaction of people's requirements. If there were anarchy and crises under capitalism, under socialism there was planning and proportionality. And what if the requirements were not being satisfied very well, and if all was not well with respect to proportionality? That meant that people were not treating the law with the proper respect and had not understood in time what it demanded of us.

It turned out that at one pole were the "laws" (the "essence," the "nature") of socialism, according to which everything was supposed to take place in such and such a way, while at the other pole were the people who were servants of the law, who failed to understand what the law-master demanded of them and for that reason made "mistakes." But what sort of laws were those, that they were constantly being violated? One mistake is a mistake. A second mistake in the same place is already suspicious. But if a whole chain of "mistakes" are made in relation to the law, it is permissible to ask: why is the law, although it is constantly being violated, still a law, while the "mistakes," which are constantly being repeated, violations of the law?

I am leading up to the idea that the new thinking signifies a genuinely revolutionary break. We have lived 70 years and have experienced many joyous and sad events, and even the untrained eye will detect a certain repetitiveness in them. In short, we have seen and know enough of ourselves to understand: real socialism is not just the capitalism turned around, in which certain of its own special regularities have managed to manifest themselves. Fairly recently it was stated from a high rostrum: we still hardly know the society in which we live! And we do not know it primarily because we do not study and attempt to elucidate the real laws to which it is subject. And we do not try to elucidate and study them because we once decided that we knew these laws once and for all. Isn't it time to take a more serious attitude toward our "mistakes" and learn to see them not only as deviations from regularities but the manifestation of them? Isn't it time to free ourselves from all ideological cunning?

And until we have freed ourselves, we will dissolve the question, "why?" without residue in the question, "who is to blame?"

Restructuring has begun, but the substitution of one question for another, by the way, continues. Granted, now it is done taking the spirit of restructuring itself into account.

Recently I read a vivid laudatory public-affairs article about the law of value. The author recalls all the "mistakes" connected with the violation of that law, and he tells how it, the law, has exacted revenge on those who have transgressed it: after all, it is a real law and does not forgive such things. There were deviations from it in the period of "war communism," and it called attention to itself and had to be reckoned with. There were deviations in the 1930s, and it once again called attention to itself at the beginning of the 1950s, and people once again apologized and corrected their ways. There were deviations at the end of the 1950s, and it once again called attention to itself, and people had to seek its forgiveness in the mid-1960s. Once again, it did not go easy for us—but here, we have what we have. And how good it was, how efficiently things went during those relatively short intervals of time in which we opened the roadblocks to the law!

But if our history goes in such cycles, if economic and administrative methods of management periodically displace one another, shouldn't we, perhaps, take a closer look at these repeating cycles? Can it be that we face a genuinely incessant struggle between truth and error, the law and its violators?

To know the real laws of the development of real socialism—that is what is more needed and more important than anything now.

This new thinking will be simultaneously the rebirth and the enrichment of the Marxist tradition. Then, perhaps, having experienced the enthusiasm of the opponents of Belinskiy and Chernyshevskiy, we will again remember our revolutionary democrats and read them with interest and without prejudice. Then, perhaps, the "dark" Hegel will once again become necessary.

I by no means want to say that first we must study and then restructure. Restructuring began on time, even late. It is proceeding with difficulty. Arguments have already started about what is more important: criticizing the conservatives or positive experience? I would answer as follows: what is most important right now is the critical analysis of the whole experience of restructuring. Its progress must also be regarded in the spirit of restructuring; here, too, the new thinking is needed.

If someone has already achieved something, it is necessary not only to promptly prepare the award papers and "disseminate the experience," but first of all to answer the question, "why?" After all, success in one sector will

by no means invariably prove to be the result of the changes that are taking place in the country's economic mechanism. After all, there were also individual successes during the time of stagnation. But now we also must no longer reduce failures to the familiar, "who is to blame?" If we assign this question the modest place it deserves and make it a derivative of, "why?" it will be possible to say that an important step has been taken from the old thinking to the new.

But any "why?" rests on the objective laws of the development of society. If we do not know them or know them poorly, that will hinder us. So the hindrance must be removed. So the in-depth study of the laws of real socialism is not a subsidiary, secondary, speculative task that diverts us from the living business of restructuring but a task of restructuring itself.

The deeper it goes, the more palpably it will affect the interests of various groups of people, and not just the bureaucrat-apparatchiks: if they were by themselves, if they did not rely on the attitudes and apprehensions of certain strata of the population, there would be no particular problems. The struggle is being waged not just between the bureaucrats and the nonbureaucrats but between the social groups on which both the former and the latter rely, respectively. And the main question is this: who will be able to carry with him the mass forces that genuinely have a stake in restructuring and in scientific, technological and cultural progress and are its main vehicles, and thereby also the vehicles of the interests of the whole people—the highly skilled workers who embody the most advanced productive forces, and the scientific and technical intelligentsia and the intelligentsia in the humanities and social sciences?

Restructuring will not remove all the contradictions but, to the contrary, intensify them. That is nothing to be afraid of: contradictions, as we know, do not impede but accelerate social development. But in order that contradictions do not take us unaware, we must be ready for them, and it is impossible to be ready without analyzing the laws to which our life is subject.

After accomplishing that task, maybe we can also answer the question: how can we, without getting off our street, get to the temple?

COPYRIGHT: Zhurnal "Novyy mir", 1987

8756

Historian Explains Stalin's Rise to Power in 1920's

18300100 Moscow *OGONEK* in Russian No 47,
21-28 Nov 87 pp 2-4

[Interview with Dmitriy Shelestov, doctor of historical sciences, by journalist Konstantin Yelyutin under the rubric "1917-1987"; date and place not specified: "Advance Towards the Truth"]

[Text] Among responses received by the editorial staff to the article "Profile of an Era" by Dmitriy Shelestov (OGONEK No 42), several letters requested us to continue publishing materials under the rubric "1917-1918". We share the growing interest of readers in the history of the Great October Revolution, and we intend in future to include a section devoted to the era that witnessed the birth and formation of Soviet society. Today Dmitriy Shelestov, doctor of historical sciences, and journalist Konstantin Yelyutin resume their discussion about problems of studying the period of great struggle between 1917 and 1920.

[Question] The report of M. S. Gorbachev at the conference in Moscow in honor of the 70th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, entitled "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Continues," was received with considerable interest in this country and abroad. Apparently, this document is of fundamental significance for historians of Soviet society. Is that right?

[Answer] The report of M. S. Gorbachev, together with the lessons of history noted in his book "Restructuring and the New Way of the Thinking for the Good of Our Country and the Entire World," which has just been published, sets the task for extending research into the history of Great October and the periods of socialist development that followed, including the 1920's and 1930's, which occupied a special place in the life of the Soviet state.

Again and again we return to the sources in an attempt to comprehend as deeply as possible that time when the first socialist society in the world began to be constructed. The report by M. S. Gorbachev gave a profound description of the 70-year course of development of the country without downplaying the difficulties and dramatic crises of the period. For the first time, for example, it was clearly stated that in the collectivization of agriculture there was a deviation from Lenin's policy with respect to the peasantry. The administrative command system characteristic of the leadership under Stalin brought about grave excesses in the socialist transformation of the countryside.

A profound social change that occurred after the events of 1917, beginning by the end of the twenties and at the start of the thirties, gave to the new building projects millions of workers who yesterday had been peasants. Read A. Malshkin's novel "The People From the Hinterland" and you will see how tightly interwoven the fate of the peasantry was with industrialization. There was a comparable change in the character of the urban population, which doubled between the end of the 1920's and the closing years of the 1930's. Such a massive transformation of the peasants into city dwellers had considerable social consequences. It was, incidentally, in my view, one of the most important social aspects of the situation in which the cult of Stalin first began to assert itself, representing him as an "overlord".

[Question] M. S. Gorbachev's report recognized the contradictory nature of Stalin's personality and strongly condemned the cult that surrounded him as utterly alien to the nature of socialism. What are the major trends in the analysis of this problem by historians?

[Answer] In order to understand the process by which Stalin's cult of personality originated, we should analyze first in detail the situation surrounding the leadership of the country and the party after 1922.

[Question] The year 1924 is usually called the boundary line.

[Answer] And correctly so. But it precludes the possibility of analyzing events from 1922 on. In April of that year I.V. Stalin became general secretary of the party Central Committee, and less than 10 months later attacks of serious illness, which occurred on 16 and 23 December, in effect removed Lenin from direct, practical leadership of the country and party. The publication of his "Letter to the Congress" in 1956, revealing records dictated by him during the period 23-25 December 1922 and on 4 January 1923, which were aimed at preventing a split in the leadership of the Central Committee and which contained a proposal to transfer Stalin from his position as general secretary, played a substantial part in dethroning the cult of personality. Although their study in the field of historical research was discontinued in the sixties and seventies, they have recently once again drawn the attention of scholars.

[Question] Let's talk about this in more detail, particularly since "Letter to the Congress" is referred to in M.S. Gorbachev's report.

[Answer] Let us agree at the outset on one thing. Citing isolated events out of a single process of development under a specific set of conditions should not obscure the final work of Lenin as a whole (from the end of December 1922 to the beginning of March 1923), comprising what is essentially his last will and testament. Speaking only of the records mentioned, it must be borne in mind that they are only a part of what Lenin managed to dictate despite his tragic illness.

The records do not come down only to a question of transferring Stalin from his position as general secretary; their contents have a deeper significance, reflecting a grave problem that drew Lenin's unwavering attention even before his illness.

In that now far-off year of 1922 the multi-national country of 135 million people, which was predominantly agrarian with almost 84 percent of its population living in villages, kishlaks or auls, took the first steps through the NEP in the struggle with hunger and devastation. The party of Lenin led the people's struggle for a new life; they numbered in their ranks about 400,000 people. In March 1922, after analyzing the party's condition, Lenin in writing to the the members of the Central Committee

pointed out that the party's proletarian policy under conditions that existed as of the beginning of the 1920's had been determined "by the immense, indivisible authority of that extremely thin stratum which can be called the party's old guard."

"Should there be even a rather small internal struggle within this stratum," he wrote further, "its authority will be, if not undermined, in any case weakened to such a degree that the outcome will no longer depend on it." This statement is fundamental in reaching an understanding of Lenin's dictated records nine months later concerning the situation in the Central Committee. They were dictated hurriedly (no one, of course, could predict the progress of the illness); such was the importance that he attached to this matter. By this time the real danger of an inner struggle emerging had increased, particularly with respect to relations between two members of the Central Committee and Politburo: Trotsky with his extraordinary self-confidence and his enthusiasm for the purely administrative side of affairs; and Stalin, who in the first months of his activities as general secretary had already gathered into his own hands virtually limitless power—a fact that disturbed Lenin since he had no confidence that Stalin would always be able to wield this power with sufficient care.

[Question] Occasionally in our mail from readers we encounter contentions that Lenin appointed one or another of his peers as his successor.

[Answer] There is no known documentary evidence of this. Moreover, what does it mean, this appointment of a successor? To what duties or position? The highest authority of Lenin was associated not with his duties but with the recognition accorded by the masses to the founder and overseer of the revolution as an authentic leader. As far as his duties went, V.I. Lenin was a member of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee Politburo, and he occupied not one, as is commonly supposed, but two state posts, which were united under his leadership—chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and chairman of the Council of Labor and Defense. Both of these organizations became union bodies with the formation of the USSR after the summer of 1923, and the deputy chairman of them in both the USSR and RSFSR were L. B. Kamenev, A. I. Rykov, and A. D. Tsyurupa. After the death of Vladimir Ilich the leadership of these organizations was, so to speak, dissolved. A.I. Rykov became chairman of the Sovnarkom (until 1930), and L.B. Kamenev served as chairman of the Council of Labor and Defense (until 1926). V.I. Lenin left as his successor the Bolshevik Party and its old guard, the Central Committee, the solidarity of which was to be guaranteed by a community of vital concerns.

[Question] What was the composition of the Central Committee and its organizations at that time?

[Answer] The composition of the last Central Committee formed with the participation of V. I. Lenin and chosen by the 11th Party Congress in April 1922 consisted of 27 members and 19 candidate members. All of them had membership in the party before the October Revolution. Eleven of them were members of the Central Committee selected by the Sixth Party Congress in 1917: V.I. Lenin, A.S. Bubnov, N.I. Bukharin, F.E. Dzerzhinskiy, G.Ye. Zinovyev, L.B. Kamenev, A.I. Rykov, I.T. Smilga, G.Ya. Sokolnikov, I.V. Stalin, and L.D. Trotsky. At the same time a number of those who became prominent in the post-October period during the 1920's entered into party, state, military, and economic activities, among them K.Ye. Voroshilov, M.I. Kalinin, S.M. Kirov, V.V. Kuybyshev, A.I. Mikoyan, V.M. Molotov, G.K. Ordzhonikidze, G.L. Pyatakov, Ya.E. Rudzutak, M.P. Tomskiy, M.B. Frunze, and V.Ya. Chubar.

By 1922 the Central Committee organs had been designed and established. As early as 1919 the Central Committee's Politburo was set up to deal with political questions and issues that could not be postponed, and the Orgburo was established to carry out all of the party's organizational work. In the following year the 11th Party Congress, while retaining under the jurisdiction of the Orgburo general supervision of the Central Committee's organizational activities, transferred to the Secretariat the management of "current issues of an organizational and executive character."

Until 1921 the Politburo consisted of V.I. Lenin, L.B. Kamenev, N.N. Krestinskiy, I.V. Stalin, and L.D. Trotsky, with N.I. Bukharin, G.Ye. Zinovyev, and M.I. Kalinin as candidate members. In 1921 G.Ye. Zinovyev was chosen to take the place of N.N. Krestinskiy, and V.M. Molotov was chosen to be a candidate member. The composition became somewhat broader in 1923 when A.I. Rykov and M.P. Tomskiy were brought into the Politburo and Ya.E. Rudzutak was added to the number of candidate members.

The Central Committee's Orgburo (of which Lenin was not a member) diminished perceptibly in size following each party congress. The sole member of the Central Committee who consistently took part in the work of the Orgburo after 1919 was Stalin. The secretaries of the Central Committee were also members of it; there were three of them until 1924, and four of them thereafter. The April plenum of the Central Committee in 1922 established the office of General Secretary; the position, as already noted, was occupied by Stalin, who remained in it until the 11th Party Congress. The longest period for a secretary in office, except for that of Stalin, was Molotov's tenure from 1921 to 1930.

[Question] Does this mean that V.I. Lenin, in setting forth his own description of the situation in the Central Committee at the end of December 1922, had in mind the party leadership as it was constituted in the early 1920's?

[Answer] Lenin's document, of course, was quite specific. It should be emphasized that he revealed what he had in mind by proposing that the number of Central Committee members be increased to include several dozens more or even hundreds. Such a step was necessary, he pointed out, "for raising the authority of the Central Committee, for making a serious attempt to improve our apparatus, and for preventing conflicts among minor elements of the Central Committee that might otherwise have undue significance for party fortunes." This first section of the "Letter to the Congress," written on 23 December 1922, was sent the same day to Stalin for the Central Committee Politburo.

The section to follow, which was dictated by Lenin on 24-25 December and also on 4 January 1923, and which included personal descriptions of the six members of the Central Committee, was according to Lenin's instructions to be kept absolutely and unconditionally secret. Only after his death was it to be brought to the attention of the next party congress.

In considering the question of stability as a guaranty against a split in the party, Vladimir Ilich emphasized that the greatest danger of this came from the relations between two, as he called them, outstanding members of the existing Central Committee—Stalin and Trotskiy—and he went on to point out negative personal traits first of one and then the other.

V. I. Lenin then recalled the October 1917 episode of Zinovyev and Kamenev (who were not in accord with the decision of the Central Committee regarding the uprising and divulged its plans, and thereafter, in November 1917, advocated the creation of a "coalition" government, along with certain other members of the Central Committee). The episode, he said, was not fortuitous, of course, but was "not personally as blameworthy as Trotskiy's non-Bolshevism." Of the young members of the Central Committee Vladimir Ilich singled out Bukharin and Pyatakov as being the most outstanding, emphasizing, however, that although the first of them "is rightly considered the favorite of the party", nevertheless "his theoretical viewpoint is extremely dubious as compared with a fully Marxist one," and the second too preoccupied with administrative measures "to be able to rely on him in resolving a serious political matter." In a letter filled with concern for protecting party unity V. I. Lenin focused attention on negative aspects of the activities of the six Central Committee members indicated, but this criticism in no way signified relieving them of their part in managing the party and the country; and this was also true of Stalin, whom he proposed only to transfer from the position of General Secretary.

[Question] V.I. Lenin then foresaw the possibility, as he expressed it, of conflicts within the Central Committee and was seriously concerned about preserving collective leadership, the democratization inherent in the party, and the very nature of socialism.

[Answer] This was one of the fundamental tenets of Lenin's records. It follows from them that the general secretary was called upon jointly with the Central Committee and its organs to safeguard the existing collective leadership of the party and the development of socialist democracy in the country. Vladimir Ilich believed that in this position there should be a communist who was more patient than Stalin, more loyal, and more polite and attentive to his comrades, without a tendency to be carried away by purely administrative procedures and without the resentment shown by Stalin, which, as Lenin sagely insisted, "generally plays the most pernicious role in politics." This aspect of Stalin's character became particularly apparent in an ugly altercation, which aroused the indication of V.I. Lenin, with N.K. Krupskaya, whom Stalin rudely upbraided after coming to suspect that she had kept on taking down Lenin's utterances, allegedly against the orders of the doctors. When Vladimir Ilich learned of this, he dictated a letter to Stalin on 5 March 1923 (with copies to Zinovyev and Kamenev), demanding that he apologize and indicating that he would otherwise break off relations with him. On the following day he requested that his letter to the addressee be personally passed around from hand to hand. It was then, on 6 March, that the health of Vladimir Ilich took a sharp turn for the worse, and four days later a new onset of illness led to increased paralysis of the right side of his body and to a loss of speech.

[Question] This occurred several weeks before the 12th Party Congress, which V. I. Lenin could no longer attend. And his "Letter to the Congress" remained unknown?

[Answer] Not entirely. As previously mentioned, the records that spoke of Central Committee management did not take up the whole of the "Letter to the Congress." The other parts of it had been turned over to the Central Committee at the end of the year, and the instructions contained in them were incorporated into the decisions of the party. Lenin's record entitled "On the Subject of Nationalities: Becoming Autonomous" was made known to the delegates at the 12th Party Congress in April 1923.

[Question] And more than a year later, the records of Lenin containing descriptions of a number of Central Committee members were read to the delegates at the 13th Party Congress in May 1924?

[Answer] Five days before the opening of the 13th Party Congress, on 18 May 1924, these records and a number of other materials were turned over by N.K. Krupskaya to the Commission for the Custody of the Documents of Lenin, consisting of Zinovyev, Kamenev, and Stalin, who, you will recall, were members of the Politburo, together with Rykov, Tomskiy, and Trotskiy. On the basis of their notifications concerning receipt of the documents, a Central Committee plenum on 21 May 1924 passed the following resolution: "In accordance with the will of Vladimir Ilich, to postpone divulging to

the congress the documents read, while making them known to the delegates, and directing that the documents are not to be published, the contents of the documents will be divulged to the delegates by the members of the Commission for the Custody of the Papers of Ilich."

[Question] This means that the reading of Lenin's document to the delegates was carried out by Zinovyev, Kamenev, and Stalin, and the congress was restricted in this instance to increasing the size of the Central Committee?

[Answer] Yes. The number of Central Committee members was increased to 53. But the members of the Central Committee chosen at the 11th Party Congress with the participation of V.I. Lenin constituted the basis of it. At the first plenum of this Central Committee, which convened at the close of 1924 and the start of 1925, a Politburo was established consisting of seven members: N.I. Bukharin, G.Ye. Zinovyev, L.B. Kamenev, A.I. Rykov, I.V. Stalin, M.P. Tomskiy, and L.D. Trotskiy. In addition, there were six candidate members: F.E. Dzerzhinskiy, M.I. Kalinin, V.M. Molotov, Ya.E. Rudzutak, G.Ya. Sokolnikov, and M.V. Frunze. At the plenum I.V. Stalin made a request, which was not complied with, that he be relieved of his duties as General Secretary. Why? The congress, and later the Central Committee plenum, it may be concluded, proceeded from the assumption that during the period of Vladimir Ilich's illness a nucleus of leadership had been formed which would base its conclusions on Lenin's "Letter to the Congress," preserving the party's collective leadership as its founder and leader had willed it.

[Question] But today we know how complicated subsequent events proved to be.

[Answer] The whole point is that they were not simple and unambiguous. As early as 1923 the followers of Trotskiy were taking advantage of Lenin's illness in an attempt to revise Bolshevism. After the 13th Party Congress, Trotskiy, in keeping with Lenin's assessment of him in "Letter to the Congress," made extravagant claims to leadership as he tried to replace Bolshevism with Trotskiyism. The ideological defeat of this anti-Leninist movement is revealed in our literature and there is no need to go over its outcome. It is noteworthy only that the trend towards factionalism and the influence of Trotskiy upon politics left its imprint on the entire struggle for public opinion that followed, and that his anti-Leninist and anti-Bolshevist stand seemed to project itself henceforth, consciously or not, into every subsequent divergence of views.

The personal qualities of Stalin, who took undisguised pride in rudely contending with ideological opponents, also played a part in intensifying the struggle. The single-mindedness and willfulness that was characteristic

of him in combination with his impatience, suspiciousness, and other negative traits, made him not simply rude but unjustifiably rigid, and even, as subsequent events were to reveal, cruel.

[Question] With the defeat of Trotskiyism, the authority of Stalin increased?

[Answer] Nowadays people are in the habit of supposing that Stalin was widely known to the party and country virtually from 1917 on. Actually, his personal reputation until about 1923 was rather slight and considerably below the level of Trotskiy, Zinovyev, Kamenev, Rykov, and certain other prominent persons then. Incidentally, the portrait of Stalin in OGONEK in 1923 was apparently one of the first pictures of him in a mass publication. A little more than 10 years later, the well-known writer L. Feuchtwanger, on his arrival in the USSR, observed ubiquitous portraits "of the fellow with the mustache," as he called him.

Stalin's power grew almost imperceptibly. As he consolidated his position as General Secretary, his participation in the life of the country became increasingly noticeable. The publication by him, along with Kamenev, Zinovyev, Bukharin, and other prominent party functionaries in the 1923-1924 period aimed at unmasking Trotskiyism served objectively the Leninist policy for the building of socialism. This became clearly apparent with the overcoming of "the new opposition" (Zinovyev, Kamenev, and others) in 1925, the defeat of the anti-party bloc of Trotskiy and Zinovyev in the 1926-1927 period, and the liquidation of the party's right deviationists (Bukharin, Rykov, Tomskiy) towards the end of the 1920's. In the course of this struggle Zinovyev and Kamenev were removed from the Politburo in 1926, together with Trotskiy, who was expelled from the USSR in 1929. Bukharin, Rykov, and Tomskiy were relieved of their duties as members of the Politburo during that same year and the one following, 1929 and 1930.

[Question] It is not difficult to detect that out of the seven members who made up the Politburo in 1924-1925, only Stalin remained in the party leadership by the start of the 1930's.

[Answer] But this in no way signifies that the service rendered in overcoming the opposition and devising the course of socialist construction is attributable only to Stalin, as began to be asserted in the 1930's. It is impossible to forget the struggle with Trotskiyism of M.V. Frunze, who met with an untimely death in October 1925, or F.E. Dzerzhinskiy, whose heart stopped beating in the midst of a passionate speech against the opposition at a plenary session of the Central Committee in July 1926. A substantial role was played by A.S. Bubnov, S.M. Kirov, S.B. Kosior, V.V. Kuybyshev, K.G. Ordzhonikidze, G.I. Petrovskiy, P.P. Postyshev, Ya.E. Rudzutak, and V.Ya. Chubar, who together with an

overwhelming majority of Central Committee members contributed to working out collectively the party's plan for building socialism in the USSR.

At party conferences during the second half of the 1920's, despite declarations by the opposition (particularly, Kamenev, Zinovyev, and Sokolnikov) concerning the concentration of power by Stalin, the collective nature of the leadership of the party and country was continuously in evidence, in conformity with actual conditions. Nevertheless, at the 14th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (VKP(b)) in 1925 Voroshilov declared that Stalin was "the principal member of the Politburo," and four years later, in 1929, he published an article entitled "Stalin and the Red Army," which played a major role in spreading a distorted version of the history of soviet society favorable to Stalin, crowned by the publication in 1938 of "History of the VKP(b). Short Course." After having taken an active part in unmasking the Trotskyite concept of "two leaders," Stalin then exploited it in such a way as to spread ideas that it was he, instead of Lenin, who had inspired the events of Great October, representing himself as the organizer and leader of all the victories of the Soviet peoples.

[Question] Well then, after 1924 Lenin's "Letter to the Congress," including its indications of serious defects in the character of Stalin, was forgotten?

[Answer] No, this document was referred to during the course of the intra-party struggle that developed. The next time was during the 15th VKP(b) Congress when the records of Lenin, in compliance with his instructions, were printed in one of the congress reports. Later, they were supposed to be printed in a collection of Lenin's works, but this did not occur; nor could it have occurred, for it was inherently in conflict with the cult of Stalin, which developed slowly but surely in the strained atmosphere brought about by factional strife with Trotsky and, emerging along with him, the "new opposition" of Zinovyev and Kamenev.

Their October episode, referred to in the "Letter to the Congress," was not incidental in nature as things turned out. After siding with the party in opposition to Trotsky in 1922-1924, they later formed a single opposition bloc with Trotsky. The nucleus of party leadership that had formed during Lenin's illness and was preserved during the first few months after his death now fell apart. The unprincipled struggle for power could not but strike a blow at the party's old guard, shattering its authority, and increasingly narrowing its potential influence upon the outcome of events—precisely as Lenin in 1922 had feared. Under such circumstances the authoritarian power of Stalin almost imperceptibly asserted itself as he strayed from Leninist principles of collective leadership.

"The old disagreements that took place when Lenin was alive," M.S. Gorbachev observed in his report, "became evident again in a new set of circumstances and in an

extremely caustic form. Lenin, as we know, had warned of the possibility of such a danger. In his "Letter to the Congress" he emphasized: 'This is not a petty detail, or rather it is a detail that can acquire a decisive significance.' In many respects this contingency has come to pass."

The recently commemorated 70th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution once again has fortified us in the knowledge that life itself demands we develop honest and courageous works of the history of soviet society, revealing the heroic spirit and dramatic nature of events: everything that fills the difficult and diverse destiny of those early explorers, whose goal, throughout the many stages of this history, was towards socialism.

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

12889

Perestroyka-Motivated Research At Latvian History Institute
18300108a Moscow VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS in Russian No 11, Nov 87 pp 78-84

[Article by L.Ya. Zile, doctor of historical sciences, professor and director of the Latvian CP Central Committee's Party History Institute, Riga: "Overcoming the Deceleration Mechanism and Strengthening the Connection Between Research and Real Life"]

[Text] The broad program of perestroyka and the acceleration of the country's social and economic development is making new demands on the science of party history. The state of affairs of this science has been subjected to serious criticism in party documents and in speeches by leading figures of the CPSU. The isolation of research from the practice of social and economic development and communist training, the indistinctness of many historical events, the "re-writing" of the pages of history for self-serving purposes, the inability of researchers to produce a constructive analysis of one or another "critical" theme or even of whole periods of the history of the CPSU, insignificant themes and the narrowness of the chronological and territorial framework of much of the research—all these things have reduced the potential of the science of party history and weakened its influence on the solution of priority problems in the various spheres of society's affairs. In essence, within the science of party history, a deceleration mechanism arises, the overcoming of which is the professional and civil duty of the researchers.

Today there has been a significant increase in interest in many pages of the party's history. Speaking to the June (1987) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, M.S. Gorbachev said: "Each generation of the Soviet people has made its own contribution to the development, strengthening and defense of the achievements of October. We are rightly proud of our history and we look

to the future with confidence" (1). The striving to find the sources of our achievements in the building of the new society, to determine the roots of negative phenomena and to learn lessons from the multi-faceted experience of history is understandable and explainable. All this demands of party historians a lofty sense of responsibility, recognition of their own role in the perestroika process, the ability to see the various, at times contradictory, processes, tendencies and phenomena and to react on a timely basis to practical needs.

Party documents direct scientists to increase the theoretical level of research and to strengthen the connection between the science of party history and practice in order to ensure the proper intensity and scientific innovation of the generalizations and conclusions.

Today, when already more than one and one-half years have passed since the 27th CPSU Congress, it is possible to sum up certain results of how the staff of the Latvian CP Central Committee's Party History Institute are implementing perestroika.

One of the first steps in this direction was a review of the 5-year plan for the institute's research activities. Emphasis was placed on the urgent problems of the present, on the elaboration of the theoretical questions of the acceleration strategy and on the generalization of the experience of its realization.

Of the 35 issues planned for publication in the 12th 5-Year Plan, 18 are devoted to the present—to the processes of restructuring the activities of party organs, to the development of socialist self-management and the realization of the CPSU's cadre policies and so on.

Sociological research is entering into the institute's work practices on an ever broader scale. Its active use is one of the effective means which make it possible to digress from mere commentary in the science of party history and to put an end to the situation where its functions are limited to repetition, explanation and lip-service approval of the decisions of party organs.

On the recommendation of the Latvian CP Central Committee, the institute carried out sociological research on a number of problems. Among them—party control of administration activities, the role of primary party organizations in stirring up the human factor, the culture of inter-ethnic ties and the electivity of the leaders in the republic's labor collectives. Sociological research was conducted on the "Political, Practical and Moral Qualities of a Party Worker" jointly with the CPSU Central Committee's Academy of Social Sciences' Party Construction Department.

Such research makes it possible to obtain and process quite rapidly objective data on the actual state of affairs in the labor collectives and on the various aspects of the activities of party organizations. It is also necessary for the preparation of scientific treatises and for the solution

of many practical problems facing the party organizations on a real-time basis. Of course, the sociological research may turn out to be effective only when there are well-trained cadres who possess the methodology and methods for conducting the research and for processing the materials. And this requires ever more urgently the coordination of the efforts of party historians and other social scientists and the training of specialists who have the methods for the research. Unfortunately, here there are quite a few unsolved problems in the republic.

An analysis of the results of the research conducted in a number of party organizations has made it possible to expose those problems to which the party organizations have inadequately paid attention and which now, in light of the decisions of the June (1987) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, are becoming particularly pressing.

Thus, the research conducted at enterprises in Riga—electric lamp, diesel-building and car-building plants—has shown conclusively the decelerating action of the economic mechanism on the development of the peoples' labor activism. And, in such a situation, all the efforts of the party organs can not ensure the conditions necessary for the efficient operation of the self-supporting subdivisions and brigades. Also rated on a low level was the evaluation of the effectiveness of measures undertaken by the local party organizations for the introduction at the enterprises of the new forms of labor organization and cost-accounting principles—in 32 labor collectives, up to 50 percent of the communists figure that this work is being carried out either poorly or not at all.

The research exposed the significant social passivity of many members of the labor collectives and their tendency to avoid participating in the various forms of self-management. It is also typical that, for example, in the local party organizations of the Rigas Apgerbs Production Association, of the Riga Electric Lamp Plant and of the Daugavpils Apgerbs Enterprise, up to 90 percent of the communists do not realize the necessity of expanding production self-management. To the question about what was obstructing the development of self-management, 56 percent of those questioned responded that they saw as the main reason the lack of preparedness on the part of the ordinary workers and 38 percent—their disinterest in the development of self-management.

The stagnant phenomena and the social passivity are the result of the action of the deceleration mechanism which has been forming in society over the course of a prolonged period of time and particularly in the 1970's and the beginning of the 1980's. The roots of this deceleration, as was pointed out in the January (1987) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, lie in the fact that "during the working out of the policies and in the practical activities, conservative attitudes prevailed, as did inertia and the tendency to brush aside everything which did not fit into the usual schemes, as well as the reluctance to solve the pressing social and economic questions." (2)

Also guilty to a significant degree in this matter is the science of party history—it could not analyze properly the experience accumulated in the building of socialism and could not work out properly recommendations for its creative use with respect to the new stage of the country's development and for avoiding a repetition of the previously tolerated errors and miscalculations.

All this is a serious lesson for the party historians. Taking it into consideration means uncovering the roots, the essence and the process of formation of the deceleration mechanism, everything which led to the reinforcement of social apathy and skepticism and to the undermining of socialism's moral principles. For the party historians, assimilating the lesson of the past also means it is necessary to be able to react on a timely basis and competently to the processes and phenomena occurring in the party and to be able to analyze and explain them thoroughly.

Currently, in the institute, works are being prepared for publication on the urgent problems of the restructuring of activities of the party organizations. Thus, E.N. Ozhiganov and A.I. Ivanov are working on the monograph "The Activities of Party Organizations in Stirring Up the Human Factor in the Labor Collectives." Envisioned in it is the widespread use of the sociological research materials. The preparation of a monograph by V.G. Mitryaykin, "The Activities of the Latvian CP on the Shift of the Republic's Industry to the Intensive Path of Development," has been completed. A collection of articles, "For a Style that is Businesslike and Creative," will be published jointly with the Latvian CP Central Committee's Organizational Party Work Department. It, like a number of works that have already come out, is being developed through the common efforts of scientists and practical workers. Such collaboration makes it possible to bring the themes and research contents closer to real life and to everyday practice and facilitates the scientific understanding of the new tendencies and phenomena in party work on a more real-time basis.

The monograph by A.I. Ivanov, "Party Control of Administration Activities," was published based on the sociological research materials. For the 70th Anniversary of the Great October, a collective monograph, "The Realization of the Party's Social Policies," is also coming out.

The problems of improving inter-ethnic relations occupy a significant place in the researchers' works. A number of works are being prepared in which an attempt is being undertaken to reflect the dynamics and the contradictions of the processes occurring in this sphere and to expose not only the factors which facilitate the strengthening of the friendship between peoples and the deepening of the internationalizing of the various aspects of our life, but also those factors which exert a negative influence on inter-ethnic relations. One of the still poorly worked-out problems is that of the culture of inter-ethnic ties. A monograph by I.K. Apine and Yu.I. Goldmanis will be devoted to this.

The most burning questions of counter-propaganda are examined in the recently published collection of articles, "The Ideological Struggle. Its Experience, Problems and Directions." It rebuffs the various types of fabrications disseminated by our enemies abroad.

The propaganda of the works of the classic writers of Marxism-Leninism occupies a primary place in the activities of the collective. At the present time, work is proceeding at an accelerated pace on the translation into and publication in Latvian of the ten-volume "Selected Works" of V.I. Lenin. This year, the sixth and seventh volumes are coming out and, in 1988, the remaining volumes will be published. This creates the conditions for promoting the study of Lenin's legacy, will permit an even greater number of people to expand their own store of theoretical knowledge and will expand the opportunities for the creative application of Lenin's ideas in contemporary practice.

The intensification of attention to present-day problems does not mean an undervaluing of the importance and significance of the historical experience of years past. Among the basic problems confronting the institute's staff is the development of an objective and concise essay on the Latvian CP's history designed for the average reader. It will reflect all the periods of activity of Latvia's communists and will name many of those who fought for Soviet power in Latvia and who, in the years of bourgeois rule, headed up the working class's revolutionary struggle. The essay will tell also of those of our countrymen who, in the years of the Civil War and in the years of the restoration of the national economy and the first 5-year plans, participated in the strengthening of the Soviet state.

One thing that will also not be passed by in silence is the fact that the fate of many Latvian bolshevik revolutionaries, such as Ya.E. Rudzutak, R.I. Eykhe, Ya.I. Alksnis, Ya.Kh. Peters, M.I. Latsis, Ya.A. Berzin-Ziyemelis, Ya.M. Krumin-Pilat, D.S. Beyka, and K.-Yu.Kh. Danishevskiy, turned out to be a tragic one—they became victims of groundless repressions. At the same time, a decisive rebuff will be given to the fabrications spread abroad about the identification of these repressions with the essence of socialism. The tragic errors with all their burden are no reason to deny the fact that, over the course of a prolonged period of time, the Soviet state developed dynamically and progressively and the socialist order convincingly demonstrated its own constructive possibilities and humanistic essence. To strike this out would mean coming out against historical truth. "History," said M.S. Gorbachev, "needs to be seen exactly as it is. Everything was, and there were mistakes—even grave ones, but the country moved forward. Take the years of industrialization or collectivization. This is real life, reality.

This is the fate of the people with all the contradictions: with both the achievements and the errors." (3).

It is indisputable that there should be no "blank spots" in the science of party history. But this in no way signifies a departure from the principles of the party spirit in the evaluation of historical occurrences, from the class positions or from historical truth.

One of the urgent questions is, for example, the question about the implementation of the collectivization of agriculture in Latvia at the end of the 1940's. A special monograph, which our institute's staff is preparing jointly with the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences' History Institute, will be devoted to this theme.

The socialist reform of agriculture turned out to be a most complicated problem. The victory of the socialist revolution opened up the path to the socialist reconstruction of the republic's agriculture based on maintaining large-scale collective farming and to revolutionary reforms in the peasants' entire way of life. But in order to do this, it was necessary to convince the peasants through experience of the necessity and the advantageousness of the shift to the new forms of management.

The paths to the solution of this problem had been defined by Lenin's cooperative plan, which provided for the necessary taking into consideration of the peasants' economic interests, for the strict observance of the principle of voluntariness and for the gradual transition according to the degree of establishment of the necessary conditions from the simplest forms of cooperation to production cooperation. Lenin wrote that enlisting the peasants' cooperation would require "an entire historical era," in the best instance—"1-2 decades." (4)

Collectivization in Latvia, just as in the other republics of the Soviet Baltic region, was carried out under conditions when experience in its implementation had already been accumulated in the USSR and there was every opportunity to learn both positive and negative lessons during the solution of this problem.

However, as historical practice has shown, Lenin's most important instructions about the necessity of establishing the corresponding conditions for organizing the peasants' farms into a cooperative were not taken into consideration properly.

In dealing with the collectivization process, we will study the degree to which the peasants of Soviet Latvia mastered the simplest forms of cooperation and we will examine whether or not they exhausted all the possibilities for growth, and whether or not it was lawful that their development was artificially interrupted.

In the course of collectivization, excessive acceleration of its rate and the use of administrative measures were permitted. This led to the situation where the rate of agricultural collectivization set the rate of its re-equipment. Such a situation intensified the difficulties which are inevitable in the process of the organizational and economic formation of the kolkhoz system.

During the elaboration of the collectivization problems, it is also important to take into consideration the fact that it occurred under conditions of the most severe class struggle. Now, decades later, the severity of the class struggle under the conditions of the collectivization of agriculture in the republic is sometimes smoothed over in the memories of even those who participated directly in the carrying out of the collectivization. Whereas our research, including the manuscript of a monograph prepared by Ya.E. Riyekstinsh, confirms anew the fact that the kulaks emerged as violent opponents of the socialist reforms in the countryside. They circulated hostile rumors, set fire to kolkhoz buildings, slaughtered cattle, performed outright terrorist acts against party and soviet activists and kolkhoz production organizers and were the most active accomplices of banditry. According to the incomplete data, nearly 1,600 people perished at the hands of the class enemy and many of them were participants in the Great Patriotic War and the first socialist reforms.

All these things resulted in the need for retaliatory measures: nearly 4,000 kulak families were sent into exile. At the same time, certain errors were also allowed: not all the exiles were enemies of Soviet power. However, we are talking not about the physical elimination of the former kulaks, rather, only about their migration into other republics. Many of them settled there. A portion of those sent away subsequently returned to Latvia.

Of course, there are still a number of questions associated with the practical implementation of the party's policy on agricultural collectivization in the republic, which can and should become the subject of research, including that of historians. There are no complete social statistics which would make it possible to disclose more thoroughly the many processes of social development in their dynamics and in all their contradictoriness. However, now it is important to investigate carefully, without sensationalism, the course of the historical processes and to seek well-founded conclusions in order to assist in learning all the positive and negative lessons from historical experience.

It is precisely from these positions that the institute's staff is approaching the publication of the final fourth part of the "Essays on the History of the Latvian CP." It is devoted to an analysis of the activities of the republic's party organization over the period from the end of the 1950's to the middle of the 1980's. The manuscript of the "Essays" had already been prepared for publication, but the group of authors and the editorial staff considered it necessary to rework it in the spirit of contemporary requirements.

We are talking about the necessity of taking into account completely all the complexity and contradictoriness of the researched period. One of the problems is the objective and comprehensive evaluation of the activities of various party and state leaders and of certain undertakings which emerged in those years.

Thus, over the course of a prolonged period of time, nothing has been said about many of the things associated with the activities of N.S. Khrushchev—a historically contradictory person. And the measures which were implemented in various aspects of society's affairs during his tenure as First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee have not received a proper evaluation. Moreover, it is still necessary to analyze completely the experience and significance of a number of steps adopted then, which were objectively aimed at eliminating the excessive centralization of the management of various aspects of society's affairs, at expanding socialist democracy, at overcoming bureaucratic red-tape and so on.

Take, for example, one of the undertakings which can not be evaluated on a simple basis—the elimination of the sectorial ministries and the establishment of the sovnarkhozes [national economic councils] at the end of the 1950's. Mention is made in party documents of the negative aspects of this reform—there was disruption of the management of a sector as a unified whole, the opportunities for conducting a single scientific and technical policy were hampered and regional tendencies were reinforced. But, in those same documents, in particular in the materials of the September (1965) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, mention is also made of the positive role played by the sovnarkhozes in the intersectorial cooperation of production.

In investigating the period associated with N.S. Khrushchev's activities, it is impossible, of course, to pass silently also by the errors which were permitted at that time. We are talking about the unjustifiable division of party organizations according to the so-called production principle, the elimination of industrial cooperation, the transformation, forced in a number of instances, of kolkhozes into sovkhozes, the introduction of groundless limitations with respect to the development of private subsidiary farming by the kolkhoz and sovkhoz workers and so on.

The party historians also need to answer a number of questions associated with the implementation of the CPSU's political policies in the subsequent period. One of them—why it has not been possible to implement the things envisioned in the 1965 economic reform, as well as the party and government decisions on matters relating to the improvement of the economic mechanism, which were adopted in the 1970's. In general terms, this can be explained by the fact that an optimum correlation had not been found between the economic and administrative methods of management. And although calls were made repeatedly for the shift to the advantageous use of economic methods, the old system, which leaned mainly on the administrative methods, stood its ground and was even able to consolidate its position somewhat.

It is a known fact that the system of managing the economy based on rigid centralism, detailed regulation of work, directly set quotas and budget allocations, as noted in the June (1987) CPSU Central Committee

Plenum, "had ensured the solution in the briefest of time frames of such strategic problems as had taken decades in the developed capitalist countries." (5)

However, under new conditions, the excessively centralized forms of management of the economic system have turned out to be inefficient. We still continued to remain their captives and took them for the only correct and most complete expression of the essence of socialism. We did not grasp, as we should have, Lenin's insistence on the necessity of approaching any phenomenon and evaluating it by taking into consideration the specific historical conditions. In the same manner, we disregarded Lenin's insistence on the necessity of ensuring the correct correlation between centralism and local initiative. As a result, we have lost much, in fact, excluding from initiative economic activities, hundreds of thousands of labor collectives and millions of specialists.

The primary task of party historians today is the generalization of the experience of the party organizations' practical activities for the realization of the policy of perestroika and the acceleration of the country's social and economic development. At the same time, it is worth noting that the policy by itself, worked out by the April (1985) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, did not emerge in a vacuum. Even under the conditions of the growth of stagnant pre-crisis events, "the country's development did not stop. Tens of millions of Soviet people labored honestly and many party organizations and our cadres acted, actively, in the interests of the people... The need for changes objectively became urgent in the economic system and in other spheres..." (6)

Such an evaluation makes it incumbent upon us to approach the study of both the party's activities in the 1970's and the beginning of the 1980's and the party history problems of other periods by taking into account all the dialectics and all the complexity and contradictoriness of the examined phenomena. "... When we say," it was noted at the June (1987) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "that democracy assumes lively, broad and responsible discussions and the comparison of various points of view, this means that it is impossible to consider as democratic the attempts, in the guise of the struggle with one half-truth, to replace it with another half-truth." (7) From these positions, it is important to approach now in the science of party history the investigation of the past and the investigation of the present.

Even in the 1970's and the beginning of the 1980's, with the increased negative phenomena, a restructuring of the economic system and of other spheres of society's affairs was becoming an ever more pressing need. Its necessity was becoming more recognized by ever increasing masses of people in the party and in the nation. The analysis of the historical roots of perestroika and the disclosure of its objective conditionality should also

occupy a prominent place in the works of party historians. We are also orienting the group of authors of the "Essays on the History of the Latvian CP" in this direction.

There are quite a few other problems on which the party historians need to work. Overcoming the cliches and stereotypes in the approach to their solution and giving free reign to the researcher's creative thinking—these are the things that need to be done now.

Footnotes

1. "Materialy Plenuma Tsentralnogo Komiteta KPSS, 25-26 iyunya 1987 goda" [Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 25-26 June, 1987], Moscow, 1987, p 6.

2. Ibid., 27-28 yanvarya 1987 goda [27-28 January, 1987], Moscow, 1987, p 8.

3. PRAVDA, 14 February, 1987.

4. V.I. Lenin, "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" [The Complete Collected Works], Vol 45, p 372.

5. "Materialy...", op. cit, 25-26 June, 1987, p 42.

6. Ibid., 27-28 January, 1987, p 7.

7. Ibid., 25-26 June, 1987, p 34.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Voprosy istorii KPSS", 1987.

12752

Paper Discusses Presence of Krishna Sect in Lithuania

18000115 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
29 Nov 87 p 2

[Article by A. Koryakov: "In the Shadow of an Indian Deity"]

[Text] Krishna. Guru. Bhagta. Kirtana... Just a few years ago these words, brought into our world as it were from another epoch, might have elicited only a vague association. Only a few people—experts on the Orient and lovers of exotic myths—were familiar with these words and the philosophical trends behind them. Now, many people have heard of them.

Those who have seen the film by Yu. Podniyek, *Legko li byt molodym?* [Is it Easy to be Young?], will probably remember the young man clothed all in white, who appeared for a short time on the screen. He told of his unsatisfactory life, of the feelings of discomfort he was experiencing, and described how our age, "kali-yuga," is an age of troubles, lies and hypocrisy; therefore he has turned to the most gracious god Krishna, who brings him deliverance from suffering. Then close-ups again appeared on the screen; and through the clouds of fragrant incense one could barely discern human figures, rendering praise to the Indian deity; and strange chanting was heard.

This graphic illustration provides a certain impression of the Krishnas, our contemporaries, who have rejected worldly goods and worldly names, and have abandoned their professions and customary way of life. They have retreated, as one can demonstrate, to a peaceful abode, where worldly troubles cannot reach them, and where the melody of the sitar is always heard.

But let us turn away from the legends and from the close-ups which caused such a sensation, and turn towards the reality, taken from life.

On the territory of the Soviet Union, and Lithuania in particular, the ideas of Krishna were spread to a certain extent at the end of the 1970's following the visit to Riga of Swami Vishnupada, an Italian by birth, and one of the leaders of the European "Consciousness of Krishna" sects. What caused the subsequent interest in this religion? Most likely the very same thing that attracts those who follow the teachings on biofields, and human extrasensory capabilities: the attraction of all that is unknowable, beyond the bounds of the common and the ordinary.

Believers in Krishna must think only of Krishna, and everything they do must be done for his sake. From 5:00 AM, according to the teaching, until late at night; on the street; at work; during meals; on the way home—it is always "Hare Krishna..." Krishna professes total rejection of the material world, and complete estrangement from all that is earthly.

At the same time the methods of implanting this belief were altogether earthly and well-tried. And although the Krishnas of Vilnius have denied any missionary activity, declaring that their faith is only for themselves, the facts bear witness to the contrary. They also bear witness to the fact that the servants of Krishna have acquired quite a good grasp of human psychology as well, devoting their attention primarily toward those who seem unsure of themselves, and who are easily susceptible to suggestion.

For example, Ye. Gorelik, a native of Minsk described how once he was hailed by a stranger who asked him to buy a photocopy booklet with an innocuous title, which according to the stranger was a guidebook for yoga. When Ye. Gorelik bought it purely out of curiosity, the man asked him to get together with a group of young lads to whom he was prepared to deliver a lecture, once again on yoga. When he was turned down, the stranger brought out several other brochures, foisted them off on his interlocutor, and explained that after reading them he should pass the brochures on to other people who shared his interest in yoga and Indian philosophy. All of these brochures, as it subsequently turned out, were not at all full of philosophical and medical information on the system of yoga exercises, but contained the basics of religious teaching. And they were being distributed by V. Komotskiy, a resident of Vilnius.

For attempting to distribute such literature, which promotes reactionary and idealistic teachings, the police have several times detained Saulys Dagis, another member of the sect. Dagis has used certain other methods as well, dealing not with an interest in yoga, but with such things as love of one's fellow man and participation in the fate of one's loved ones. Here is what V. Shchayev, a junior CID [Criminal Investigation Department] agent at the Kaunas Internal Affairs Department wrote in his report, after a very abrupt encounter with the world of the Krishnaites: "A young man named Saulys approached me near the Medininkay restaurant, and suggested that I buy a publication of the 'Krishna Consciousness' organization from him. I declined. Then Saulys suggested coming with him to an apartment, where they would give me something to eat, present me with a brochure, and accept me as a brother..."

And that is the way it usually begins. But, I would point out, that the Krishnaites interpret the slogan, "All people are brothers," in their own way: for them, brothers are only those who belong to the sect. And the specific practice of the sect, which demand unquestioning obedience to the "guru" (teacher), and continuous attendance during "kirtan" (religious festivals) in an ecstatic state, actually are aimed at destroying the individual's personality, and totally isolating him from society.

This can be clearly shown by turning to the fate of the Krishna followers themselves, both those who remain in the sect, and those who managed to extract themselves from it.

V. Komotskiy's path to mysticism is characteristic of people who are mistrustful, who suffer from an inferiority complex. At one time he was extremely obese and became shy because of this, like any young man would. He tried self-treatment: he began to fast, and took up vegetarianism. Because of his mistrust, he distanced himself from his friends, and problems of personal relations arose. By chance he learned of a religious system which in certain features (vegetarianism) coincided with the way of life that he had led before. This chance coincidence became, in his mind, a hypertrophic form of predestination.

Later on, after becoming a fanatical follower of Krishna, he made an extremely strange and unattractive impression. His colleagues at work said that, "At work he would always be carrying a book, and would be reading from it all the time. He kept water in a flask, and said that it contained special, purified water. And he would hold strange conversations."

S. Shemeta, another Krishnaite, made an even stranger impression. "He would walk about in white clothing, similar to Armenian-style underwear," recalls E. Valadkene, one of his colleagues at work. "Hanging from it were some kind of beads, and there was a pocket in which he kept a red cap, and a red sack on which was sewn, 'Hare Krishna.'" However, with all his outward estrangement, Shemeta deftly and secretly made use of a typewriter belonging to the organization at which he worked, for the reproduction of literature. And when he was arrested by militia agents for distributing illegal literature, the "holy" man conducted himself in a commonplace, defiant manner; he was rude, and refused to answer questions. But there is also a "divine" explanation for this; for according to the thinking of the Krishnaites, those who serve Krishna have no need to conform to the material world in their activities. On the whole these are frightening words. They could be used to justify anything, and open the way to anarchy. Words which one way or another will become the manual for actions for these people, the majority of whom in the past were embittered failures. But now they have found for themselves a highly illusory meaning for their existence. Of course every person has the right to his own way of life and way of thinking—but only if this does not cause harm to society and to other people.

But that is just the problem: that hardly any of these "enlightened ones" strive to keep their convictions to themselves, or not to enlist new victims for the system of teachings—exotic in form, but inhuman in content—perverting their lives. Let us listen carefully, therefore, to the testimony of people who have shed, albeit tardily, the patina of religious mysticism, who have returned from the world of dreams to the world of reality. Saulys K., an artist: "On the whole, speaking of Krishnaism, I personally do not think that this passion was of any use to me. And the chief thing is that I wasted spent a lot of time senselessly..." Gintautas B.: "Although I also took part in kirtans, I could not accept the principles of

Krishnaism completely; after all, I live in a normal society..." Sigitas R., a student: "I became acquainted with the ideas of Krishnaism three years ago, and took part in kirtans. Some time after I began to eat in accordance with the principles of Krishnaism, I noted that my hair started to fall out. This year I went to a cosmetology clinic, where I underwent a course of treatment. Now I have once again begun to eat meat."

In such situations, insight does not come all at once. I would like to quote the words of one woman, a person with higher education, for whom Krishnaism at one time was not a brief flirtation. "Gradually," relates Natalya R., "I came to the conclusion that the teachings were false, that they are harmful. As the result of following its dogma myself, I cut myself off from those around me, even from those close to me. I think that the spread of this dogma must not be allowed: it leads to alienation of people. Constantly repeating mantra; carrying out other rites; and the rejection of animal food—all of this puts a person into a state of stupefaction."

And another woman, the mother of Iovita P., a twenty-year old woman who also left the sect, told me: "The main thing is, that it destroys love. For everything that lives. For them there is only one thing—Krishna. All else, even their parents, does not exist." And the woman began to cry as she thought about those days, when her daughter left the house, and turned her mother into a "thing" from an Indian painting. It is also hard for Iovita herself to think about those days. It was as if she was living among people; however she did not see people in the literal sense, but mentally as an *idee fixe*; and day and night, even independent of her will and reason, the words of the mantra sounded. It was similar to schizophrenia.

It seems fitting to point out that certain of today's Krishnaites have been diagnosed as mentally ill. The pursuit of an illusory tranquillity has cost them dearly, leading them into a seemingly quaint, exotic world, to try out what turned out to be a terrible *cul-de-sac*. Crippled lives, the loss of their health, and the suffering of their loved ones—is this not too high a price that the worshippers are forced to pay, who speak so much about love for those close to them; but who in fact are militant members of an anti-human religion?

09006

Uniate Metropolitan Accused of Supporting Nazi Occupation

18000216 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian on 7 Jan 88 carries on page 3 a 1600 word article by candidate of historical sciences K.E. Dmitruk entitled "With Cross and Trident" in which he provides a brief biographical sketch of the life of the late Uniate Metropolitan Andrey Count Sheptitskiy. Dmitruk's article appears in response to a recent renewal of efforts in the West not only to

cannonize but to "revitalize the ideological legacy" and "immortalize the earthly deeds" of the late Uniate Metropolitan Andrei Sheptitskiy. The article is on the whole uncomplimentary to the metropolitan stating the the greatly influential leader of several "clerical-nationalistic parties" had a "longstanding pro-Western orientation and was a devoted proponent of the idea of the predestined dominance of the German nation in the East."

K.E. Dmitruk states that with the beginning of World War I, Sheptitskiy rallied the uniate clergy and its bourgeois-nationalistic minions to the support of the

Austro-German bloc. Dmitruk also accuses the Uniate metropolitan of supporting and facilitating not only the occupation of Ukraine by the Nazis but the genocide carried out there as well.

According to K.E. Dmitruk, the March 1946 Synod of the Greek-Catholic Church held in Lvov which "resolved to liquidate the act of 1596 by which the Uniate Church was set up, separate from the Vatican and return to the paternal fold of the Russian Orthodox Church" was the response of patriotic clergymen to the realization of the perfidious deeds committed by Metropolitan Sheptitskiy.

Filmmakers Union Plenum Views Restructuring Problems

18000180 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 12 Dec 87 p 3

[Article by I. Ivanova, G. Simanovich, and P. Smirnov: "Restructuring and the Motion-Picture Industry: From the Third Plenum of the USSR Union of Cinematographers Board; first seven paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA KULTURA introduction]

[Text]The Third Plenum of the USSR Union of Cinematographers Board, which was held on 8-9 December, discussed the question:

"Restructuring and the Prospects for the Creative Development of Soviet Motion Pictures."

In opening the plenum, E.G. KLIMOV, first secretary of the USSR Union of Cinematographers Board, emphasized the following points:

"To a large extent, what kind of moral and spiritual atmosphere our society has depends on us. Therefore, the eyes of many people, both in our country and abroad, are riveted on us. They are waiting to see not only whether we will be able to carry out a radical reform of motion-picture production, but also what principles it will be based upon. The most important questions, however, are: what kinds of films will the reform engender, will we be able to make a breakthrough to a new quality level, and will a fundamentally new phase emerge in the development of our revolutionary motion-picture art? Are we capable of accomplishing this? What changes must we bring about in ourselves in order to make this possible? And, finally, wherein lies the worldwide and lofty mission of all our restructuring and in restructuring motion-picture production in particular? We will ask ourselves these questions and, to the extent that our own powers allow, we will try to answer them.

"...And I regard this plenum as one which is capable of taking a step toward consolidating our creative forces. We must rise above any factional predilections or personal animosities and unite on the fundamental basis of a common concern for the destiny of motion pictures. The latter can and must become an active force for restructuring and the revolutionary renewal of our society."

Reports were delivered by V.P. DEMIN, secretary of the USSR Cinematographers' Union Board, and A.N. MEDVEDYEV, first deputy secretary of the USSR Goskino Board.

The plenum approved the charter and board of the USSR Motion-Picture Fund, and it also elected E.A. RYAZANOV, A.S. SMIRNOV, and V.I. TOLSTYKH as secretaries of the USSR Cinematographers' Union Board.

YU.P. VORONOV, chief of the CPSU Central Committee's Cultural Department, and A.I. KAMSHALOV, chairman of USSR Goskino, took part in the plenum's work.

From V. Demin's Report

There is nothing surprising in the fact that in our work after the Fifth Cinematographers' Congress we paid fundamental attention to the economic and social problems of our large and still unexhausted industry. Restructuring is moving along the same course in all the country's fields. Does this mean, however, that the spiritual can be postponed until later, that its problems will solve themselves, and that we need to tackle only economic matters? Of course not: the factor of unawareness, the human factor, must not be allowed to go unaccounted for, especially where we are dealing with art and creative work.

We must formulate aloud what kinds of prospects we have seen ahead of us and what ground we feel under our feet. Without such an albeit most general sense of agreement on the basic guidelines of the movement, those of us who advocate restructuring cannot feel ourselves to be like-minded persons.

Not everybody—not even everybody assembled here in this hall—feel themselves to be adherents of restructuring. Some people smile distrustfully, others shrug their shoulders in perplexity, while still others have spouted a great deal of hot air but have not lifted a finger to actually do anything. Most of the people assembled here, however, have told themselves the following: it's now or never! History, we are ready to respond to your challenge!

When speaking about the new artistic thinking, we usually narrow our eyes and eagerly peer into the beckoning distance. Nevertheless, it is right here, together with us in crumbs and little grains; it ripened in its elements during the most stagnant years. Despite all its paradoxes, the period of stagnation did provide us with favorable material for thought, and squeamishness toward the general gray stream of false art impelled demanding artists upward to an open and indubitable spirituality. How else are we to explain the enigma of "Repentance," which became an event for our entire art and even for our entire culture?

"A village cannot stand without at least one righteous person." But the fact remains that the vast majority of creative persons, seemingly with the approval of the reading public, became alienated not from life with its contradictions but from ideas because they did not wish to provoke objections. A cult of the "correct idea" arose; such an idea purportedly increases an author's talent ten-fold, whereas an "incorrect idea" automatically dooms him to fruitlessness.

In important party documents the situation in this country on the eve of the April (1985) CPSU Central Committee Plenum was considered to be approaching a crisis. I think that the cinematographer can boldly assume the joyless title of outstanding workers in both life and art.

This union has accomplished a great deal; it has begun even more things but has not completed them. To say, however, that in the area of changing our finished motion-picture product a "sharp turn" has been noted (an "abrupt turnabout" or a "radical turning-point")...would mean speaking unconscientiously.

To plan a masterpiece is absurd. They evolve, by the way, out of unpretentious plans. But we were right in planning to decrease the "gray," mediocre motion pictures which nobody needed; just as we were undoubtedly right to anticipate a general turning of our repertory to face life and its social circumstances, to the conflicts born of humble prose, rather than to the shining azure of the heavens.

Our documentary films have made a remarkable leap forward in the last two years. New topics, prohibited until very recently, gave rise to new modes of narration and new intonations in the narrator's text. "Look, people are living under impossible conditions!" exclaims the film "Bear Country. What Further?" "We are criminals because we are destroying nature" is a theme taken up in various ways by "Masters of the Tundra," "The Dam," "Land and Water," and at least ten other films. Penetrating films have begun to appear about drug addicts—"Wolves in the City," and about alcoholism among women—"The Limit." The boldly sweeping "Bribe" or the rather dryish film about usury manipulators revealed stages of corruption ranging from people at sales counters to important officials in sizable offices. These are films for shock therapy; they act like a cauterizing agent on an infected sore.

During the last two years the feature-film repertory has been amazingly indifferent to the publicistic influence—not even as "elements of a new artistic solution," nor out of a simple and nowadays understandable interest in publicism per se. There is "Plyumbum," whose creators are convinced that a soulless robot is not suitable as a teacher of life and a healer of social sins. There is the half-successful film by Yanis Streych entitled "It's Easy to Fall into an Overgrown Ditch," where the features of a "shady," sinful life on a certain kolkhoz are reproduced in a merry and inventive manner. There is "Assa" with its reprimand to all adults because they do not know nor wish to understand young people. Finally, we have "Forgotten Melody for Flute," with its self-exposing hymn of officials who have gone astray.

And is that all? Is it enough?

It is good if the timidity of screenwriters and producer-directors stems from a lack of desire to sing new songs in the old way. It is good if they do not wish to serve restructuring with their creative art as they previously served other slogans of the day. It is very good if they are waiting for the moment of their own complete restructuring. And it is bad if the slowness of our turnabout is connected all-in-all with the traditional slowness of the cinematographic fly-wheels, which stubbornly refuse to speed up their tortoise-like pace by one iota.

Ahead of us lie new abrogations of common, long-standing taboos. One of these taboos is talking about the working class in terms of flattery. Moreover, despite all the oaths of love and fidelity, it is extremely rare that the workingman himself, whether urban or rural, is the principal hero of our motion pictures. At the lowest end of the spectrum it is a foreman or brigade leader, a section or shop chief. But best of all—a director, institution manager, kolkhoz chairman, or raykom secretary. While celebrating this social stratum again and again in motion pictures that are successful and even very successful, or those which flop or get off on the wrong foot, how is it that we fail to take thought that always—whether in the war, before the war, and after the war—is it not the people who have borne the principal burden of the times? The thesis "More democracy—More socialism!" must also look into these sections of our creative-arts laboratories.

One more social need to which we must respond lest we remain aloof from the questions of the day. Nationality attitudes. Until quite recently complete clarity reigned here in our country: all nationality problems—in principle, as expressed in theoretical abstractions—had been solved in our country long, long ago. But in every day life utterly groundless frictions, even clashes and misunderstandings, are still encountered.

And here are some figures which are well known to everyone: within the total repertory the republic-level studios present 52 percent of production, but only 8 percent are made available to All-Union audiences. These figures are strange. If we believed in their veracity, we could gladly scrap our "basic model"—it would be sentenced and doomed by them. But we know the following: there is a great deal here which stems from inertia, from relying on drift, from bad traditions against which we have not attempted to struggle. After all, it was precisely the republic-level studios which produced "Repentance" and "Is It Easy To Be Young?"

New artistic thinking, which all of us thirst for so much, is impossible without changes in our attitude toward history.

Here we need to begin almost from scratch. Over the course of many years we have cultivated a kind of historical oblivion. It's as if the events of the day in our country evolved just today, were conditioned by themselves alone, and lacked any kinds of roots whatsoever.

For a very long time, unfortunately, our motion-picture industry was an obliging assistant in the matter of creating models. Forbidden topics, figures, and names were, so to speak, doubly banned for this industry. The topic of revolution, which at one time gave birth to masterpieces of Soviet film classics, yielded more and more frequently to the clumsy control of time-servers. The latest trends, connected in the legitimate theater with the name of Mikhail Shatrov, were shunted aside by the motion-picture industry. His screenplay entitled "February" gathered dust for 15 years in Lenfilm's archives.

The blank spaces in history, with which we have begun a painstaking struggle nowadays, are blank spaces in culture and morality. Here, following the lead of newspaper and journal belles lettres, there is an extremely wide field of activity for motion pictures.

Equally bad in politics are a conservative refusal to pay attention to new factors of reality and a frivolous vanguard which does not wish to consider anything but these factors. The situation in culture is completely different. Here it is not the means which are the deciding factors; they are decided by the plenitude of real contents achieved with their aid. The "good old" motion picture, with its clear social idea carefully worked out on a literary foundation and with its virtuoso-style, practically natural style of acting, has been fully subscribed to in our own times by the filmmaking of Iosif Kheifits and Yuliy Rayzman.

The "author's motion picture" is a phenomenon of the comparatively late, mature motion-picture industry. In our usage it refers to a film where the author's will, freely presented to the audience, constitutes the chief artistic principle, more important and more essential than the usual requirements of the genre, dramaturgical canons, aesthetic conventions to be shared with the audience, etc.

Meriting special discussion is the so-called "poetical motion picture." I agree that this single term subsumes a set of too many diverse stylistic and creative tendencies and predilections which are combined quite arbitrarily. I also agree that the creative platform of these artists was contradictory in the broadest sense and could not be completely implemented. Nevertheless, I am convinced that this current of our motion-picture industry was spoiled by persecutions and impediments which for some reason and with particular assiduousness were placed in its path.

Also unlucky in our country was a form which in its structure was, in a certain sense, the polar opposite of the poetical film. I am talking about the "political film." The political motion picture signifies a film where politics itself becomes the subject of examination and the storyline. Examples are "A Great Citizen," or, let's say, "The Sixth of July." Yes, this is a film with a passionate idea but not with a standard slogan! Yes, this is a film without

reservations, but not at the price of being a complete primitive! Yes, this film should involve and propagandize, but what? It is not important where the plot unfolds—whether in Europe or in the Middle East—what is important is that it presents us with truisms along with clumsy, half-baked arguments.

A monological culture presupposes making everyone fit the same pattern and, therefore, able to dress it in the same uniform. A dialogical type of culture directly provokes and calls for dissimilarity and even eccentricity. Competitiveness leads to selection, but in principle we would need a palette with all the colors, including even those which nowadays seem most unexpected.

And so, just what is the new artistic thinking, our sought-after "x," our "bluebird"?

It is social, universal, and historical. It is thinking which does not fear contradictions. Instead of the principle of a didactic monologue, it proposes the principle of a dialogue with equal rights for both sides. It is pluralistic thinking which decisively struggles against the concept of a hierarchy in art. It is thinking which is open to merriment and the more sombre colors, to farce and to profound tragedy. It is thinking which light-heartedly accepts amusing motion pictures but which also does not object to the most dramatic conflicts.

Restructuring requires courage, but not only to declare whom one is for and whom against. There is another kind of courage—an everyday kind of bravery. It is the bravery, patience, and diligence of work; and it is to this that we are called again and again by the inspirers of restructuring.

From A. Medvedev's Report

Experience has shown that, although the past year was devoted primarily to organizational matters, a whole series of problems arose which were strictly creative in their nature. They are being solved and, for the most part, will be solved by the entire practical experience of our motion-picture industry. Such questions are the following. Will organizational restructuring genuinely serve the interests of art, or will we prove to be an element of the "market," striving to achieve economic prosperity at any price? Will we have in practice such a concept as a program of Soviet cinematography which would mandatorily join together the true interests of the state in art with the demands of the audience, as well as with the will of the genuine artist and the creative group? How will democracy be safeguarded from the ambitions of factions and from the dominance of localism? And, finally, what guarantee is there that the process of the decisive, essential modernization of the entire system of creative and production relations in our industry will be irreversible?

Answers to many similar questions will be provided by the practical experience of the next few years. Equally inappropriate are the hasty canonization of the initial experience and a rejection in panic of the contradictory nature of such experience.

Among the problems that we must pay particularly close attention to are the following two: the methodology and forecasting of the fruitfulness of the activity of the new public management of the studios; and the new principles of centralized planning.

The vast majority of film studios have held elections of artistic councils. We encounter practical experience when the new councils defend the old figures as before, when stress on gross volume and fulfilling the plan become the criteria of artistic conscience—and that's all. But it can be stated very definitely that the establishment of artistic councils, as well as their election and approval in accordance with the new custom, is a profoundly progressive phenomenon. This is the foundation of our restructuring. Individual responsibility is coming to take the place of anonymous administrative rule.

Glasnost and further elaboration of the legal foundations of the artistic councils' activities will yield their own positive results.

Now about centralized planning. Should we have it and, if so, what kind should it be? We should, but on a different principle.

Nowadays we need the magnet principle, the principle of support, the principle of extracting all that is progressive, interesting, and talented. This principle is not simple to implement; it was somehow easier to winnow things out. Programming our own activity must not be reduced to a compilation of units, nor to promises, which look very nice in an official document, that during the five-year plan such and such films will be made and in such and such quantities. Instead it should really boil down to an acknowledgement of the general idea of our motion-picture industry's development. But we are very poorly prepared for this.

And in our organizational work we passed through a period of "cavalry attacks." I recall our battles around the 1987-1988 topical plan, when we intended to rapidly eliminate everything old by using the methods of Peter I and Yegor Trubnikov: ban, close down, and expell. The old is not simply vital; it is complex. It does not consist merely of names which at present are no longer on the registers of our presidiums; it is in each of those attending them.

And very simply, we already learned this as the Pioneer oath—renunciation of gray mediocrity, of hack-work, etc. It is more important to understand the meaning of the processes through which we will have to pass.

These processes are quite complex. I'm not going to list here the names of the films, the very latest films, which were made with a presentiment of restructuring; they have become the first swallows of restructuring in toto. Let me just mention "Repentance."

We will not be in a hurry with the new wave, nor will we complain that there is none. Restructuring is painful not only on the organizational level but also on the internal level. Many present-day films are marked by a struggle between the old and the new approaches, and sometimes this occurs within a single work.

I do not intend to weary you with a list of the repertory, genre, and topical trends in our cinematography. Let me just dwell briefly on a group of films which comprise the initial success, the leading edge of our restructuring—films about young people. It is probably correct to say that they deal with heroes who constitute the alarm and the hope of society as a whole. Among them are "Games for School-Age Children," "The Burglar," "The Black-mailer," and the Moldavian film "Iona." I wish to recommend with satisfaction and pleasure the motion picture "Temptation," produced by V. Sorokin, with the screenplay by Yu. Klepikov, and the motion picture "My Name Is Harlequin," by V. Rybarev and Yu. Shchekochikhin. But even in these films, which I am fully confident in numbering among the achievements of our motion-picture industry, we encounter a throw-back to the former timidity, a stereotype of the most important thing—explanation of social causes of phenomena. Either the parents are divorced, or one of the parents has a drinking problem; there is no other explanation.

I emphasize once again that we are at the very beginning of mastering the art of creating—not compiling things, not locking into set forms—but creating programs for our motion-picture industry. It has been fairly said here that the studios' first few proposals have been reminiscent of the traditional set forms of plan units, and sometimes even an assortment for the sake of economic prosperity. New artistic management means not only structural changes but also new goals and new thinking.

Together with the other non-production sectors, the motion-picture industry will make the transition to a cost-accounting system beginning of 1 January 1989. Therefore, there is no time for shilly-shallying back and forth. And we absolutely must study economics, for economics is linked with that same independence of the studios about which we talk so much. A studio that has to ask for things will never be independent! And how can we call the Studio imeni Dovzhenko independent if, due to the slipshod nature of its leading officials and because of the anarchy which is tearing this studio's creative group apart, it has already accumulated a deficit amounting to hundreds of thousands of rubles?

It must be said that we have finally obtained the support of the State Committee on Prices, Gosplan, AUCCTU, and the Ministry of Finance, and a document has been

submitted to the Council of Ministers with regard to freeing the motion-picture industry from taxes. That means one more step in the direction of cost accounting because, when the industry is freed up from the obligation to pay taxes, the state subsidy will also be reduced.

In this connection, the problem of state orders has arisen. The new status of state orders is important. I want to notify you from this rostrum that, beginning in 1989, every author or studio applying for a state order will have to engage in a unique kind of "public defense" of their right to a state order.

And, finally, let me make my last point; it has to do with the program for 1989. People ask me if this program is better than those of 1987 or 1988. Today it is better from one point of view: it has become more conscientious, there are no obvious pot-boilers, no downright ephemeral works.

When you know the potential capability of this or that artist, you understand that he is tackling something not by chance; he wants to do it. But there is not enough publicism, incandescence, or passion, not enough feeling that we are living in very difficult and contradictory times.

* * *

If all the numerous and, at times, verbose speeches delivered during the discussions were to be published in a separate booklet, the reader would see rising in front of him a multicolored panorama of the present-day spiritual life of society and of the motion-picture industry, which ought to reflect its most vital problems. General questions of world outlook and specific criticism aimed at Goskino at the USSR Union of Cinematographers, bold, polemically pointed speeches and cautious, lamentably ordinary these made with one eye on the podium, businesslike, specific proposals and reciprocal claims, aspects of the cinematographers' material and creative life—all these comprised the vital tone of the present forum of these professionals of the motion-picture screen.

Risk is a noble thing and particularly so in art, the producer-director M. Zakharov reminded us. Unfortunately, however, even in the case of success, such risk has so far been completely unrewarded, either morally or materially.

Will we be able to overcome the crisis situation in the motion-picture industry without also solving the extremely important world-outlook problems which have arisen to confront our society? The philosopher V. Tolstykh invited the people assembled here to give this some thought.

The uneasiness caused by a certain estrangement of the union's leading officials from the actual situations which have arisen during the process of introducing the new

model of cinematography at the studios was expressed by the producer-director V. Troshkin, who illustrated this point with the example of the election of the artistic directors of the Central Documentary Film Studio.

Soviet animated cartoons, which have gained worldwide recognition in recent years, have remained the poor relations in our large cinematographic house—this was the main idea resounding in the speech by the producer-director Yu. Norshteyn.

There was a great deal of talk at the plenum about people whose actions are hampering interesting initiatives in the motion-picture industry. Some of these persons were named by the producer-director S. Solovyev. In his sharp, principled speech he talked about the breakdown of the innovative initiative in the system of releasing new motion pictures.

In the opinion of the motion-picture critic V. Sokolov, television films have remained, as before, outside the area of particular attention from the leaders of either the USSR Gostelradio or the Union of Cinematographers.

The producer-director E. Ryazanov spoke from the rostrum with irony and sarcasm about the complex fate of his own works on television.

We must carefully safeguard the talents which have raised and will raise the level of our country's motion pictures to the level achieved by world artistry—this was spoken about by the actor and producer-director A. Kaydanovskiy.

The screenwriter Ye. Grigoryev spoke about the need to turn motion-picture art toward the acute, urgent social problems of the present day. Nevertheless, he emphasized, we must not forget about the essential need of Soviet audiences to see the unvarnished truth about their country's history on the screen.

Negative experience is also experience. It must be taken into account and thoroughly if only in order not to permit relapses of banning "shelved" films. The producer-director M. Osepyan called upon motion-picture theoreticians and practitioners to do this.

Turning to events of pre-war and wartime history, the writer A. Adamovich expressed the opinion that Stalin's screen image needs to be rethought. Because, of course, in the motion pictures of past years this figure has been presented in a lacquered, idealized light.

We have had too many enciphered characters and aesthetic exercises! We must make films simple and accessible to the common people; we must speak with them in an understandable, human language. Such was the strong feeling, as always, in much of the polemical speech delivered by the producer-director S. Govorukhin (from the Ukraine).

A proposal to integrate the efforts of two creative unions was made by the architect Yu. Gnedovskiy. This would lead more rapidly to a situation whereby our presently cold and "official" motion-picture theaters would be transformed into cozy and "domestic" halls within which the audience would meet art.

The young producer-director S. Chernilevskiy (from the Ukraine) reflected, with regard to cinematography, on true culture and pseudo-culture, on the stereotypes and trite formulas engendered by the period of stagnation in which the uniqueness and unproducible nature of the human, individual personality was "drowned."

In speaking about the gradualness of restructuring as a natural and principled process, the literary critic I. Vinogradov called for abandonment of the idea that dissemination of the truth and glasnost can be gradual and measured out, for a half-truth is a lie, while incomplete information engenders mistrust among people.

The distance between our films and the common people is as great as before, and, in my view, there is an unfortunate tendency for it to become greater, noted the producer-director V. Menshov. He stated the opinion that analysis of the reasons for this alarming phenomenon had not been sufficiently reflected in the plenum nor in V. Demin's report. And this, in the speaker's way of thinking, led us to a situation wherein many speeches were neither summarizing nor constructive.

Disagreement with this point of view was expressed by the producer-director A. Smirnov, who emphasized that the present plenum had heard many critical utterances but also many common sense, business like suggestions. He also polemicized against S. Govorukhin's call for making "simple" motion pictures: because what so very many of our country's films lack so much today is specifically a high degree of artistry.

The attempt to seek out the cause of our total failures, miscalculations, and mistakes wherever you like only not in ourselves, as well as our compromises with our consciences, was subjected to criticism by the producer-director M. Shveytser. He called upon his colleagues to make films in which there would be a feeling of addressing not people in general but specific, living people and their moral sense.

The producer-director M. Soosaar (from Estonia) stated his confidence that the very rapid conversion of the republic-level motion-picture industry to full cost accounting will facilitate the strengthening and broadening of ties between the Estonian masters of the screen and their colleagues from other studios and will increase the mutual motivation to bring about a businesslike partnership.

The critic M. Kladko spoke with alarm about how little attention is still being paid by the creative union's leading officials to screenplay problems.

The actor A. Romashin talked about a similar situation which has evolved with regard to the actors' workshop.

The producer-director L. Gogoberidze (from Georgia) focused attention on the fact that many people even now have just not become accustomed to the democratic way of thinking and often take criticism directed at them not as another point of view on art but merely as a manifestation of personal hostility.

Her colleague, the producer-director R. Bykov, emphasized that frank and often even brashly pointed talk at the plenum helped to reveal many accumulated difficulties, acute problems which all of us had encountered in the process of restructuring the motion-picture industry. Now the main thing is to solve them.

The director of the Videofilm All-Union Production Engineering Department, O. Uralov, provided a well-developed picture of what is taking place nowadays in video production, what kinds of problems are confronting those persons engaged in creating, producing, and disseminating this type of television film, which has such excellent future prospects.

Also taking part in the discussions were the following: L. Nekhoroshev, chairman of the USSR Cinematographers' Union Auditing Commission; S. Kulish, A. Khamrayev, G. Bardin, and S. Khodzhikov, motion-picture producer-directors; O. Kurganov, screenwriter; V. Kuzin, director of the Leningrad Documentary-Film Studio; A. Mikhaylov and O. Belousov, editors.

2384

Writers' Union Plenum Holds Conference in Alma-Ata

Chairman Proskurin Interviewed

18000170a Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Dec 87 p 2

[Report by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondents A. Samoylenko and A. Pelekhatkiy, on a visiting plenum of the USSR Writers' Union's Prose Council held in Alma-Ata, followed by an interview with P. L. Proskurin, secretary of the Writers' Union Board and chairman of the Prose Council; interview conducted in Alma-Ata following the plenum; exact date not given]

[Text] Alma-Ata—As already reported, the USSR Writers' Union's Prose Council held a visiting plenum in Alma-Ata on the topic "The National and the International: Lessons of History and the Present Day." A large group of writers—P. Proskurin, V. Lichutin, G. Gachev, V. Mikhnovskiy, M. Murataliyev, A. Tagan, Sh. Niyazi, R. Bismukhametov, S. Aliyev, V. Bondarenko, P. Ulyashov, A. Baygushev, Ye. Sergeyev, T. Ochirova, Ye. Markova, A. Barkhatov and R. Seysenbayev—came from Moscow to take part in the plenum. They were

joined in Kazakhstan's capital by K. Zhusupov, S. Dzhitov, E. Borbiyev, Yevg. Kolesnikov and K. Omurkulov (Kirghizia), A. Karayev, K. Kuliyeu and Sh. Khalmukhammedov (Turkmenia), Kh. Gulyamov, Yu. Kovalev and P. Shermukhammedov (Uzbekistan), S. Tursui, U. Kukhzod, A. Samadov and D. Bako-zade (Tajikistan), and the Barnaul prose writer V. Sukachev.

During the plenum's two days of work, 25 people spoke. The topic of internationalism and friendship among the literatures of the USSR's peoples, which was announced in R. Bismukhametov's report, was continued by P. Shermukhammedov, D. Doszhanov (Alma-Ata), Sh. Khalmukhammedov and S. Aliyev.

A. Kekilbayev (Alma-Ata) offered reflections on the results of a superficial knowledge of history and the consequences of the existence of "blank spots" in it. V. Lichutin and G. Gachev expressed the thought that the writer should work out his own view of history and that the present time demands a determined struggle for the truth in both life and art. They were seconded by V. Gondarenko, for whom the present stage in the development of Soviet literature is marked by liberation from the stereotypes and dogmatism of the past.

A. Tarazi (Alma-Ata) devoted his speech to an analysis of multilingual Kazakhstan literature as a distinctive model of the literature of the USSR's peoples.

S. Dzhitov spoke of the beneficial influence of Russian literature on the emergence and development of Kirghiz prose.

Ye. Markova and T. Ochirova called for a search for new approaches in the study of national literatures. A. Karayev's speech dealt with the need to step up the internationalist upbringing of readers. P. Ulyashov urgently recommended that present-day writers learn the skills of depicting the representatives of other nationalities, of which the legacy of the classics of Soviet literature serves as an example. G. Belger (Alma-Ata), speaking of the accomplishments of Soviet German literature, warned against reducing the concept of "internationalism" to the mundane family level of mixed marriages.

M. Auezov (Alma-Ata) subjected present-day Kazakh writers to harsh criticism for their inadequate knowledge of the history of their people and a corresponding decline in their artistic influence on readers. S. Muratbekov (Alma-Ata) spoke of the mechanism for distributing prizes and offices in the writers' organization, a mechanism which operated only recently and sometimes operates even now. The speech of V. Karpenko (Alma-Ata) was suffused with concern for the state of Russian literature in the "outlying" regions, as well as a sense of the responsibility of writers from the older generation to young writers.

A. Baygushev discussed the utilization in present-day works of the rich oral folk literature. V. Mikhankovskiy focused on the problems of translation.

V. Sukachev noted that such conferences not only permit writers to become acquainted with one another but also expand their outlook, deepen their knowledge, and provide rich food for reflection.

Finally, many of those who spoke touched on the acute ecological problems of the Central Asian region. Thus, the speeches of S. Tursun, K. Nurlanova (Alma-Ata) and Ye. Sergeyev dealt with the disastrous state of the Aral Sea. This discussion was continued at a round table organized by the Kazakhstan Writers' Union's Committee on the Problems of the Aral and Balkhash in the editorial offices of the magazine ZHALYN.

A meeting with readers also took place at the Kazakh State University.

Following the conclusion of the plenum we talked with P. L. Proskurin, secretary of the Board of the USSR Writers' Union and chairman of its Prose Council.

[Proskurin] We saw the purpose of this visiting plenum of the USSR Writers' Union's Prose Council to consist in discussing certain important current issues—they are reflected in the agenda—with our colleagues from Central Asia and Kazakhstan, in bringing writers closer together, in working out a precise and well-oriented view of what is happening in life and literature, and in supporting those who sincerely want to join the new processes. I think that our plenum worked toward these goals.

[Question] One circumstance is disturbing: For all the efforts of the USSR Writers' Union's Prose Council, its leaders, and the people who gave reports and attempted to set the tone of the discussion, the audience in the conference hall of the Kazakhstan Writers' Union remained, to put it mildly, indifferent; and if one does not want to understate the case—and you could not help noticing this—the audience was just indifferent but not as large as it should have been, judging from the importance and heated nature of the discussion. Of course, we are not suggesting that one would have expected a full house with extra chairs brought in, but you must agree that there is a great deal that prompts one to reflect.

[Proskurin] Indeed, there were a number of circumstances you couldn't fail to notice. Although there was no indifference. Here I disagree with you. There was something else: a hidden tension, a waiting. And I myself for a long time could not understand: what, exactly, was the matter? How did one explain it? There are reasons, and they are a lesson for us. We know that for many years history itself in all its completeness and objectivity was banned, and a habit of "blank spots" developed. And there was also an unspoken ban on the literary treatment and investigation of the present day itself, in its most

painful and burning manifestations—that is precisely what, to put it mildly, was not encouraged. And now many people are waiting and cannot overcome their fear of speaking freely and sincerely.

Just between us, the atmosphere in the Kazakhstan Writers' Union at the present is such that any discussion can be muffled in it, as in cotton wool, and any undertaking can get bogged down. It turns out that the "hosts" of our session could not even clearly inform writers about the upcoming visiting plenum of the USSR Writers' Union's Prose Council.

[Question] Forgive us, Petr Lukich, why must that be spoke of "between us"? Can it be such a secret?

[Proskurin] You're right. The state of affairs in the republic Writers' Union has long been no secret either to the public or to officials. We had in mind, relying on the organizational and creative help of the leadership of the Kazakhstan Writers' Union, to discuss as broadly and democratically as possible in Alma-Ata extremely serious problems that require interpretation and solution in our complex and difficult time, but the Kazakh writers neutralized each other, breaking down into groups and losing a sense of themselves as a single creative force. In-depth discussion and the search for a unified direction and for the truth are possible only in a friendly atmosphere and only where the participants in a discussion are able to rise above subjective opinions and personal relations and ambitions. That was the sort of force, one which works toward a bringing people together and consolidation, that we failed to find in the Kazakhstan Writers' Union and, if you will, we remained alone in discussing the visiting plenum's agenda.

Of course, there were a number of profound speeches by Kazakh writers that touched on the most diverse aspects of both the literature and the people's life of their huge republic. The question of creating a good professional school for translators is very acute, and that urgent question must be resolved as soon as possible. Writers from Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenia, Kirghizia and Moscow took active part in the discussion, and a great deal still needs to be analyzed, weighed and generalized, and the discussion could have been even deeper and more fundamental if the hosts themselves—leading Kazakh prose writers and critics—had taken a more active part in it.

There is so much that is important and interesting in life and literature today that it is possible to work usefully and actively and to think, speak and write honestly and candidly, but Kazakh writers still simply cannot orient themselves toward that sort of life and work. The reasons for this are well known. How and in what direction people must reorient themselves are clear. The objective state of affairs in the republic Writers' Union and the times themselves demand that everything be put in its proper place. To all intents and purposes, creative life in

the Kazakhstan Writers' Union has been paralyzed by internal feuding, and this disease must not be driven even further in. For the sake of improving the creative atmosphere in the Kazakhstan Writers' Union, it is time for those whose personal ambitions have already exceeded all permissible limits to come to their senses and, perhaps, step aside. Leaders must be identified who can consolidate the organization. It is impermissible that the forces of such a large writers' organization as the Kazakhstan Writers' Union vanish like water in the sand.

And against this background our trip to Alma-Ata was not superfluous, either, and we accomplished our purpose. The effect of this visiting plenum will benefit literature. It is too bad, of course, that Alma-Ata was in many respects merely the geographical site of this activity. It was necessary to travel as far as possible from Moscow. By constantly gathering in the capital we, willy-nilly, get detached from the concrete aspects of the life of many regions, which are entire "countries" and powerful cultural centers. And by closing ourselves off in Moscow lecture halls, we begin, without being aware of it, abstracting ourselves from reality and discussing general problems in general. But here, on the spot, we necessarily get closer to the concrete matter of life and, regardless of the level at which an activity is conducted, the most urgent problems and sore spots of life and literature prove to be at the center of attention.

It was here that I, like other visiting participants in the plenum, realized how alarming the ecological situation is in the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan. Until this moment I personally could not conceive of the whole extreme situation. An attempt at ecological discussion was made at our visiting plenum; an active impetus for it was provided by Vladimir Sokolov's timely article "The Aral's Fate," which had been carried recently in *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA*, and discussion of the Aral's catastrophic situation had been continued at a round table in the magazine *ZHALYN*, in which writers, journalists, ministers and scholars had participated most ardently.

[Question] Petr Lukich, your words convey alarm over the ecological state of Central Asia and Kazakhstan. It was also heard in the speeches by those who came to attend the visiting session. That is understandable. What is perplexing is something else. Proskurin, Lichutin and other Moscow writers are worried about and looking for a solution to Kazakhstan's acute ecological problems, but the republic writers' organization, which numbers more than 500 members of the USSR Writers' Union, has maintained a striking tranquility on this matter.

[Proskurin] One mustn't exaggerate—there are angry souls here, too, and a good many of them. If one looks at the large picture, ecological problems are not intensely regional. That is the large picture. But the answer to your question also lies once again in the atmosphere into which the republic's writers have sunk and which they

themselves continue to thicken. There is another aspect here. Until recently, and I have already spoken of this, everything in our country was so overcentralized that at the local level any initiative sounded dissonant. And even now we must—and there is nothing wrong with this—more actively share experience from the center with the republics. Both the experience of activeness and the experience of surmounting social and civic stasis, which ruinously fetters thought and talent. In some places the lethargy persists. 500 Kazakhstan writers plus the Writers' Unions of the Central Asian republics. That is a tremendous force, and first and foremost they themselves must think about their land! And such visiting activities as our plenum have, in this sense, a great detonating force; they break up the inertia and the dogmatic view of life.

[Question] What the ecological speeches signified was concern over the fate of people's native land, but there were practically no constructive proposals. Participants in the plenum gave much more attention to the agenda.

[Proskurin] You probably have in mind the highly debatable opinions that were expressed, especially in the report on Turkic studies?

[Question] We won't name the names of those who spoke, but it's not enough to call their opinions debatable!

[Proskurin] It turned out that some participants in the plenum simply were unprepared for serious discussion and sometimes, at the rostrum, looked extremely glum, with their petty and emotionally colored attacks on serious and fundamental things. The ability to carry on a debate must also be learned. Glasnost doesn't consist in conveying everything from the rostrum that God, so to speak, put in your heart.

[Question] Petr Lukich, the subjunctive mood often comes through in your speech. Appeals and wishes are correct. But doesn't it seem to you, a secretary of the Board of the USSR Writers' Union, that it is also time to use authority, in the sense that in many cases passivity and a wait-and-see attitude at the local level are by no means attributable to a process of accumulating energy, but rather to an unconcealed laziness, a willful stubbornness, and an unwillingness to get involved in real work?

[Proskurin] That's a legitimate question. Authority should also be exercised for the purposes of expanding democracy. We received an unenviable legacy. Frequently in the creative unions—and the farther from Moscow, the more firmly—the "world is ruled" by administrative fiat and bureaucratism. These methods have a good many supporters, and sometimes they still hold the levers of power. What can be done so that what is progressive moves to the front ranks and breaks through the crust of stagnation? Of course, neither I nor anybody else has a universal recipe, but one thing is clear: writers themselves should discuss and solve the

problems facing their creative unions. No one will bring us guidance from outside regarding our organizational and creative activities, and no one will give us an irreproachable leader who is suitable for everyone. Yet we have gotten used to waiting for everything to be decided for us over there, by officials, and all that is left for us to do is to lower our eyes and raise our hand. You recall the experience of the Moscow Writers' Organization. What should have happened there. Why should people be afraid of a collegial decision? I'm convinced that no one can analyze matters and cite the ways out of stagnation better than the writers themselves. Preference will necessarily be given to the decent person, the moral decision and the healthy and effective approach.

It is necessary to prepare ourselves more thoroughly for such activities. Also to prepare, so to speak, feedback, so that people locally will feel a desire and take a businesslike attitude toward such visiting activities. Obviously, by and large it is necessary to rely on local forces and not to bring in excessively large groups from the outside. From Moscow it is possible and, I dare say, necessary for the time being to provide the theoretical groundwork for the discussion, to guarantee its level, and to prepare information for reflection.

For the rest, every one of our republics possesses an extremely unique specific background and material that enriches the general picture of our socialist reality, enhances its social and humanistic significance, and permits us to look more deeply into reality and the life of our people and understand the urgent problems that confront our literature. In our visiting activities it is necessary to shift the center of gravity, I dare say, precisely to identifying the internal creative reserves of the republic we are visiting, and to drawing them into our general process of the democratization and restructuring of life.

And it is necessary to illuminate such activities as broadly and fully as possible in our press and on radio and television—at the present time writers' discussions are usually connected with the underlying life of the people and bring to light a great deal that is new, sometimes unexpected, and at the same time progressive and revolutionary.

Kolbin Meets With Writers

18000170b Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Dec 87 p 7

[Article by staff correspondent A. Samoylenko, "Days of Serious Work"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—Siberian Literature Days in Kazakhstan are over. For all the hosts' desire to hold a meeting in a businesslike fashion, it depends to a considerable degree on the mood of the guests. As to what that mood was among the Siberian writers, one can judge from V.

Astafyev's words, which were quoted in KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA: "All of us—including, most likely, Kazakh writers—are tired to death of fanfares and banquet speeches and empty verbiage. It is time to move from words to deeds."

In welcoming Siberia's writers at the opening in Alma-Ata's central concert hall, O. Suleymenov, first secretary of the board of the Kazakhstan Writers' Union, recalled that the Kazakhstan Zhazushy Izdatelstvo had put out a book titled "Storona Sibirskaya" [The Siberian Land], which contained works by nearly 50 writers and became, in essence, an anthology of Siberian literature. Today's meeting is the organic continuation of the creative and friendly contacts between the peoples and literatures of Russia and Kazakhstan that were first established by the Kazakhs Ch. Valikhanov and I. Altynsarin, the Buryat D. Banzarov, and the Yakuts A. Kulakovskiy and M. Ammosov. During these days participants in Siberian Literature Days have repeatedly recalled the teachers and friends of the first professional Kazakh writers—Vs. Ivanov, L. Martynov, S. Markov and P. Vasilyev.

At a ceremonial evening gathering devoted to the beginning of Siberian Literature Days in Kazakhstan, speeches were made by V. Povolyayev, head of the guests' delegation and secretary of the Board of the RSFSR Writers' Union, S. Danilov (Yakutia), R. Filipov (Irkutsk), V. Belkin (Krasnoyarsk) and D. Zhalsarayev (Buryatia).

The evening gathering was attended by M. M. Akhmetov, deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers and K. S. Smailov, chief of the Kazakh CP Central Committee's Culture Department.

The writers were received by G. V. Kolbin, first secretary of the republic Communist Party Central Committee. For more than two hours, in a relaxed discussion that was not regulated by the table of ranks, a serious and honest conversation took place on the state of affairs in Kazakhstan and on the positive changes that had become evident. Naturally, the multinational writers of Siberia and Kazakhstan were interested at that meeting in everything with which we invest the concept of "internationalism." KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA quoted the opinion of V. Rasputin: "One must not take a bad attitude toward internationalism, but we need the sort of internationalism that unites rather than impoverishes peoples, and protects their languages, traditions, history and culture—as a unified organism protects each of its parts, which cannot be replaced."

But it is no secret that until recently it was considered sufficient merely to talk about internationalism, hold festivals under the slogan, "Friendship of Peoples Is Friendship of Literatures," exchange visiting performances by national vocal and dance ensembles, and stop at that. At the writers' meeting with G. V. Kolbin there was

talk about the fact that genuine and effective internationalism is impossible without the solution of acute socioeconomic problems and the establishment of social justice.

After visiting some of the republic's oblasts, the Siberian writers returned to Alma-Ata. On the eve of a literary evening in the Kazakhstan Writers' Union's conference hall, which traditionally has closed the Days of Siberian Literature, I talked with the delegation's leader V. Povolyayev, secretary of the board of the RSFSR Writers' Union.

"Each of us will take away with us extremely valuable information for a writer and a deeper idea of the socioeconomic processes that are taking place today in Kazakhstan. Here in Alma-Ata the leaders of Siberia's writers' organizations made a decision to further strengthen business relations with the writers of Kazakhstan. Next year they will visit the writers of Chita, Irkutsk, Novosibirsk and Tomsk.

8756

Republics Voice Needs at Artists Union Plenum
18000182 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in
Russian 24 Dec 87 p 2

[Article by T. Rykhlova: "Businesslike Discussion"]

[Text] In Moscow, the regular plenum of the USSR Artists Union's management took place. Held ahead of the 7th USSR Artists Congress, it discussed the extremely important questions that will be put on the agenda of all-union forum delegates by the union's management. But the plenum's atmosphere was also determined by another, more important sign of the times: artists and critics held a consistent, businesslike discussion about the development of the Soviet visual arts at the time of perestroika, in the context of radical changes in the life of our society.

What is essential is that things heard on that day somehow fall into a complex, multifarious, yet unified by its purposefulness theme of discussion. For this reason, I am not going to write on the plenum a mechanical report that would follow closely the transcript of the proceedings. The agenda does not always reflect everything: those who were present at the plenum, including reporters, were no passive observers. The mind compared opinions and speeches, some seemed unquestionable, while others were subject to lively discussions.

The topics of discussions were first raised in speeches. The speeches were short, but their main theses were in one way or another developed during the following discussion period. It could hardly have happened differently. Let us take, for instance, the speech by N. Ponomarev, USSR Artists Union Chairman, on the preparation for the upcoming congress. But what is really this preparation? It is in fact a discussion of the questions

that concern artists most, that call for re-evaluation and concrete solutions by the supreme authority of the artistic union, i.e., by the congress.

The speech discussed the goals facing the artist at a time of overcoming stagnation; the need to return to the principles of true artistic competitiveness that formed the foundation of the truly highest achievements of the Soviet art and enriched its national artistic schools and traditions; and the often difficult process of liberating the artist from internal constraints, from the regulation of the art and from the dogmatic approach to creativity. "The final result, that is the work of art, is the most convincing argument in an artistic discussion," said the speaker.

This view was echoed in the speech by Moscow critic V. Manin who pointed out that the established habit of dividing art according to its formal characteristics and of attaching labels — be it "left" or "right" — is in fact taste extremism which is far removed from the aims and goals of esthetic exploration of the complexity of the world.

It may seem that these are theoretical questions. Yet, are they not connected to the broad discussion about setting up various creative groups within the union's framework that took place at the plenum, to the problem of seeking flexible organizational forms that would permit evaluating the artist's work truly by its "final result?"

The speech also addressed the interaction and mutual enrichment of national artistic schools. It maintained that "in our art, there should be no attempts to force someone's opinions or views on anybody, or to put pressure on one region on the part of another." Again, this thesis was developed in other speeches, and it was done in different ways. B. Dzhalalov from Uzbekistan spoke of the need for more effective representation for artists from the union republics in the central entities of the Artists' Union. D. Skulme from Latvia correctly pointed out that in Moscow, the capital of a country of many nationalities, it is time to set up representations of the art of each of the fraternal republics, in the form of 15 permanent galleries or exhibition halls. This is perhaps even more important than a corresponding network of cooperative stores. As to V. Stelmashonok from Belorussia, he spoke how they intend to place strict limits, with the help of local control organs, on the activity in that republic by artists who reside outside its confines, or "official moonlighters," as he rather unkindly called them.

Well, diversity of opinions can be at times considerable. For instance, here is an indicative example. N. Ponomarev provided the following statistics: the managements of the Artists' Unions of the RSFSR and Armenia and Moscow and Leningrad organizations have no artists younger than 35 years of age. I quote: "To care better for the young, we must trust them more." This is true, and the truth was further underscored by the composition of

the plenum's participants, among whom young faces were not dominant, to say the least. And here are some explanations. A. Lopukhov from the Ukraine, while expressing his opposition to any artistic groups and proposing to re-introduce the status of candidate to the union, said also that the young are not promoted to managerial entities due to their own childishness. Ye. Maltsev from Leningrad had a different explanation: the nation's institutions of higher learning (from the Carpathian mountains to the Kamchatka peninsula, I would like to note) graduate 6,000 young artists [per annum?]. (The data is the speaker's.) Is not this too high a number, taking into consideration the fact that it is time to seriously think about "the union's survival." (This is a direct quote.)

It should be noted that the above-mentioned opinions are not the plenum's position. The importance of working with young artists was noted in the main speech, which also emphasized the role of the youth affiliate. I think that to accuse young artists of childishness is to ignore the fact that they are actively seeking their place in the restructuring of the visual arts.

The plenum paid considerable attention to the questions of internal life of the creative union. V. Volodin, M. Lukyanov and V. Myagkov spoke of the new edition of documents which regulate the activity of the USSR Artists' Union and its Artistic Fund. A. Kovalev reported on the process of implementation of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Further Development of the Visual Arts and Their Increased Role in the Communist Education of Workers." The general opinion was that the draft of the Congress' statute needs serious additional work. The most important objections were against the minimum educational requirement for membership. M. Lushnikov from Moscow named the main causes of the shortcomings: the discussions of the draft were poorly organized, and the commission in charge of working out the draft of the statute met irregularly. As to the measures prescribed by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution, as well as other problems of material support for artists' work, here there are difficulties. There is a shortage of exhibition halls, studios and art and other supplies. There are also problems in training and placement of artists, in propaganda, and in publications. Sh. Oradov spoke emotionally of the hardships faced by artists in Turkmenia. He also told the plenum how the republic's ancient crafts are on the brink of losing their ancient traditions.

Finally the last, but by no means the least important group of topics raised by the plenum's participants. Artists were alarmed by the virtual absence of a Museum of Soviet Art in the country (which was mentioned by A. Vasnetsov), by the deplorable condition of many artistic monuments and by the extremely low level of aesthetic education: the schools' curricula past the 7th grade no longer include any further exposure to the visual arts. The plenum's resolution also reflected a serious concern

over the recent decision by the USSR Ministry of Institutions of Higher Learning to close the art history division at the Moscow State University imeni Lomonosov's history department.

These were, in essence, the main topics of discussion at the plenum. The discussion was stern, objective, self-critical. One of the speakers said that at some creative unions perestroika is like a boat where everyone wants to steer but where there are few oarsmen. I think this is an exaggeration. There is plenty of oarsmen. There are people ready to tackle most difficult problems of organizing creative work and to seek ways of future development of our visual arts. Many of those people were present at the plenum. Yet, its resolution seems much too complacent. More was spoken than written down; more still, I think, needs to be discussed at the congress.

Yu. Voronov, Chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Cultural Department, and V. Zakharov, USSR Minister of Culture, took part in the plenum's work.

12892

'OGONEK' Rates 'Best' Contributors to Literary Journals

18000172a Moscow OGONEK in Russian No 46,
Nov 87 pp 18-19

[Article by Tatyana Ivanova: "Frankness for Frankness"]

[Excerpts] And it was too bad about him, and it was necessary for me to go my way.

A. Herzen

About Literature? Not So Much About It . . .

That ideas become a material force only after having taken possession of the masses, everyone knows. Have the ideas of restructuring and glasnost turned into a material force? I believe that an affirmative answer to this question is in order because the changes in the life of our society are obvious. But another thing is also obvious: The path to complete victory is thorny and not simple.

Have you read the article by Yu. Karyakin in the ninth issue of ZNAMYA? A journal columnist, writing, as it is accepted to say, "for the broad reader," recommends for reading, first of all, not a novel, not a tale, and not a story, but an article on a literary subject. Why?

Because Yu. Karyakin depicts the type of an opponent of perestroika. He shows his typical traits and signs. He analyzes his system of actions, deeds and statements, motives of actions, and methods of operations.

On the basis of the material of literature? But the material of literature for research of this type, whatever there is, is in abundance. We are talking about the novels of V. Dudintsev and B. Mozhayev, the poems of A. Akhmatova, Ye. Yevtushenko, and A. Voznesenskiy, and the fates of M. Tsvetayeva and Boris Pasternak—all of this is known, is clear and close to the workers who read, to the scientists, teachers, and physicians, as well as to the engineers.

Yu. Karyakin depicts the type so accurately and clearly that people, who have become familiar with his article, easily recognize the opponent of perestroika in their environment—their work, academic, rural, and construction environment. They distinguish him even on the basis of vocabulary alone, on the basis of phrases.

On the basis of round and well-worn words, which create now the appearance of thought, now the appearance of passion, anger, and triumph. On the basis of political labels, which the type adores to hang up and knows how to interpret in a masterful fashion. On the basis of how he distorts your words, drops hints about some foul actions, picks up on mistakes, cases of negligence, and slips of the tongue, and is triumphant when he ensnared, and when he did not ensnare—he invents, lies, and uses cunning.

This type does not know how to argue in terms of substance, he only knows how to give a rebuff. A rebuff to all who think differently than he himself does, feels differently, and does not see the facts of the past and the phenomena of the present the same way, and imagines the prospects and the future differently. It was he who gave a rebuff to Academician N. Vavilov and the composer D. Shostakovich, to the farmer T. Maltsev and the poet B. Pasternak, to the editor A. Tvardovskiy and the singer V. Vysotskiy. A rebuff! And if a rebuff was impossible—a letter to the authorities. If the letter does not work—a denunciation.

Now, when such methods do not have the desired results, this type has gone into hiding. He does not make use of glasnost, he does not speak up, he wants to remain incognito, waiting for his hour. Yu. Karyakin has thrown him the gauntlet. Will the "conspiracy of silence" be interrupted? . . .

Yu. Burtin proposes another battle to the opponents of restructuring. Will they accept it? Can they accept it?

The article of Yu. Burtin in the eighth issue of OKT-YABR interprets the time we have lived through, the years of the conscious activity of the socially mature generations today, interpreting the fate of Tvardovskiy. Here is his entire life, here are the actions and their motives—everything in full view, in front of everyone. And then you, too, get up on the platform. You tell what your life was like, why you, for example, perceived the activity of Tvardovskiy in the post of editor-in-chief of NOVYY MIR as harmful to society, why you believed

that it should be stopped as quickly as possible. Tell how you achieved this, by what methods, was it necessary to overcome resistance, if so, whose, if not, then, in your view, why. . . . And so on. . . .

A talented conversation about literature invariably, always becomes a conversation about life itself, about the most vital. The article of Yu. Burtin is called upon to help everyone who has thought over the years we have lived through, who is trying to find his place in today's struggle.

How Russia, through suffering, achieved Marxism, how our entire country, through suffering, achieved restructuring, achieved glasnost, and achieved the necessity of democracy. In defending them today by word, actions and deed, we are defending our own revolutionary theory and its sacred ideals—freedom, equality, and fraternal unity, we are defending the goal of communists: "To transform society in such a way that every one of its members could develop completely freely and apply all of his abilities and strength, not encroaching in so doing on the basic conditions of this society." I have cited F. Engels's "Project of a Communist Symbol of Faith."

Did you re-read it long ago?

There is so much that one should read today, but, it seems, there is still more that one should now re-read. In various newspapers and journals, from television screens and from the lips of writers there now sound words to the effect that somehow there is nothing to believe in, that the ideals have disappeared somewhere. To the question: "What do you believe in?"—serious people suddenly answer: "In happiness, in spirituality. . . ." I deeply sympathize with these people and experience a feeling of guilt before them. And I wish that other people who write, along with me, would experience it: Somewhere all of us are not fulfilling our tasks. These are our fellow-citizens who have started not to believe in anything?! And in their own people? And in reason? And in the triumph of truth and good? And in the fact that in the end the most just human society will triumph on earth?

If You Don't Like It, You Will Not Write Very Well

Natalya Sorokaletova, a Muscovite, asks why I never write about Vladimir Makanin. All the more so, you see, because two of his works appeared at once simultaneously—in OKTYABR and in NOVYY MIR.

Well, why "never". . . . I very much love this writer's tale "Where the Sky and the Hills Met", and I love his stories. And I have written about this. As for the tales "Loss" and "One and One", they left me indifferent. And when I remain indifferent, I decide not to write.

This, by the way, is a very serious question, in my view, for radical criticism. From all sides they appeal to us: Make objective assessments. Subjective ones are not needed. But is even one person in a position to make

even one judgment not subjectively, that is not having put into it his own feeling—delight, fascination, or, on the contrary, antipathy—is he in a position, in so doing, to express himself so as for the reader to understand the judgment, accept it, sympathize with it, and share it? What objectivity can there be in our line of work? I think this way, but I'll speak differently, as needed? I'll speak, as prompted by abstract common sense and the opinion of the majority?

But I would not begin to give myself to such a pursuit for anything: It is uninteresting. And without use, in my view.

An objective judgment about a work arises from the most diverse, surely subjective critical judgments. And the more the critic will invest what he writes with his own feeling and his own soul, the more sincerely he will speak, the more people will understand him and will want to support him or contest him.

In one of the surveys I expressed bewilderment in connection with the publication, in the journal MOSKVA, of an article about the epithet "dark blue". And in vain, I believe, A. Kosorukov, an author who had sent an angry letter to the editors, took offense at OGONEK and me. I did not examine the merits and shortcomings of this article. But there are academic publications for research of this type. MOSKVA is not only a literary-artistic, but also a socio-political journal. And the question of the role of the epithet "dark blue" today is not the most topical, no matter how you look at it. My reproach was addressed to the journal, which in this case had made irrational use of its pages; a literary critic, of course, has the right to the most scrupulous philological investigation, and all the more so in relation to such a work as "The Tale of Igor's Campaign."

This, of course, does not mean in the least that the journals should concern themselves only and exclusively with the present and its problems. And I hope that no one thought so. When Olga Chaykovskaya in August in NOVYY MIR publishes the article "Grinev", you see, she teaches us not only to read the classics. She presents us with the very science about which I have talked from the very beginning: The science of the inclusion of our most deserving forefathers in today, the science of memory, and the art to learn from the past. When during the same month of August, ZNAMYA publishes the memoirs of participants of the Patriotic War of 1812 and we hear the voices of people of different generations, different class and military-professional groups, undistorted by either time or space—the living and close voices of our own forefathers—we receive a charge of patriotism, pride, food for thought, and we are enlightened.

When in the July issue of ZVEZDA we read the memoirs of M. Chulaki about Dmitrii Shostakovich, we find out about our own great compatriot and about our own time what, possibly, we did not know or did not have a good idea of, and this clarifies our view. And the newly-found

play of N. S. Gumilev "The Hunt for the Rhinoceros", of course, is natural and appropriate on the pages of the second issue of the journal RUSSKAYA LITERATURA.

As far as the critical section of ZVEZDA is concerned, the extremely subjective and inaccurate criticism seems unjustified to which the interesting book of Anna Saak-yants about M. Tsvetayeva, published by "Sovetskiy pisatel", was subjected in the pages of the journal. The first monograph investigation of the life and creative work of the most complex poets by one of the most authoritative specialists and Tsvetayeva-experts is distinguished, in my view, by depth and originality of analysis, professionalism and correctness. It is strange that these qualities of the monograph were not taken into account by ZVEZDA.

To Bow and Scrape? . . . To Thank? . . .

"I have not read the tale of Astrakhantsev, but I agree with him, and not with you. That Moscow has fallen into decay is the opinion not only of Astrakhantsev and NASH SOVREMENNİK, or my opinion personally. This is the opinion of all so-called simple people from the most diverse cities."

" . . . We have come to the conclusion that you are exactly the same Tanya as is described in the novel "Do Not Die With the Secretary Tanekha". The office novel blooms with a double flower. So that: To keep silent or to destroy it? To destroy! But for you it would not be bad to give information about the biography of the critic: Married, divorced, are there children, does she have a lover? Who gave you the right to call the truth gossip?"

" . . . Ivanova accuses A. Astrakhantsev of an unfair attitude to Muscovites. He advises the writers that, in order to get to know the spiritual world of Moscow women, to look into their handbags. He bemoans the destruction of the beautiful buildings of Moscow—having delayed the trial of the Muscovites. He fosters turning to religion. To understand what Moscow women breathe, it would be sufficient to watch the broadcast of the Moscow-United States television bridge. We, the women of the province, as A. Astrakhantsev called us, do not put our personal [affairs] above the authority of the Fatherland and we will not go to the capitalist for advice with our adversities. We love our Fatherland infinitely. Handbags—this is an intimate corner of a woman, but in terms of content they are identical for all of us. That's the way, comrade Ivanova!"

"Your observer only pretends that she is writing about literature. In fact, she is trying, as this is fashionable among certain parts (the Khrushchevists), to engage, under any pretense, in the blackening of our history under the leadership of the great I. V. Stalin. This was apparent from her very first survey, where under the guise of praise of the young writer Yu. Polyakov, she wrote about the harm of denunciations. But in our

history there were no denunciations, only a struggle with those slanderers and other enemies of our people. Also the obstructed appeal "Kill the cult in yourself." Our country cannot live without a strong hand, that is its nature. A copy of my letter has been sent to the appropriate authorities."

Here are excerpts from a number of letters cited, with preservation of the style, orthography and punctuation of the authors. Here are their names. Oleg Nikolayevich Konev from Sverdlovsk; V. V. Dobrokhotova from Ivano-Frankovsk; Valentina Matveyevna Yurina from the town of Krymsk of Krasnodarsk Kray; and V. G. Smirnov from Leningrad.

Pardon me, comrades, that I am citing your letters in excerpts. Only the fact that I am citing the letters in support of the journal in still shorter form may serve as my justification.

Glasnost makes it incumbent to engage in frank conversation, is that not so? Apparently, it is enough to thank the reader for any letter, to bow and scrape before everyone who has addressed the editors. It suffices to flatter the reader.

I divide the letters into two piles. Provisionally I designate them as follows: "Letters in support" and "letters of protest." In the first pile are the letters of people "who know how to read and write." In the second. . . you saw for yourself what was in the second.

I pity all of them: The illiterate, those who bear malice, who are not able to see farther than their nose, who do not understand that they are ridiculous in their narrow-mindedness and aggressiveness. I feel sorry—but. . . "it was necessary for me to go my way."

Have you never meditated about how much misfortune the lack of culture and illiteracy are inflicting on us? Of course, at the base there is only economics, and culture thus is no more than superstructure. Of course, the most important reasons for our misfortunes lie in the mistakes of planning, in the excessively-expanded bureaucratic apparatus, in the low skill of the workers, in careless work, in loose discipline. . . A few reasons!

Well, but the mistakes in planning, the bureaucratism of the bureaucrats, and the boorish attitude to their own business and the people surrounding them—is not all of this from low culture, not from the lack of culture?

Our society is now in such a stage that the feeling of good, fairness, and morality is not enough to be an active member of it. It suffices only not to prevent progress. To promote it, real culture is necessary.

Indeed, about what patriotism, for example, can one speak with a person who knows even his native language very little? About what democracy? About what active vital position?

And today there are no social reasons for a lack of culture in our country. It can only be a consequence of our own laziness, our terrible self-assurance (one of the consequences of the same lack of culture).

I believe that no deserts before society give the right to aggressiveness with respect to the person who thinks differently than you do, all the more so to boorishness.

If We Are Not Indifferent—We Read

Although this survey is basically devoted to letters, let me, if only briefly, act in my usual role: I will tell what to pay attention to in the latest journal issues.

The story of Vyacheslav Kondratyev "At the "Svobodnyy" Station" in YUNOST about those very years when we lived "under the strong hand," without which, in the opinion of one of our readers, our people does not know how to cope. And Yuriy Shcherbak's documentary narrative "Chernobyl" in the same journal, shocking in its bitter truth and terrible simplicity. About Chernobyl. . . . Some readers consider Chernobyl to be the consequence of precisely the free life, the life "without the strong hand." I dare say that this is a profound and harmful delusion.

The misfortunes of the stagnant years most certainly were engendered precisely by the years of the cult. The epidemic of indifference and irresponsibility was caused by the virus of "small-cog" psychology deeply embedded in us and by the bacillus of one of the most anti-human slogans: "In our country there are no people who are indispensable." Once people are small cogs, once it does not cost anything to replace everybody, it means there is also nothing to demand of us. Such logic.

But the work of Yuriy Shcherbak is nevertheless optimistic. Yes, viruses, yes bacilli, yes, epidemics—but what splendid people, how strong in spirit, staunch, talented in their work, and united!

No, my people does not need "a strong hand", it is only its yoke, and it crushes and prevents it from straightening itself. It only needs to be trusted, to be respected, and to be counted on. For many years this has not been the case—for many years. Genuine trust is only now beginning, and it already shows itself from its best sides. In this I believe piously.

In the July issue of the journal PROSTOR Yuriy Rozhitsin's tale "The Pool" was published, pay attention to it. A whole series of works from the time of collectivization has seen the light recently. Two of them are especially good, I would call them even outstanding: First of all, this is B. Mozhayev's "Husbands and Wives", secondly V. Belov's "Eves". But even in these conditions, Yuriy Rozhitsin's "Omut" must not leave our field of vision, for myself I put it mentally in the same respected series.

"The Children's Home", the notes of the educator Larisa Mironova. The July issue of URAL. It is a shame to discover in oneself dictatorial traits, but, if it were up to me, I would compel everyone to read these notes. I would directly compel them, honestly.

A stern narrative without the slightest sentiments. I feel sorry for the children. . . . Not only because they are robbed, humiliated, and live in the cold and in boorishness. I pity them because they are not developed, not educated, and it is up to no one to develop their feelings. They live on the run and then, to the question: "What have you eaten?" they answer: "Garbage." They steal, they behave like hooligans, and they fight, they are not trained to work and are absolutely unprepared for an independent life. Our children, ours"

Other critics in other publications will certainly tell you about the tales from ZNAMYA—they have already begun to do so. I insistently recommend not to skip Gennadiy Lisichkin's article "Against the Current." Before us is the very case where we either want to be active participants of the changes that are taking place in society—then we read Lisichkin, examine him carefully (and with his help form our own attitude to the processes taking place in the economic life of the country), or we do not want to be active—then we can in fact be indifferent to this article.

Again I call your attention to the journal URAL, to Vladimir Sokolovskiy's tale "The Invincible Kostin"—in it lives the hero and sparkling life, and one reads it with great interest and sympathy. A young, new writer's name, which I will remember after this first acquaintance. The discovery of a name is a joy, and I want to share the joy.

Where Is Our Paper?

Many readers have sent letters with one question: What to subscribe to? I attentively keep an eye on the last pages of the journals, where the program for the coming year is announced, I read with attention the interview of the editors-in-chief of the journals in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. What to say? If you can allow yourself no more than two "thick" journals, I would advise ZNAMYA and NEVA—here are the most tempting perspectives. NOVYY MIR, OKTYABR, and DRUZHBA NARODOV promise a lot that is interesting. And we will keep an eye together with you on the remaining ones: You see, when real restructuring takes place in a journal, this is at once noticeable, and a subscription may be registered beginning with any month. It is, of course, expensive, but the situation with retail is simply disastrous."

I have an old, attentive reader, with whom I have been corresponding for many years. His letters used to help me make surveys: I would miss something—he never. And this is the bitter letter sent to me some time ago by this reader, who knows literature very well and loves it in

the right way: "For more than half a year I have not been reading—not a single work from among those about which you have been writing in the surveys: In 1987 in the Soyuzpechat news-stands of our town I was not able to purchase a single copy of the thick literary-artistic journals. I could not permit myself a subscription. I make extracts from LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, PRAVDA, SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, and two local newspapers. And although I have believed all my life that the needs of the spirit are higher than the needs of the belly, a little bit also must remain to satisfy the "base" requirements. All of this exasperates and annoys me to no end: The impossibility to read—this, this is what I am talking about. I calmly endure difficulties with meat, with fish, and with bread, finally, but I am incapable of understanding why our great and powerful country cannot make it possible for all those who wish to do so to read to their heart's content. And the journals, to judge by the press, are becoming more and more interesting from month to month. . . ." The author of the letter is Nikolay Lvovich Shchits from Voronezh.

Those are the kinds of things. . . And you know, I do not believe that there is any kind of valid reason for the empty news-stands. Because if there is a reason, it is all the same an invalid one. The lack of journals in retail sale, in my view, is not an everyday situation, but a political one. Who does not understand that a subscription to a journal is expensive? Depriving people of the possibility to purchase a journal at a news-stand, they deprive them in general of the possibility of reading the journal. You see, the waiting list in libraries for single issues is a half a year each. Thus, journals are for people who are well off?

But when my Voronezh reader writes that there are no journals, he has in mind entirely definite journals, a dozen-a dozen and a half titles, by no means more. And in Russia alone about a hundred journals are published. . . . Criticism writes, the readers talk, and the passions boil—around ZNAMYA, NEVA, NOVYY MIR, OKT-YABR, and DRUZHBA NARODOV. In an entire year, two-three interesting publications appeared in PROSTOR, DON, VOLGA, and a few more in URAL.

When there is talk, for example, about the fact that the journals are inundated with "old", "forgotten" manuscripts—people have in mind all these same journals, the others are not "inundated." When they write that the journals have become very interesting, they have in mind the same journals, the others "have not become." When they write that the journals have been carried away with negative phenomena—they are writing about the same journals, the others "have not been carried away." When they are delighted by how much good prose, as it turns out, there is in our country, how much fine poetry and serious journalism, they cite the same journals, in the others there is "little."

About the others, about the many dozen "others", no one says anything, because there is nothing to talk about.

There is nothing to reproach them for, there is nothing in them to be delighted with. They are useless. But the useless is harmful, in this lies the essence of the journalism business.

Don't take me at my word. I do not want to "cast slurs" on anyone's work and anyone's efforts. I understand that in all editorial offices people are working, and I make use of any possibility to say a good word about a republic journal and about a regional almanac, I try not to overlook a single worthwhile publication, not a single article deserving reader attention, not a single famous new name. You see this by the surveys. But it looks as if for a whole year the journal ASHKHABAD and the almanac SIBIR did not give me a single possibility to mention them in a good context in the survey. Is there no literature in Turkmenia? Is there no literature in Siberia? I do not believe it. And I will never not believe anyone for no reason at all. The editorial offices work poorly, in the old fashion, and have not restructured. The writers' organizations put up with this and do not want to fight. And this is why our remarkable literature with such improbable labor is forcing its way to the journal pages.

Here is our paper. This, evidently, is also where our retail is.

The dozens of journals which have not given a single work during a year that is worthy of the attention of the readers and criticism (or which have given two, very well—five, all right—ten fairly good works) and which filled the pages with dull prose, nerveless journalism, and indifferent criticism—are these dozens of journals not an excellent, adroitly-placed barricade in the way of our restructuring and glasnost?

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

8970

MOLODAYA GVARDIYA's Ivanov and Author Kaverin 'Square Off'

18000172b Moscow OGONEK in Russian No46, Nov 87 pp 6-7

[Statements by Anatoliy Ivanov and Veniamin Kaverin at the All-Union Conference "The Great October: Socialist Internationalism, Soviet Patriotism and Contemporary Literature" in Leningrad on the eve of the October anniversary; first paragraph is OGONEK introduction]

[Text] On the eve of the October jubilee, an All-Union Conference on the theme "The Great October: Socialist Internationalism, Soviet Patriotism and Contemporary Literature" was held in Leningrad. Thoughts about the destiny of our country's culture and the willingness of people to assume responsibility for its development distinguished the statements of the speakers and masters of the word. It cannot be said that the meeting of minds was complete and that the understanding of the tasks

facing Soviet literature was uniform. In concerning themselves with the same thing—the necessity of preserving the lofty ideological and artistic achievements of the literature of socialism, the speakers treated some names and events in our history in different ways. The statements of the editor-in-chief of the journal *MOLODAYA GVARDIYA*, A. Ivanov, and of one of the oldest writers, V. Kaverin, which we publish according to the verbatim report of the All-Union Conference, may serve as a clear example of today's disputes aimed at the clearing up of the truth.

Anatoliy Ivanov

The life of a person who is a revolutionary is never without deprivations. But it is always a fine life.

The history of a people given to revolution is never an easy history, it is not without losses, but it is always majestic. And the years we have lived through after October—the years filled with the struggle for our ideals, the defense, with weapon in hand, of our freedoms, filled with the achievements of socialism—clearly and convincingly confirm this majesty.

Undoubtedly, our successes now would be still more grandiose if we had not lost Lenin so early, if there had been in the leadership of the people and the country people possessing the same strength of spirit, the same insight, and the same revolutionary genius. But, alas, history was what it was.

At present, Soviet society has entered a new stage of revolutionary renewal. With the help of glasnost and Leninist democratic principles of criticism, the negative phenomena in our life are being boldly exposed, their reasons are being eliminated, and the path is being cleared for the more accelerated movement toward the great goal proclaimed by October. The restructuring and democratization of all aspects of our life have already engendered and, in proportion to their further development, will engender, ever new social and moral processes in society, in the deepest strata of the popular masses. And, of course, these processes will be equivocal, at times contradictory, as life is always contradictory, there will inevitably arise everywhere, including in the spiritual life of society, negative phenomena, which have already been discussed here, especially in the speech of F. Kuznetsov.

Soviet writers and all Soviet artists, of course, will begin to investigate these processes intently and to create, on the basis of this heroic and dramatic material of life, their works, in which both the positive and the negative phenomena that arise in the course of the restructuring and the further democratization of the life of society will be honestly represented. It is clear that this will be in the

works of only real writers, the great masters, who objectively investigate life, and not in the speculative works of the nimble operators in literature, of which, unfortunately, there have always been quite a few in our country's literature.

Recently, reading some journals and newspapers, watching television, and listening to the radio, I involuntarily become lost in thought: Have not some unconscientious people and, perhaps, to speak more directly, some evil-wishers of our cause, made use of the changes and the situation that has developed in society for some of their own interests and for some evil purposes unacceptable to us?

A very high price has been paid for the purity of our literature, and basically with human blood. But have we not let it takes its course to some extent? Moreover, for a quite a while. Remember, how at one time some writers, especially playwrights, began—at first very cautiously, and then more and more insistently and tenaciously—to develop the subject of the hostility of generations, opposing the so-called progressive children to their fathers, who at one time, they said, had been revolutionary, but had then become bureaucratized and degenerate. On this subject there arose and for many years flourished many theaters (for example, the Moscow Sovremennik Theater), and on this subject many writers and playwrights made careers for themselves. . .

Tell me, were not fathers who had become degenerate and bureaucratized former revolutionaries and children who rebelled against them? There were, of course. And it was necessary to write about them. Yes, only how to write and how much? Who, it is permissible to ask those who oppose the children to the fathers, raised a through-and-through peasant country from the devastation of the Civil War and brought it to the years of the Great Patriotic War as a mighty industrial power? The degenerate fathers, perhaps? But about this—about the heroic efforts of the fathers in the creation of socialism and about the passing, by the fathers to the children, of the revolutionary, labor and patriotic baton—we have written little, and we have practically not put on plays at all.

Furthermore, as bad as the fathers were, their leaders were still worse. Very well, many zealous historians, journalists, writers, cinematographers, etc. have treated the entire prerevolutionary history of Russia as nothing but obscurantism, nothing but bloody terror and gloom, not seeing in it anything progressive. Unfortunately, many have almost become reconciled with this. But as of late, the entire postrevolutionary history is also given only in the negative. The remote past—nothing but obscurantism, but all of the 70 years after October are still more dismal, for during all of these years terror reigned in the Soviet Union, blood flowed, injustice and confusion reigned, and there were no decent leaders in the country after Lenin.

I have absolutely no desire to eulogize or justify all the actions of our former leaders, be it Stalin, Brezhnev, or anyone else. But is there no need to nevertheless think about what has been said above? To think even if only about whether there is a country in the world where they would blacken and treat so one-sidedly, if you will, so vilified their history?

Why do we permit such a thing? And do we think seriously about what results from this? Once we blacken our history (both prerevolutionary and postrevolutionary), once we have opposed the fathers to the children, having represented them as degenerates, and have explained to the young people the miserable essence of almost all former leaders of the Soviet country, guilty of all our disorders, then is not logical that from the pages of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA there sounded the terrible question of some young person: "How am I to go on living?" I think it is logical, for they have already taken the history of his people away from this young person, they have already compelled him to believe in the hopelessness of the socialist system, and thus in the hopelessness of his future life.

If we continue to falsify and blacken our history in this manner and cross out everything heroic and patriotic, then we may also not hear such questions in the future anymore.

And the fact of the matter is that such negative phenomena in our historical science, in our literature and cultural environment for the time being are increasing. And the appropriate rebuff to them, alas, is not forthcoming. To take only the wave of newspaper and journal publications, whose content is the radical overestimation of our recognized spiritual-moral values. Well, let us say in the world of writers—Sholokhov would already not be the same as Sholokhov, Leonov—not Leonov, Aleksey Tolstoi—not Aleksey Tolstoi, but as follows. . . average novelists. Once Trotsky declared them to be among the many talented Russian writers who have "joined" the young Soviet literature, or "fellow-travellers". In one of his small books he wrote about them as follows (I am citing): "The 'fellow-travellers' will neither bring the Polar Star down from the sky nor invent a silent prophet. But they are very useful—they will go as the manure under the new crop [kultura]."

It would appear that at present some literary figures perceive these words of the worst enemy of Lenin, the revolution and the state as a precept. In any case, as a replacement of these universally recognized artists who more profoundly than others and better than others have researched and represented in their works the course of the revolutionary processes in Russia, batches of newly-appeared geniuses are hastily announced: These are Pasternak and Mandelshtam, and many, many others. In his article not long ago, Veniamin Kaverin called even Zoshchenko a genius. True, clumsily and bashfully, but

he nevertheless did utter this word. You are filled with wonder, what there is more of in such actions—a frivolous or stubborn desire to defy of history at any cost.

Our press now freely publishes and effusively glorifies convinced opponents of our revolution who have slandered it in their creative work—of the type of Zinaida Gippius, about which F. Kuznetsov has already spoken here, or the modernist artist Marc Chagall (who has also been declared a genius, by the way). Why is all this being done? Is it not worthwhile to give thought to the question of why some organs of the press and literary figures with surprising quickness have thrown themselves into filling "white spots" being determined by them, marking down what long ago and correctly has been evaluated by the people and by time, and crossing out old celebrated names and literally foisting on people dubious artistic standards? This is being done by a method that has been known for a long time. The same Trotsky called Leo Tolstoy "a moss-covered stone block", and Gorki—"a psalm-reader of culture."

It would be time for the various sorts of genius-declarers to understand that only the people and only time determine and name a genius for his real services to mankind. And it would be time for all of us to qualify such actions of the newly-appeared genius-declarers if they are not hostile to the true spiritual values of the people, at least not anti-patriotic.

I have touched only on two or three negative phenomena in the ideological sphere, but at present quite a number of them have appeared. But each one of them must receive an accurate and clear party assessment. For only the in Leninist terms clear, purposeful and strong ideological and political securing of any matter, including the affairs of restructuring, is the guarantee of its success.

We have lived through 70 involved and difficult post-October years and we must make full use of the experience and lessons of what we have gone through. Henceforth we must still more intently look into our revolutionary and heroic history, into every year, into every day, and into every hour of the people's life and see not only mistakes, omissions, and losses, but increasingly distinctly see and understand the most grandiose victories and achievements of all the post-October generations. To see and to understand, in order to tell our descendants about them.

Veniamin Kaverin

I will not repeat generally known truths. Without question, we find ourselves in a new, unprecedented period of the development of our society. The profound changes have not been dictated, time itself has given rise to their necessity. Some welcome these changes enthusiastically,

others are not satisfied with them, and this dissatisfaction at times goes over into blind anger. This is a natural process which accompanies every development. Significant and new is the fact that no one interferes with the arguing.

A struggle is going on between those who think mainly about themselves, that is how the grandiose changes that are taking place in the country will be reflected in their fate, and those who do not think about themselves but about literature.

The first take the view that the restoration of historical justice with respect to Zoshchenko, Pasternak, Platonov and other first-class writers is useless, if not harmful, because with such a burden of malicious injustices, undeserved offences, and, finally, simply crimes, literature cannot move forward or must move on bent legs. The first are rather afraid that their established high position may suffer when masterpieces will be published and are already being published which are capable of taking our literature to the world mainstream, and it will become clear that, by comparison with these masterpieces, their works are not worth anything. The second believe that we must remove the crude, shameless and false accusations from Mandelshtam, Akhmatova, and Zoshchenko.

To the first belongs Anatoliy Ivanov, and to the second Vasil Bykov, Sergey Zalygin, Grigoriy Baklanov, Daniil Granin, and Anatoliy Rybakov.

For the first, a poor knowledge of the history of Soviet literature is characteristic, for the second—the joy that the 1980's are reminiscent of the 1920's, when literature and history stood side by side.

Anatoliy Ivanov read somewhere that I called Zoshchenko a genius. But in assessing Zoshchenko highly, I followed Gorki, who considered Zoshchenko one of the most talented writers, and among the group of the "Serapion Brothers", which included Fedin and Tikhonov—the most talented. On the advice of Gorki, Zoshchenko wrote his "Blue Book"; not without reason he dedicated it to Gorki. Yes, I consider him an outstanding writer. Yes, the fact that for 10 years they put him into a glass cell for disgrace and called him, an officer of the Tsarist and Red Army, decorated in 1921 with five orders, a noble and courageous writer, who opened up a completely new phase in the Russian literary language, a coward and riff-raff, was a crime.

All of this could be called stupidity if this stupidity had not disgraced the 1940's and 1950's of our literature.

Anatoliy Ivanov is not alone. Unfortunately, others also think in this way. Fortunately, a few. The overwhelming majority does not complain about, but welcomes the changes that are taking place in our literature. Literature

is the mirror of society, and it reflects a picture of life unprecedented since the 1920's, a picture that is full of reflections about the past and the present.

Who is blackening old celebrated names? Who considers that Sholokhov is not Sholokhov? Al. Tolstoy—not Al. Tolstoy? Who asserts that Leonov is "an average novelist"? And why here the long-forgotten Trotskiy, whose very name in this struggle of the conservatives with the progressive writers calls forth bewilderment? All of this, as they say, has been spun out of thin air, and, more correctly, not out of thin air, but from the arsenal of the unfortunately well-known criticism of the 1930's and 1940's.

I had to hear such argumentation from those who do not know that Mayakovsky and Pasternak were friends, belonged to one literary group, and thought very highly of each other. Who does not remember what place Platonov and Tsvetayeva occupy in our literature. Who is dreaming about restoring the imaginary literature for which tons of paper were spent. Who does not understand why Fadeyev shot himself. Who regards Akhmatova as a whore with a mystical inclination. And the "Serapion Brothers", the future leaders of the Union of Soviet Writers, as a reactionary group. Who does not passionately want any changes in literature, because if these changes will continue any pupil will point his finger at any writer and say: "King goal".

Yes, we are already breathing our future. And it seems to me that there is every reason to hope that it will be a happy one for our long-suffering literature.

Copyright: Izdatelstvo "Pravda", "Ogonek", 1987

8970

Ukrainian Writer Gonchar Speaks Out on Nationalism

18000171a Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian 9 Dec 87 p 2

[Article by Oles Gonchar: "Where Did the 'Wormwood Star' Come From?"]

[Text] To appear in the city of Lenin, in the city of October, is a special responsibility, a special state of mind. Many of my fellow countrymen from the Dnepr and Volyn, in soldiers' coats or sailors' jackets, met Ilich here at the Finnish train station, stormed the Winter Palace, and received the tasks of the revolution in Smolnyy. In a speech at the All-Union Creative Conference in Leningrad dedicated to the 70th anniversary of Great October, I also spoke of the fact that many of my peers, hand in hand with the sons of other nationalities, defended the besieged city, and fought and spilled their blood on its battlefronts. Some of them later became well-known Ukrainian writers.

For us who live in the Ukraine, the city on the Neva is still dearer because it was here that 1.5 centuries ago, thanks to the efforts of the progressive Russian intelligentsia, that the young Ukrainian genius Taras Shevchenko was released from the slavery of serfdom. In the hard year of 1918, in the period of hunger and chaos, the first monument to Taras Shevchenko in the country was erected here. And isn't it really a symbol of international brotherhood, this monument created at the will of the Russian working people by the Latvian Yanis Tilberg!

In the year of the 70th anniversary of Great October, it is natural to ponder again, to think over what the revolution was for the peoples oppressed under tsarism, and what deep creative powers it brought to life. The first decade after the revolution in the Ukraine saw the opening of thousands and thousands of Ukrainian schools (before the revolution our people did not have a single school taught in our native language); choral groups which later became famous worldwide were created; theaters were born, and a new socialist literature, staggering in its richness of talents, grew up—the people's creativity acquired a mass nature, a sort of spiritual explosion occurred, a universal uplifting, an occurrence so phenomenal that the historians of our culture not without reason call the 1920s the revolutionary Renaissance of the liberated people.

The stagnant years, clouded by the growth of so-called negative phenomena, caused a great loss to our literature and entire culture. Literature sometimes had difficulty recognizing its readers, in serious confusion, it more and more often met up with the signs of moral decay: working people perishing in the soil of alcoholism, women giving up their own children, losing their primordial natural instinct and feeling of maternal love, the callousness, cynicism, and even drug abuse spreading among some of the young people—all of this was stunning, and a response was required, a psychological analysis of such alarming phenomena. I think that literature in general was not afraid to look life in the eyes, it did not, as it may seem to some, avoid difficulties, nor did it stain itself with lies either in cases in which it portrayed tragic situations or at times when it devoted its pages to the brighter aspects of existence; after all, there were some brighter aspects, the people were laboring tirelessly, they were building up, they were thinking, and thirsting for justice. Isn't it from this thirst that the bold energy of restructuring, Leninist and populist in its essence, invincibly grew up?

For Ukrainian literature, the years of stagnation and libertarianism turned out to be still more difficult because violations of principles so dear to the people as Leninist nationality policies were considered reasonable in everyday practice. It went as far as closing the Ukrainian schools, cutting off the program of national history and literature, curtailing the hours of local radio broadcasting, depriving citizens of the Ukrainian edition of the evening newspaper—such zeal was all but acknowledged to be an "internationalist" service. And this is

characteristic: the more entrenched those same aforementioned negative phenomena became, and the more widespread instances of law violation, bribery, careerism, and corruption became in the republic, the more zealously the crude possessors of official seats came down on the spiritual national values of the people. Unique monuments of culture were consigned to the category of "unowned" properties, the history of the people was distorted, and because of this very scandalous departure from Leninist norms it came about that under the force of artificially—I repeat, artificially!—created conditions, especially in the 1970's, national Ukrainian schools were closed by the dozens and hundreds, and all of this was done in order to demonstrate more loudly their "loyalty," zeal, and official orthodoxy. Anticonstitutional and ignorant, narrow-minded actions were for a long time even encouraged by influential Ivans who had forgotten their ancestry; in this arbitrary rule, one could see the signs of what was almost an "accelerated merging of everyone and everything," about which the office acolyte wanted to be the first to report, to announce that everything had been smoothed out and depersonalized, and his wretched office "mongrel" was in charge everywhere.

The trials were not easy for literature and for our readers. How can we not feel pain when we see that the language, that gene pool of culture, its foundation, its living soul, is constantly subjected to humiliation, is pushed onto an inconsequential plane by the belligerent careerist, is in the position of a "nonprestigious" language, and there is little in life for which it is meaningful and useful, except perhaps for vulgar bureaucratic anecdotes. Could an atmosphere of so perceptible a spiritual oppression really have been considered beneficial for the development of literature and culture in all manifestations? After all, the language of one people or another is not only a national property, but also a treasure of all mankind.

Today, under the conditions of democratization, yesterday's petty tyrant feels more and more unsure of himself, the person who thought that for him everything was permitted, who considered bureaucratic arbitrariness not at all a reprehensible style for himself. Today, trembling before advancing glasnost, the violator of socialist legality, the office boss is forced to bury himself deeper and deeper in his bureaucratic debris, in the twilight of unchecked activity, not acknowledging, however, that he is bankrupt. Secretly opposing restructuring, at the same time he searches for ways to best adapt to it, and our duty as writers, clearly, consists of sharply exposing the chameleons and windbags, even if they acknowledge glasnost, but only for others and not for themselves. Our duty also, clearly, consists of working in a truly creative way, writing with conviction and no indifference to support the healthy forces of society, to open up for the country the figures of people who are fearless, who have initiative, who welcome the changes with their whole hearts, and are capable of wisely and responsibly taking on their shoulders the vast work of restructuring.

The passionate desire to work—at restructuring, at the revolutionary renovation of life, at its further humanization—unquestionably all of our fraternal literatures will unite us here even more. One would think that at this stage the role of our central all-union journals would be especially great, since it is no secret that some of them sometimes displayed a strange deafness when the matter in question was, for example, nationality problems, which injure us so much, obviously forgetting that the literature of the Country of the Soviets is multinational and will remain so in the future. Let us always take an example from the Russian classicists, who had such a sensitive attitude toward their brothers of other languages, and in the form of our entire lives let us take an example from the humanitarian activity of that true internationalist, Vladimir Ilich Lenin, who up until the last hour of his life was concerned for the solidarity of our Union of Republics, and for the never-dimming friendship and equal rights of all peoples and nationalities of the country. In the interests of the work ahead of us, worthy creative participation in the renewal of society, we should, clearly, in our literary environment, place more and more value on the spirit of friendship, sincerity, and mutual understanding, and affirm our feelings in specific, everyday practice—it is for the sake of this that in, for example, the Ukraine, republic publishing houses regularly put out, in excellent translations, a library of works of all the fraternal literatures—both the large and the small ones. Restructuring is not just a gift from fate, it is also an appeal to action, an appeal, I should think, no less strong and justified than that which was made to cultural figures during the years of the revolution and the years of the Great Patriotic War.

We can do a great deal. Evidence for this is the growing voice of public opinion, the activation not only of publicists but also of all genres of literature and art, movements, which received the resolute support of the party and the government, to protect the Baykal and Yasnaya Polyana, the wave of articles and speeches for saving Lake Sevan and the Aral Sea, and also a number of publications thanks to which our unhappy Chernobyl, which rocked the planet, came more and more clearly out from the cloud of disinformation.

Writers of the Ukraine are investing a great deal of courage in the artistic study of problems touching on the vital interests of society and each family. The disturbing publications on Chernobyl by Boris Oleyunik and Yuriy Shcherbak, the strong, irreproachably argumentative writings of Sergey Plachinda, Valeriy Knyazyuk, Yuriy Stadnichenko, and Bogdan Sushinskiy on the most urgent questions of protecting nature, language, and culture, and the in-depth studies by many other writers of moral and ecological problems are meeting with broad support from readers. We are taking a stand to raise the feeling of dignity in every individual, and the feeling of Soviet patriotism, to see that the generation growing up in schools and kindergartens command both the Russian and the Ukrainian languages with exactly the same love, perceiving in a natural interconnectedness the concepts

of the international and the national, from the harmonious combination of which a deep humanistic “sense of a unified family” is engendered in the heart.

A few words about the interrelations between literature and our modern science, and especially the departmental understanding of life. They take offense at us, they write complaints about writers’ rudeness, they complain that we are, according to them, nearly always encroaching on areas outside of our sphere. It cannot be denied, the successes of science are unarguable, no one is going to belittle them. I think, however, that modern science, with its fantastic, not always controlled, and, perhaps, not fully understood power must not be allowed to be too self-sufficient, it must not disregard public opinion, including the opinion of literature. After all, it is worth something to note that exactly a month before the Chernobyl catastrophe our writers’ newspaper *LITERATURNIA UKRAINA* published very disturbing material about the state of affairs at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station—and if the people whose business it is to read such materials had read it, and if glasnost was respected at the station, the catastrophe could perhaps have been avoided entirely.

It is well-known that currently the Ukraine is choking from being oversaturated with industry, particularly harmful chemical industry; people are suffering from disease, the water is polluted, we are running out of fields, and here and there the environment of our home is becoming unsuitable for life. Who should we ask where the storks and swallows have disappeared to? Why are nuclear power stations springing up one after another, almost end to end: Rovenskaya and Khmel'nitskaya, on the Dnepr—Zaporozhskaya, and not far away Yuzhno-ukrainskaya, and why are they moving so fast to dig the foundations, gather up the countryside, and hack down woodland preserves for yet another one, the not even officially confirmed Chigirinskaya Atomic Power Station? And isn't the end to all this clear, reactors going up in the polesye, in the steppes, and in the Crimea, and ideas being brought forth to place atomic hoods even in the upper reaches of the Desna, our last remaining river which is unpolluted with wastes, in the land which up until now has been the source of the light of “The Tale of the Host of Igor.”

It is clear to everyone that we cannot get along without power engineering, nor, obviously, without chemistry, but what is the price to us to attain these bitter wealths? Will all of these supergiants constructed in the most beautiful places be justified, if they form a desert around themselves, if they destroy nature, if they deprive mankind of the very poetry of life, the happiness of living and laboring in a natural, pure and safe environment?

One forms the impression that we are nearly always putting narrow departmental interests above the interests of the society, that no one ever asks the opinion of the people regarding the value of new departmental

construction projects, and the narrow-minded bureaucrat in the grip of gigantomania keeps asserting that "science demands victims." And can we, the writers of the country, be silent under such a state of affairs, can a literature conscious of its responsibility and our entire creative intelligentsia even assent to the self-assured departmental bigwigs who trample the principles of socialist humanism underfoot and defend their own actions from the slightest public criticism, would it suit us not to express the things that are currently so troubling people's minds, and deeply affect the fate of millions of people?

From the mouths of our best scientists, not technocrats nor pragmatists, but those who are fully conscious of their intellectual and moral responsibility for what is going on and for people's future, we sometimes hear that the metaphoric "domesticated" atom seems to their minds a still-dubious acquisition, and its "advantages" have not been so universally proven, guaranteeing, as some claim, "ecological purity" to the planet. All of these Trojan-horse gifts of the 20th century should still be weighed as strictly as possible, pondered from every angle, checked and checked again for soundness, humanity, and for their morality or immorality.

For the sake of justice, it must be said that science too, clearly, does not always find it simple to hold back the onslaught of powerful departments, the adherents of sweeping projects. For instance, the current question of erecting the grandiose Ochkovskaya dike, which is supposed to fence off the entire Dnepr-Bug estuary from the Black Sea. Biological scientists are expressing the opinion and authoritative experts are cautioning that if these ideas are implemented, the mouth of the Dnepr would turn into a vast stinking bog, choked with blue-green algae, where everything alive would suffocate, and although the designers of the project themselves admit the reality of this threat, and although this "project of the century" has still not yet been conclusively confirmed, nevertheless the land reclaimers in the estuaries...are already beginning work. What do we call this, how do we explain it?

I think that in such cases it is extremely essential to ask the will of the people themselves, the opinion of the indigenous inhabitants of the region, those who in the course of their lives have labored in these lands and are better able than others to determine: is it worth it to lose this tiny river, to let this fruitful Chernozem go to Cyclopean projects with consequences which are not understood? It has not been our custom to ask people whether they want to rename a city or an old street, or what they think about this strange Chigirinskaya Atomic Power Station in a densely populated, historic region which is so dear to all of us. Who should be asked and why? In the maze of officialdom, after all, they frequently have a skeptical attitude toward public discussions of various types of "epoch-making" projects: what can you expect, they say, from people who are not competent, who do not have the credentials?

No, the people are always competent, and they have the highest credentials!

Both literature and science, I think, must cast off their ambitions and harmoniously, hand in hand, from humanistic positions, labor in the name of humankind and its future. We should strive to ensure that the labor of the mind and heart of each person are in accord with the conscience, that each person alive is sure that he will not bring harm either to humankind or to nature through his actions and intentions.

In conclusion, let me say one more thing. Among Ukrainian writers, the idea has been ripening for some time to call an international "Chernobyl forum" of the intelligentsia—perhaps it would be worthwhile to support this idea? To gather together in order to ponder together where it came from, this "Wormwood Star"—from the biblical nights or from the nights to come? Why did it choose us in particular, what did it want, so strangely and terribly, to say to this century, what did it want to warn all of us about?

And what should literature be following this global shock, after all in our very sense of the world, level of cognition, and in our very understanding of the role of the human race and its highest destiny, we can never again be the same as we were in the previous thousands of years.

All of us, the writers of the peoples of the Soviet Union, and our foreign friends, are today familiar, I think, with the strong feeling of hope in connection with the agreement to eliminate two classes of missiles. The European intelligentsia and the intelligentsia of other continents today as never before are in need of great unity. The recognition of the collective responsibility of all mankind for the fate of the planet, and the growing striving of peoples toward friendship and lasting peace are becoming the cause and the passion of millions of people. The writers are no exception here. We live for this, and for this we will labor.

12255

Literary Journal Experiments With Young Contributors

18000171b Moscow *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA*
in Russian 9 Dec 87 p 5

[Interview conducted by *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* Correspondent N. Zenova with V. Lukyanin, chief editor of *URAL*: "For a Narrow Circle? The Journal *URAL* Conducts an Experiment"; first paragraph is *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* introduction]

[Text] "The issue of *URAL* which you are now holding in your hands is markedly different from any of the issues previously published. It is different, as you have already noticed, both in external appearance and the principles of format, but the main thing is the content.

The issue was put together from pieces which we previously did not accept for publication. Which we did not accept on principle...." Thus begins a note to the readers from the editorial office of URAL, which will be published in the next issue. This issue is experimental, and the work on it has already been completed. Our correspondent asked Chief Editor of URAL V. Lukyanin to explain the essence of the experiment.

[Answer] In recent years we have had constant debates: how should we live in the future, how can we command authority with the readers?

At one of the open party meetings, the head of the Department of Prose, the young writer V. Iskhakov advanced this idea: let's put together a youth issue, by the efforts of the social editorial board, and give the opportunity to speak out in it to individuals who were previously denied this chance. I immediately supported this idea, but I set a condition: I will not interfere in the work, you got yourselves into this—you can get yourselves out of it. I reserve for myself only the right to veto: either I will sign the completed issue or I will turn it down.

[Question] Was another issue prepared at the same time just in case?

[Answer] I had some such idea at the beginning, but I gradually became convinced that what they "had gotten themselves into" was being handled in a sufficiently interesting way, and an extra insurance policy was hardly necessary.

Pieces were selected for the issue which are unusual primarily in the form of expressing artistic ideas and the methods of converting impressions of life into the "substance" of art. In the world of some of them, the reader will not find it at all simple to get used to things, if his taste has been trained in accordance with the tradition of depicting life in the "forms of life itself."

[Question] But after all, the journal, nevertheless, is made not for a narrow circle of connoisseurs who are interested in demonstrations of the new possibilities of artistic expressiveness, but for a wide readership.

[Answer] But who knows just how narrow a "narrow circle" is? Perhaps, it is already wide enough? Who can answer this question? Only the reader himself.... We are counting very much on getting responses—they will help us to sum up the results of our experiment, to determine how fruitful the quests of the authors and the editorial office were.

[Question] This is a job for the future, but for now, what is your personal impression of the issue—as a critic and an editor?

[Answer] The impression of the issue is fairly mixed. But something unquestionably important and interesting has come up: I am convinced that we have a new generation of capable young people who are seeking their own way. In literature, they are inclined to see literature to a much greater degree than many representatives of the older generation, writers of the traditional realm. No matter how foreign to my taste some of the "peculiarities" of these youngsters are, I must acknowledge that there was not a single thing proposed for publication about which I could say: it shows no talent, it is without a sense of language and style.

And for the collective—now I am speaking in the person of the editor—the results of the experiment are now clear: it has brought us closer together, it has strengthened the atmosphere of trust.

[Question] Valentin Petrovich, one last question: this experimental issue of yours is a manifestation of the interests of your readers and of their level—this is useful, of course. But after all there is another task as well—to influence this level. Well, if they do not accept your experiment, if the majority come out against it—what then?

[Answer] The point is, we are not experimenting in a vacuum. All the policies of URAL today are calculated to raise the cultural level of our readers. I hope that the things selected for publication next year will help us to resolve these tasks. And we will be printing works by B. Ruchyev and V. Makanin, N. Nikonov and K. Lagunov, O. Trifonova-Miroshnichenko handed her novel over to us (in the figure of the main character one can divine Yuriy Valentinovich Trifonov, even in the manner of a portrait), and Yu. Semenov. We are publishing V. Nabokov's novel "Dar" [The Gift] with a foreword and an afterword in which all the necessary accents will be laid out as required.

12255

PRC Interest in Soviet Literature, Language Described

18000122 Moscow *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* in Russian 16 Dec 87 p 2

[Article by Svetlana Selivanovna: "How They Read Us In China"]

[Text]

Letters from Nanking

Two years ago I received an unexpected letter from China. The unknown correspondent wrote: "I send you hearty greetings from the far-off south Chinese city of Nanking. Early in 1985 I watched on television as you acquainted readers with three new and timely novels—"Porogi" [Steps] by I. Grekova, "Posledniy pereulok" [The Last Alley] by L. Karelin, and "Bez vsyakikh

polnomochiy" [Without Any Authority] by B. Megreli." (I might add parenthetically that at that time I had a television series called "Krug chteniya" [The Reading Circle], in which I told about literary novelties in our journals.) "...I found, read, and recommended these novels to publishing houses. My translations will come out in print in 1986. If possible, please tell me the reaction of Soviet critics to these works, and recommend some new books".

At the end of the letter my Chinese correspondent told a little about himself. "I am a teacher of Russian literature at Nanking University. I am 40 years old. As a boy I sang "Moscow-Peking". When I was a young man, I selected the Russian language and literature as a specialty for my whole life. I wanted and still want to benefit mutual understanding of the Chinese and Soviet peoples..."

Of course, I immediately answered Yu Ichzhun—that was the author of the letter—and soon received another reply from China.

"At your suggestion, I recommended for publication certain works of Soviet writers which appeared last year. They told me that "Igra" [The Game] by Yu. Bondarev and "Pozhar" [Fire] by V. Rasputin had already been translated into Chinese and are awaiting publication. They also supported the idea of translating "Pechalnyy detektiv" [The Sad Detective] by V. Astafyev. The same is true for "Imitator" [The Imitator] by S. Yesin. Also, I have already written a journal article about "Fuku!" by Ye. Yevtushenko".

The answer to my second letter came immediately.

"I read the novel by Chingiz Aytmatov, "Plakha" [The Executioner's Block] which you wrote about. I wrote an article on it and sent it to the journal. On 21 October I watched the "Literary Almanac" on television, in which critics I. Zolotusskiy and L. Anninskiy talked about "Plakha". It seems to me that they disagreed with many things in the new Aytmatov novel, especially in its second part... I am nevertheless inclined to give a higher evaluation of the novel. I believe that the second part is in its own way strong in an artistic as well as in an idealistic sense. Avdiy, in my opinion, is a unique Idiot in the epoch of 20th century civilization. Maybe in time the value of the Aytmatov novel and the image of its main character will become more apparent..."

In his next letter Yu Ichun shared his plans.

"I would like to compile a yearly almanac which would present the most popular Soviet works and their authors in a given year. My idea has been approved by the editors of the Hailun Tsian publishing house. Therefore, the review article which you sent me in February of this year has been a great help to me. I ask you to write another such article at the end of this year..."

To be honest, it was difficult for me to keep up with the pace of my correspondent. "I have already read, I have already translated, it is already being published...", and this about almost every work on which I have reported.

I wondered whether it was the indefatigable character of my Chinese colleague, his personal fervent devotion to Soviet literature, or whether the interest in current-day China really was so great that almost all of our new literary works go right to publication. A fortunate incident helped me to find an answer to this question. In October of this year I had occasion to visit China.

KAPRYAL, Member of MAPRYAL

Here too we must begin from afar and remind the reader that MAPRYAL is the International Association of Russian Language and Literature Instructors formed 20 years ago. (Exactly 20. This is an anniversary year for MAPRYAL). At the present time, the association unites specialists in Russian philology from 28 countries, has its own press organ—the journal RUSSKIY YAZYK ZA RUBEZHOM, has UNESCO status, and generally is one of the authoritative international cultural organizations. As soon as MAPRYAL was organized, it was immediately joined by the national associations of Russian philology specialists in the world's major countries, except the Chinese. In China at that time there was simply no such association, although, of course, Russian studies did exist and even had very old and deep-rooted traditions. It was only in 1981 that the Chinese instructors of Russian language and literature at the philological VUZes unite under the auspices of KAPRYAL. The abbreviation, as one may easily guess, is easily expanded—the Chinese Association of Russian Language and Literature Instructors. (We might add that, aside from KAPRYAL, there are two other Russian language studies organizations in China at the present time. One unites the secondary school teacher, and the other—Russian language instructors at non-philological VUZes.

KAPRYAL was founded in Shanghai, and its president is Shanghai University Professor Chu Menchao. Much has been accomplished in slightly over 6 years. Two all-Chinese conferences on Russian language studies have already been held, and a third is being planned. And yet KAPRYAL could not help but feel inhibited within its framework. It needed organizational and scientific ties with world Russian philological studies. It needed access to the broad world arena. MAPRYAL could provide all of this. And so, 2 years ago, in April of 1985, KAPRYAL became a real member, and we might add, a very active one. Already the next year Chinese specialists in Russian philology participated in the work of the 6th International Association Congress held in Budapest.

In another year they themselves hosted and organized the 7th International Conference of Russian Philological Journal Editors.

Editors of journals from Bulgaria, Mongolia, Poland, the USA, and Czechoslovakia came to this conference. (I, too, found myself in China in October of this year as a participant). Our Soviet delegation also came. It was headed by Professor V. Kostomarov, who was the MAPRYAL secretary-general, director of the Russian Language Institute imeni A. S. Pushkin, and academician of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. The delegation also included A. Abramovich, editor-in-chief of RUSSKIY YAZYK ZA RUBEZHOM, L. Babayeva, editor-in-chief of RUSSKIY YAZYK V AZERBAYDZHANSKOY SHKOLE, Professor I. Barannikov, editor-in-chief of RUSSKIY YAZYK V NATSIONALNOY SHKOLE, V. Ivanov, editor-in-chief of RUSSKAYA RECH, and L. Maksimov, assistant editor-in-chief of RUSSKIY YAZYK V SHKOLE.

Of course, the Chinese delegation was particularly impressive. It was headed by the gracious host of the conference, which was held at the Peking Institute of Foreign Languages, the rector of this institute and KAPRYAL vice-president, Professor Van Fusyan. The delegation was also comprised of Russian language and literature instructors from almost all the Chinese VUZes affiliated with KAPRYAL, and mainly—editors of journals on Russian studies. And how many of these (journals) do you think there are in China? There are six in all (three linguistic and three literary). Probably no other country in the world has that many. So in this respect, the Chinese specialists in Russian studies have the lead. However, they also do not lag behind in anything else, as for example in the system of training specialists in Russian philology as well as, we might add, specialists in other foreign languages. We were able to judge this if only by what we saw at the Peking Institute of Foreign Languages, where we not only worked, but also lived for our entire 10-day stay in China.

The Institute

The Institute is among 36 leading VUZes in China (altogether there are over 1,000 VUZes there). It is located in a rather remote region of Peking and occupies a huge territory—an entire little city! It has 11 faculties offering 28 languages. Russian is in second place, after English. The Institute offers courses to prepare translators for the U.N. There are two scientific-research centers—one on foreign literature and one on foreign languages, as well as two in-house presses. One publishes scientific-methodological literature and the other—textbooks and instructional aids, including recordings and video cassettes, color slides and films. Here too, on the Institute's territory, is a store where you can buy all of these things. It is interesting that cassette recordings of our songs are especially popular—"Podmoskovnyye vechera" [Moscow Nights], "Katyusha", "Ryabinushka" [Ashberry]... So, my advice to anyone planning to visit China is to take along records and cassette recordings of our songs. They will be the best souvenirs.

The institute has very broad international contacts. Every year it holds at least three international symposia. It has established scientific ties with 27 leading universities in 17 countries. As yet it has no such direct ties with Soviet VUZes, although as Van Fusyan said, recently he spoke in Moscow with our Deputy Minister of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education A. N. Belov, and proposed sending Soviet specialists to the institute as visiting lecturers. A. N. Belov accepted the proposal.

As yet, out of 70 foreign specialists at the Institute, there are only two of ours—O. Bolotina from the Far Eastern State University, a sinologue who conducts a seminar on literary translation, and A. Volkov from MGU. He is working his first year there, teaching various linguistic courses. There are also 18 of our students studying at the Institute. Of course, this is very few, but the groundwork has been laid. Altogether there are 3,500 students enrolled in daytime courses. Many of them live in the dormitory which is located here, on the territory of the institute. It was interesting to observe in the mornings how they all happily and with great concentration engage in mysterious Chinese gymnastics—ushu.

A large part of the instructional time is spent in the audiolinguistic center. There is something to envy! It has the latest Japanese instrumentation, display screens, video recorders, a splendid film hall, and excellent audiolingual booths. Every day television programs are received from the USA and USSR, recorded on video tape and immediately viewed. For those studying Russian, Soviet films are shown regularly. We sat in on one of the lessons. On the television screen was Red Square. They were watching our holiday parade. They watch and listen (each one sits in a separate booth with headphones) to the text read by the announcer. They write it down in their notebooks, and then translate it.

And here is a humorous episode. Two members of our delegation, Valeriy Vasilyevich Ivanov and Leonard Yuryevich Maksimov, were walking along a little side street near the Institute during their free time. A Chinese man comes up to them and addresses Ivanov in excellent Russian. "I recognized you. You are Ivanov". The latter was awe-struck. Here? In Peking? How? As it turned out, the Chinese man was in charge of the video recording office at the Institute and often saw Ivanov in our broadcast "Russkaya rech" [Russian Speech]. Later, when we came to his office on our tour, he showed us his riches—an archive of video cassettes with recordings of the most popular Soviet television broadcasts. I remember thinking: "We should study foreign languages like that! Something might even come of it."

As I have already said, the Peking Institute of Foreign Languages is not only an educational institution, but a very large scientific center. Among the 10 periodical publications which it publishes there are two journals on

Russian philological studies—RUSSKIY YAZYK and SOVREMENNAYA SOVETSKAYA LITERATURA. I would like to tell about the latter in greater detail.

Journals and Editors

On second thought, I will tell you all at once about three Chinese journals devoted to our literature. That is because, as it became apparent from conversations with their editors, these journals share common problems.

Den Shupin is the editor-in-chief of SOVREMENNAYA SOVETSKAYA LITERATURA. She is a small, frail woman, a little shy but very friendly. At my invitation, she came to visit me together with her colleague Chan Tinhua, the assistant editor-in-chief of SOVETSKAYA LITERATURA. The journal is published by the Institute of Soviet Literature of the Peking Pedagogical University. That evening I had another guest, a graduate student of the Peking Language Institute, Shen Li or Volodya, as everyone called him. (The Chinese generally give a second, Russian name to those studying Russian). We drank tea. (Every morning in our rooms—and we lived in a special wing for foreign specialists—there appeared the necessary attribute of any Chinese household: a large thermos filled with hot water and packets of aromatic jasmine tea).

Den Shupin told us that she had studied at the same institute where she now works. Unfortunately, she had never been to the Soviet Union, but at that time, in the 50's, there were very many Soviet specialists working in China, and she was able to learn the language well. She has been in charge of the journal since 1979. It was founded that year. There have already been 44 issues published, with overall circulation of 1,050,000 copies. There have been over 280 works of Soviet writers published in Chinese translation. Let us take, for example, the last 5 issues. They contain a play by M. Shatrov, "Diktatura sovesti" [Dictatorship of Conscience]; a story by N. Yakovlev, "Marshal Zhukov"; a story by A. Platonov, "Yuvlenilnoye more" [Juvenile Sea]; poems by N. Gumilev and B. Pasternak; a novel by B. Shukshin, "Lyubaviny"; a film script by G. Panfilov and A. Chervinskiy, "Tema" [Topic]; a story by S. Zalygin, "Zhenshchina i NTR" [The Woman and the Scientific-Technical Revolution]; a story by Yu. Rytkheu, "Vozvrashcheniye na zemlyu" [Return to Earth]; a review of the novel by Ch. Aytmatov, "Plakha"; the novel by V. Dudintsev, "Belye odezhdy" [White Vestments]; a short story by V. Bykov, "Karyer" [Quarry]; a short story by V. Rasputin, "Pozhar" [Fire], and new works by V. Makanin, A. Kurchatkin and A. Kim.

It seems that the journal has already attracted a constant readership. Here is a letter from its recent mail.

A docent from the Institute of Thermoenergetics at Tientsin University, Gun Yunyi writes (we might add that the journal's readers are people from the most varied professions, not only philology): "As a long-time

subscriber of your journal, I have always had a deep respect for the work of your editorial staff. I believe that you have undertaken not some fashionable work, but have opened a window for us through which we can see how people live and work in Lenin's homeland, and what their spiritual condition is. Reading your journal, I become convinced that the works of Soviet writers are imbued with philosophical thought, illuminated with the light of their ideal, and this inspires us and strengthens our faith in the future..."

And there are many such letters.

"Yes, our mail is very good, too," Chan Tinhua joins in the conversation.

"Two years ago we printed a story by Boris Vasilyev, "Zavtra byla voyna" [Tomorrow There Was a War] in our journal. Immediately we received a flood of letters. Here, for example, is what a student at the base school of Tsinghua University wrote: "The story by Boris Vasilyev, 'Tomorrow There Was a War', had a great impact on our fellows... Some people read it in the washroom after work... Our Komsomol group held a heated discussion. Everyone expressed their opinion, even the quiet ones spoke up".

"Generally," continued Chan Tinhua, "we translate much material which is practically the most significant. In 8 years (our journal has been in existence since 1980) we have published 286 works by 177 writers. Among these was new prose by V. Tendryakov, P. Proskurin, V. Astafyev, D. Granin, S. Alekseyevich, V. Kondratyev. We also published the "Master and Margarita" and "Sobachye serdtse" [A Dog's Heart] by M. Bulgakov, "Priklyucheniya obezyany" [Adventures of a Monkey] by M. Zoshchenko, and even the stories of Arkadiy Averchenko. We also publish poetry: A. Akhmatova, M. Tsvetayeva, Vladimir Soloukhin, Ya. Smelyakov, and R. Rozhdestvenskiy—we can't name them all..."

We find room also for plays and film scripts. For example, recently we published the play by A. Dudarev, "Ryadovyye" [Rank and File]. It has already been produced on the Chinese stage. (I might add that while I was in China, everyone was talking about the opening of the play by M. Shatrov, "Krasnye koni na siney trave" [Red Horses on Blue Grass]. I didn't get a chance to see the play, although for four nights in a row there were familiar faces on the television screen. They were showing the film by S. Bondarchuk "Voyna i mir" [War and Peace] in Chinese).

It became clear in the course of the conversation that my fellow conversationalists themselves were well-versed specialists in Soviet literature. Den Shupin showed me her recently published article about the philosophical quest of modern Soviet prose. Chan Tinhua was the author of works on Soviet literature of the 20's-30's. It is specifically for this reason that I posed strictly professional questions to them. I asked them if, in their

opinion, there is some commonality between the problematics of modern Soviet and Chinese literature. In response I heard an unconditional "yes". The best representatives of both your literature and ours, they said expressing their opinions, do not limit themselves strictly to the circle of personal concerns. They think about the fate of the planet as a whole, and they think about humanity. In Russian literature this tradition is especially strong. It dates back to the classics—to Leo Tolstoy and Dostoyevskiy. Unfortunately, noted Den Shupin, today's youth does not know the Russian classics as well as the older generation. Many of them prefer everything Western, and not only in the best examples: cheap best sellers, entertaining films, rock music—everything that "mass culture" brings with it.

I look at Shen Li—Volodya. And what do the young people themselves think?

He smiles. "In my opinion, not everything is that synonymous. I, for example, have many friends who like literature, including Soviet literature. But we need the entire fulness of knowledge. That is why we read American and Western authors, and want to draw our own conclusions. As for 'mass culture', I must say honestly that I am interested in rock music, but I don't see anything bad in that. Let us have a choice, let there be development, let there be contradictions... We will sort it out."

"But in order for the young shoots to be living and healthy, the tree must have strong roots," I try to object.

Shen Li agrees. "Of course. And the young people think about that. Today, for example, in China there is a broad youth movement developing for the restoration of the national cultural traditions, monuments of art and national music. Recently, before you came, China celebrated for the first time the holiday of traditional Chinese art. There were concerts, exhibits of paintings, plays, and a national opera was staged. So one does not exclude the other, it seems to me.

Shen Li dreams of coming to our country. He has long had this dream. He was born in a border region in the north of China. Among his childhood neighbors there were some Russians. There was one neighbor—"my Russian babushka [grandmother]", as he recalls. She sang him Russian songs and told him stories. He knew a little Russian even then. From that time on he liked Russia. He entered the Peking University in the Russian language faculty. Later he became a graduate student and is engaged in linguistic area studies—there is such a comparatively new scientific discipline. He is interested in everything associated with our country. We had to answer many questions for him.

However, Shen Li was not the only one who asked questions. Almost all the Chinese comrades whom we had occasion to meet asked questions. Once a unique evening of questions and answers lasted for over 4 hours.

A meeting with Russian studies specialists at Peking University and a meeting with journal readers lasted almost as long. Here are just a few of the questions asked by various audiences.

"What comprises the essence of the policy of glasnost?" "What is your attitude toward the novel 'Plakha'?" "Will there be a new reading of Gorky in the Soviet Union?" "How is the Pasternak novel 'Doctor Zhivago' evaluated in the USSR?" "Won't the increase in publicistic endeavor in Soviet literature lead to a loss of its artistic character?" "What is the attitude of Soviet linguists to the incursion of the influx of foreign words into the Russian language, particularly anglicisms?" "What is the Pamyat Society?" "What was the essence of the disagreements in the 60's between Kochetov and Tvardovskiy?" "How should we evaluate the depiction of collectivization in Sholokhov's novel 'Podnyataya tselina' [Virgin Soil Upturned]?" "How should we treat the return to 'forgotten names' in Soviet literature?" "What is the new emphasis in the history of Soviet literature?" And so on, and so forth...

I will conclude my narration about Chinese literary journals by presenting yet one more, a third—RUSSKAYA I SOVETSKAYA LITERATURA. It is published at Wuhan University, but its editorial council includes representatives from 10 Chinese VUZes. This journal was founded, as one can easily guess, at the same time as its two fellows—in 1980. Unlike the other two publications which we told about, the Wuhan journal devotes much space to the Russian and Soviet classics. It has published entire issues devoted to Pushkin, Turgenev, Lermontov, Dostoyevskiy, Leo Tolstoy, Chekhov, Gorky and Sholokhov. Many works are published in new translation.

Generally, the journal gives serious attention to the problem of translation. In late 1985-early 1986 it held the first competition for the best translation from Russian. By the entry deadline, the competition had received over 500 translations. It printed the best ones, and awarded a special prize to the competition winners.

"We are already planning to hold the 2nd competition," says the journal's Assistant Editor-in-Chief Low Li.

Low Li is easy to talk to, not because she speaks Russian as if it were her native tongue (I'm not surprised at this anymore), but because she has a certain specific kindness and warmth. She has an undivided interest in you as a person. She willingly tells about herself. She, in her words, was lucky. She was educated in the Soviet Union, at Leningrad University. Her husband Chu Chaoan, a professor and vice-president of KAPRYAL, also studied in our country. They returned to their homeland in 1959. They never forget that time in Leningrad. That, says Low Li, is for the rest of their lives.

She notes unexpectedly: "Something is happening to the Russian language. It is becoming harder and harder for us to read, especially newspapers. The lexicon is changing. New terms are appearing. Sometimes we have no idea what they mean. Our generation of Russian philologists has to retrain itself."

And in fact, when I spoke with the Chinese, something about their Russian surprised me. It appeared, maybe, too "correct" and slightly archaic. As it turns out, when we live at home we don't always notice how quickly our own native language changes—unfortunately not always for the better.

"We read your newspaper," continued Low Li. "Often we take materials for our journal from it—poems, prose, discussions with writers, and archive publications. However, it is becoming increasingly more difficult to read. We prefer to print short articles in our journal."

She sighs. "After all, you know, we have four modernizations. Everyone is very busy, working from morning 'til night. There are other difficulties as well. The greatest of these is the shortage of information. Of course, we receive almost all the Soviet literary publications, but by the time they reach us, by the time we process them, new works are no longer new. There is only one solution—to establish direct contacts with your press organs."

Den Shupin and Chan Tinhua told me the same thing. Let's hope that this will be accomplished.

There is one other problem. The publishing houses have started working very efficiently in recent times. For example, three of them have already published "Deti Arbata" [Children of the Arbat] by A. Rybakov. Practically within 2 months "Belyye odezhdyy" [White Vestments] by V. Dudintsev came out as an individual book, and B. Pasternak's "Doctor Zhivago" was published. And all this was in a hurry, "with more fervor". Serious competitors are appearing for the journals, and even their circulation is dropping. What can they do in this situation? The solution is the same: direct ties with Soviet publishing houses and with the Soviet Writers' Union. Then things could be printed by imposition, discussions with authors could be published. As it is, we must make do with our own efforts, relying on those who have recently been to the Soviet Union.

Now, I believe, I understand why we were asked so many questions, and why our doors were always open...

Adding Touches to the Portraits

And yet the most interesting things are not the questions themselves, but rather the people who ask them.

I found myself sitting at dinner next to a stately, middle-aged, outwardly inscrutable Chinese man. We met. "Li Sichun," he introduced himself, "docent at Peking Foreign Language Institute." He asked the "obligatory"

question. How did I like China? What could I answer to this? I mentioned the first thing that I noticed—the Peking contrasts. On one hand were splendid hotels, and on the other—the drab everyday life. "That is an accurate observation," agreed Li Sichun. The rapidly growing social contradictions frighten many of us also. Values are changing, spirituality is declining...

Then he told me a little about himself. His fate had developed dramatically, as it had for many Chinese of his generation. In the 20's Li Sichun's parents came to Moscow. That is where he was born. In 1956 he returned to China out of a sense of patriotism, as he says. Then the "cultural revolution" came, and he spent 8 years in prison.

"But you know what helped? The Russian language. I remembered Turgenev, Dostoyevskiy, and Leo Tolstoy. I remembered Russian songs. I taught my cellmates 200 of them. We sang in chorus. When you hear a Russian song, you feel peace pouring into your soul. They are sad, but they have hope...I was able to establish correspondence with my relatives only in 1980. By that time my father had died. My mother lives to this day in the USSR, in Donetsk..."

To my question of whether relapses of the "cultural revolution" are possible today in China, Li Sichun answers firmly: "No, the people won't allow it. They have become independent and learned to think without prompting."

Another of my fellow conversationalists was Chao Yunchun, vice-president of KAPRYAL. He was very lively, energetic and smart in appearance. In the 50's he studied at MGU [Moscow State University], where he defended his dissertation in linguistics. For the first year- and-a-half after graduating from the university, he worked in the Tsinhua agency, then went to teaching. During the years of the "cultural revolution" he was persecuted as a "revisionist". Today he is pro-rector of one of the largest VUZes in Shanghai. He dreams of writing a biographical dictionary of Russian and Soviet specialists in Russian philology with a complete bibliography. He thinks about defending his doctoral dissertation in the Soviet Union...

I had occasion to meet Li Minbin, chairman of the department of Russian and Soviet literature at Peking University, back in Moscow, prior to my departure for China. That is when he came to our country for the first time as part of a small university delegation. They were establishing contacts with Moscow University. When he learned that I was in Peking, he immediately came to visit and excitedly told me about his trip to the USSR. How much he had seen! How many people he had met! He would definitely update his book on area studies—a textbook on the Soviet Union. He is working on the idea of a comparative study of Soviet and Chinese literature. In general he had many plans. When he was leaving, he gave me a bunch of books for his Soviet friends—now he had many of them in our country.

You might ask, did I meet my Chinese correspondent in Peking? You remember, the one I told you about at the beginning? No, unfortunately I didn't meet him. He couldn't come. He telephoned and promised to write... But his friend, Li Chitsi, an instructor at Ch'angch'un University, was a member of the Chinese delegation. He told me much about Yu Ichun and recalled how they studied together...

Li Chitsi himself knew our literature very well. He and his colleagues had just finished collectively translating "Children of the Arbat" by Rybakov. Soon the novel will be printed by the Ch'angch'un publishing house (yet another translation!). I asked him why he became interested in this work. He said, primarily the historical material, the topic of man in history. I asked Li Chitsi one other question: Was he sorry that he had selected Russian as his specialty? There was true amazement in his voice: "Sorry?! Why, of course not! I love Russian literature and I'm happy that I can study it."

China is a country you long to return to. I don't know if this will ever come to pass, but I want to believe that Li Chitsi and my young friend Shen Li, and the sweet Low Li, and the stern Den Shupin, and Chan Tinhua, and all my other new Chinese friends will someday visit our country, and that we will meet again.

P.S. After this material had already gone to press, I received a letter from Yu Ichun. He too believes in our meeting ("in our time the world has become small...") and tells of his current endeavors ("I translated 'The Sad Detective', published reviews on 'Plakha' and 'White Vestments', and am writing about 'Zubr' ...").

And, as always, he asks: "what are they reading in Moscow, what are they talking about, what new reviews have come out..."

I have to sit down and answer him.

12322

Jurists Debate New Laws on Glasnost, Press, Demonstrations

18000162 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 22 Dec 87 p 6

[Article "Code of Laws and 'Code of Honor'" (Roundtable conducted by T. Menshikova)]

[Text] Today we often repeat: we are all students in the school of democracy. And during our tenure as students we very earnestly try to understand this difficult science. We have to reinterpret things we thought we understood, recall other forgotten things from the past, pose questions, and answer them ourselves. We have become more argumentative. We now defend our point of view more boldly and actively. And in our search for the truth, we turn more frequently to the law which, unfortunately, does not always clarify conflicting situations.

Are legal science and legal practice keeping up with the movement of public thought? Are they doing their utmost to promote restructuring?

In order to obtain competent opinions on these points, we convened a roundtable of legal scholars from the Institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Scientists: **B. Lazarev**, doctor of juridical sciences; sector chief; **M. Piskotin**, doctor of juridical sciences; sector chief; **K. Sheremet**, doctor of juridical sciences; chief editor of the journal SOVETSKOYE GOSUDARSTVO I PRAVO; and **A. Shchiglik**, doctor of juridical sciences; senior scientific associate.

Is Everything That Is Not Forbidden Permitted?

CORRESPONDENT: The words "law," "lawful," "just" and "unjust" are used with increasing frequency in our everyday conversation about interpersonal relationships, the life of the collective, and management techniques. And this is probably natural. With the development of democracy and glasnost, the role of general and statutory law and the legal sophistication of society grows. But bold exploration and decisions must also be reinforced by law. Specifically what is the nature of the legal guarantees of democracy and glasnost?

B. LAZAREV: I must correct you. Glasnost is one of the elements of democracy. In general, we are talking about a large block of problems ranging from legal support for economic restructuring to the need for change in legislative acts that comprise the basis of the economic, political, and social rights and freedoms of all citizens.

A. SHCHIGLIK: The January Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee explicitly discussed the need to guarantee our democracy with the appropriate laws. Thus, our practice and the democratic procedures that are introduced into life by restructuring—including the development of glasnost—require certain legislative acts

that summarize real experience. In particular, the Law on Glasnost has been drafted and will be one of its most important legal guarantees. The Law on the Press is in the drafting stage.

B. LAZAREV: Our institute proposes writing into the law the principle that all normative acts concerning the citizen's rights and obligations should be published. We believe that if any of them has not been published for any reason and has not become general public knowledge, a citizen should not be held responsible for its violation. This is also a guarantee. Here is another example. We speak about freedom of speech which is guaranteed by the Constitution. Everything seems obvious. But specifically what does this mean? That the concept of political freedom means that everything that is not forbidden is permitted? But there are different kinds of speech. And there are prohibitions here—in the criminal code and in topical laws. There are state secrets, confidentiality of deposits, medical confidentiality, secrecy of adoption, in a word, rights are not without limits. In the process of reforming legislation, careful thought must be given to democratic institutions that need certain kinds of guarantees.

M. PISKOTIN: The Constitution also guarantees the freedom to demonstrate. But is there a mechanism that regulates this political freedom?

A. SHCHIGLIK: There have been no detailed normative statutes of any kind. But now the executive committees of the Leningrad soviet and the Moscow soviet and of a number of other cities have adopted such statutes. It is true that they are temporary. They have been published and people know how to use this form of expressing their will without violating legal order. I do not say that these statutes are perfect. By no means. Nevertheless, they eliminate a great deal of conflict.

M. PISKOTIN: But you will not deny the self-evident fact that the freedom to demonstrate has been purely declarative in our country. In practice, it was nevertheless assumed that there could be no other kind of demonstrations than officially organized demonstrations. In my view, it is an altogether abnormal situation when the Moscow soviet or Leningrad soviet sets the limits to the action of the Constitution. Even though in the given specific situation this may be a step forward. Incidentally, as far as I know, such a legislative act is being drafted.

K. SHEREMET: In my view, another difficulty is that everyone today has his own interpretation of the concept of democracy. The first question that arises is: what should we guarantee? Before us an entire panorama of candid opinions is unfolding and there are spontaneous demonstrations. This is not the totality of democracy but only its most superficial level. We are only gaining new political experience. The reforms have not reached the nether processes. To hope that the law will immediately make provision for everything is to entertain one more

illusion. For example, in the case of demonstrations we are frequently faced with the need for the more detailed guarantees of realization of the initiative to exercise a constitutional right. But what happens when the guarantee exists and the initiative is absent? Let us turn to the work of the Soviets of People's Deputies. Are all the laws in this area observed? Thus, the law explicitly states who should recall a deputy who fails to justify the voters' trust or who commits an act that is not worthy of his high rank: the voters! Only in two instances can the Soviet itself revoke a deputy's authority before the expiration of his term: in the event of illness or the deputy's move to another city, etc., or when a criminal judgment takes effect. However, in actuality the Soviets themselves quite frequently revoke the authority of deputies who have not justified [the voters'] confidence and relieve them of their responsibility to the voters. Is this anti-democratic? So it is that the law exists, the procedure exists, but the democratic institution does not work. In a word, the question of guarantees is very complex. After all, there also exist in society other mechanisms in addition to legal mechanisms: public opinion, the state of legal conscience of the administrative apparatus, the level of political sophistication...

B. LAZAREV: I would add that the legal mechanisms are properly functional when other social mechanisms—political, economic, organizational—are working. Otherwise, legal regulators are suspended in mid-air, exist as rhetorical formulas or as potentialities. It is written that the ispolkom is responsible to the Soviet of People's Deputies. However I do not seem to recall any case when a Soviet having the necessary grounds to do so disbanded its own ispolkom. Even though in a number of places, the work of ispolkoms rouses considerable censure.

A. SHCHIGLIK: We have declared war on bureaucracy. In the codes of a number of union republics, there are criminal responsibility norms specifically for bureaucracy. But who can cite cases where proceedings were instituted specifically for juridical responsibility?

M. PISKOTIN: Guarantees are indeed a large and difficult problem. After all, we use the word "democracy" primarily to characterize the nature of political power. And if we look deeper, the main consideration here is how to influence the political decision-making process. After all, the authorities risk nothing if they consult with only a narrow circle of people when they make a decision. And the law does not as yet guarantee anything here. Nor does our political practice as yet state that a given organ of power reliably and unerringly carries out the will of the majority in every case. In a word, this situation is clearly problematical. We must think and think.

K. SHEREMET: And search for new approaches. Indeed, everything is clear only because no one wants to change anything. And anyone who wants to do so must search and must make his way through his own, sometimes painful mistakes. And he must more frequently

address the basic democratic questions. Then there will be fewer whimsical interpretations. One newspaper published under the rubric "We Learn Democracy" an article which told how a correspondent and a kolkhoz chairman got up early so as to be on time for a meeting. They could not be late because the previous meeting had fined one of the managers a certain sum. This would not seem to be a triumph of democracy. Except for the fact that a meeting is not empowered to fine anyone. This "democratic fining syndrome" proved to be quite stable because the same newspaper—this time on the front page under the title "Kolkhoz Democracy" once again reported that the kolkhoz chairman, upon discovering that a tractor driver had done a bad plowing job, immediately convened a meeting of the board and fined the tractor driver and himself...for bad management.

B. LAZAREV: I am interrupting you. Logically, the same chairman should have exercised another democratic institution and sued himself for the unlawful imposition of a fine. Next, he should have appealed the decision and won the case so as to follow the example of the famous corporal's widow...

M. PISKOTIN: On the whole, we must encourage a greater degree of public discussion of the basic political values and democratic axioms. One of them: "everything that is not prohibited is permitted" has only recently gained recognition. The opposing principle has dominated in practice. There must be more persistent work to restructure legal conscience in the direction of common sense so that people would see a real relationship between the individual, society, law, and the state, and would not perceive their rights as gifts from above.

K. SHEREMET: I would continue the idea of my colleagues and speak of the colossal significance of legal conscience. It is becoming a motivation for action. It promotes the realization of laws and the defense of citizens' rights. But we observe a paradoxical situation. On the one hand, there is endless discussion of the propagandization of the law, of the need for legal sophistication. On the other hand, we frequently forget about new legislative acts. The Law on the State Enterprise (Association) was recently adopted; so many hopes were connected with it and it was the subject of public discussion. The campaign died out and there was silence. It is a large, complex law. How will people be converted to work under the new conditions starting 1 January if they are all still in the grip of old legal concepts? A thousand questions arise. Even now people are unclear regarding the status of the work collective's council, for example. In what way does it differ from a trade union committee? How can a person become the master of his enterprise if he does not know this law? This is incomprehensible. This is an enormous gap in economic and legal propaganda.

I would not hasten to adopt new laws. We must gain social experience and "play through" the situation. Otherwise we will risk reducing everything to general philosophical principles that are so abundant in many of our legislative acts to the detriment of precise juridical norms.

A. SHCHIGLIK: But we must also not be too slow. After all, situations are arising and some of them are very acute. Let us take the appearance of informal associations. It is no secret that they also include asocial associations. The process requires normative regulation. The question may arise: why regulate it? If there were no excesses, if there were no conflicts between such associations and the local authorities, it would not be necessary to intervene. But they do exist. And therefore, the legislator in order not to prohibit must find rational mutually acceptable solutions and alternatives. Now, at a time when the Law on Voluntary Associations is being drafted, a law that will define their legal status more precisely, the point at issue is how to consider the interests of informal youth groups and political clubs.

K. SHEREMET: I think it should also be debated whether such associations require legal status and if they do, the form this status should take. Is it not sufficient that they simply observe the norms of Soviet laws? Observe—create, conceive, test. We had better let the law enforcement agencies have their say.

The observance of legislation is in general a necessary but difficult thing. After all, norms are intended for average situations while actual events confront us with wholesale exceptions to the rules. This is why, in order to sum up our discussion of guarantees, I wish to speak of one of the most urgent needs. We must do our utmost to develop and strengthen such a guarantee as the court. I am convinced that the court must play a substantial larger role in our public life. Specifically the court—as a democratic institution! A great deal is required for this. It is first of all necessary to overcome the prejudice in public opinion that only professional troublemakers are involved in litigation and that a person is besmirched by merely appearing in court even as a witness or civil plaintiff. No, we recognize the fact that the court is not a stain on a person's biography. The court is the place where a person can defend his civil rights. The adoption of the USSR Law "On the Procedure for Appealing Unlawful Actions by Officials Infringing the Rights of Citizens" which was adopted this June was a very important step in the direction of strengthening both legality and the authority of the court. But once again, we have not widely publicized this law.

A Newspaper Is Sued

CORRESPONDENT: Since we have already begun talking about the courts...The development of democracy and glasnost entirely unexpectedly resulted in an increase in the number of lawsuits against certain editorial offices. Everyone who feels himself aggrieved by the

newspaper sues. Actors, scientific associates, and even investigators, the lawfulness of whose actions are questioned by the newspaper, carry their dispute to a court session. What is more, in today's discussions, in the heated exchange of opinions on all manner of ideological, creative, and scientific problems, one frequently hears the exclamations: "I have been insulted! I have been slandered! I demand the protection of my honor and dignity!" Thus, for example, three candidates of sciences—E. Yevseyev, V. Begun, and A. Romanenko—considered themselves to have been insulted: the author of a newspaper article had the audacity to question the scientific merit of conceptions announced by them. In the process of preparing the materials, the author had consulted a number of serious scientific subdivisions. Nevertheless, the court accepts all complaints for examination and there is a long deliberation that consumes much time of journalists and the court. What is more, the "aggrieved" who defend themselves in this way transform the courtroom into a tribunal for their far from indisputable ideas, continue to disorient public opinion, and create a public scandal.

The question is: should political, creative, and scientific disputes come within the competence of a civil court and be decided in a court proceeding?

B. LAZAREV: The question of what is scientific and what is unscientific should be discussed by appropriate scientific forums and not in court. Questions of creative substance can also be decided in newspaper polemics. The court must decide the issue of the breach of law and disputes concerning the law. It is not the court's business to decide which conception is true and which is not.

A. SHCHIGLIK: A scientific or ideological dispute is not the subject of a court hearing.

K. SHEREMET: The concept of jurisdiction can probably not be applied to the concept of scientific character. This is a more complex matter. Otherwise we can very easily return to the idea of a monopoly on the truth. But the court in general cannot claim to establish scientific truth. It can establish and qualify legal infractions.

M. PISKOTIN: Naturally, the court's situation is more complicated today. It, too, is not on top of things under the new circumstances. It is not by chance that many judges have not been nominated for reelection in the recent elections. In many respects, we are not prepared for glasnost. We do not know how to react to people's actions. But we must develop an understanding of this. I think that much more responsibility is required today for the publicized word of everyone, including newspapers. It is not enough to make accusation, there must also be a system of arguments. After all, democracy is above all arguments, a detailed system of evidence, and persuasion.

K. SHEREMET: One can theorize a little here. We are dealing with the influence of two factors. The first is associated with survivals of the times when arguments were replaced by evaluations of "ours—not ours," and labels. And pinning a sharp label on something was considered a publicistic attainment. A critical article had to be unequivocal and definite. The set of labels was very limited but they always bailed out the author who lacked ideas. And this was in keeping with the social expectations of a certain, most influential part of the audience. That is, the political label operated as a certain social category that was resorted to in order to define a position rather than to reveal the essence of a phenomenon. For the writer, this was a kind of "safety system" or an ideological Quality Emblem.

It must be admitted that our social science also worked for such a system of thinking. It was little concerned with arguments. It operated with a set of postulates and ready formulas. It is not so easy to get free of this. Inertia is very strong. The latter circumstance is connected with the fact that we are simply not accustomed to dealing with a society in which there is a broad spectrum of opinions, thoughts, and actions that are by no means perceived in the same way by different strata of the population. Even if this is not associated with violations of the law. This has not yet become part of the democratic consciousness.

B. LAZAREV: Just so! We try to brand and excommunicate from our values everyone who thinks differently. This comes from the times when intolerance was synonymous with ideological loyalty. But today we realize that we must listen to any opinion.

M. PISKOTIN: Excuse me! Polemics is a dispute. The placidity of Gogolian heroes according to the principle: "You are right, Ivan Ivanovich, and you are right Ivan Nikiforovich" is hardly a meritorious here. We recall how Belinskiy, Gertsen, and Plekhanov polemicized...And, of course, Lenin polemicized without injury to human dignity. But he was merciless toward an opponent he considered to hold incorrect views. He always brought the causes and goal of a dispute, its political essence to the point of maximum clarity. As a result of this, a polemic never became a Philistine settling of accounts or a game of ambitions. We have not succeeded in mastering Lenin's style of strict but proven polemics without "organized conclusions." We must devise a "code of honor" for the disputing sides in which the use of political labels and appeals for sanctions against those who think otherwise will be considered a prohibited technique.

A. SHCHIGLIK: The problem has become more acute due to the increasingly frequent clashes between people with different views of restructuring and clashes between its advocates and opponents (even though, naturally, no one openly proclaims himself an opponent). Imagine what would happen if each of the disputants were to sue! The tone of critical publications would also become

sharper. I agree that the court cannot examine ideological and creative disputes. Nor can it determine whether a given conception is scientific or unscientific. But since conflicts do arise, it is necessary to define more precisely the concept of criminal insult and injury to honor and dignity in order to avoid misunderstanding and confusion.

B. LAZAREV: But everyone is entitled to take offense at what he considers offensive. But not everything must be brought into court. At one time, the most offensive label if not political accusation was "Weismanist-Morganist." Today, on the other hand, if you want to offend a scientist, you call him a "faithful follower of Lysenko." A person who considers himself insulted by a critical publication has two models of behavior. The first is to defend his rightness in polemics in the press. The second is to apply to the court for protection. It is more rational to clarify one's relations with the press organ and to present one's arguments. But once one applies to the court, it must be borne in mind that personal, emotional reaction to criticism cannot be decisive for the court. The task of the court is to decide whether a given citizen has grounds for truly considering himself to have been insulted. I recall such a case: in the heat of a quarrel, one person called another person bow-legged. The latter went straight to the court! But the judge did not accept the case because it is not the business of the court to measure the straightness of legs. In scientific and sociopolitical cases, it is necessary to determine in each specific instance what relates to purely scientific and ideological materials and what is nothing more nor less than emotional gushing; what is boorish behavior and what is actually criminal insult, i. e., a legal infraction. But only a judge can decide whether or not to accept a suit. Therefore, the level of legal sophistication of the judges themselves must be raised substantially. They must not admit cases that should not be the subject of the court's deliberations.

A. SHCHIGLIK: Another point of view is also possible here. Let us write what is an insult and what is not. But is this possible? After all, no "list of offenses" will be complete. This is why we elect people's judges, entrust them with solving these difficult, always creative problems, and count on their wisdom, flexibility, and their knowledge of the laws.

M. PISKOTIN: I would nevertheless like to add that it seems to me that we very often suffer from the fact that we have been corrupted by monopolies. And the fact that we equate every institution, every organization with the state. Each of our enterprises is a monopoly. Everything it produces ends up on the counter. Where else can you buy anything? We suffer from the fact that every newspaper has had a monopoly on the truth. It always had the last word and rendered the verdict.

The development of democracy, the art of debate and broad public dialogue representing all spectra of opinions will help to resolve many conflicts. And I am

convinced that it is much better to use a citation or in general to allow people to have their say than to pin an offensive label on someone. You know that self-exposure is more convincing than exposure.

And of course, the role of legal sophistication must grow. Without it, democratization is inconceivable.

Calling The Irresponsible To Account

CORRESPONDENT: You warn us against the illusion of absolutizing the law. Indeed, it cannot answer all questions in society's life. And nevertheless, many conflicts that arise around statements in the press could in our view be resolved more successfully if the legal status of the mass media, the rights, and obligations of journalists in our country were regulated. What do you consider timely here? Is it necessary to legislate the right to obtain information, to more precisely regulate the responsibility for reacting to criticism?

A. SHCHIGLIK: Many problems arose in the process of drafting the Law on the Press. I can say that an extensive study was made of foreign practice and of the legislative acts that exist in foreign countries. Very large difficulties arose in the process of defining the status of audiovisual media. But the legal status of the journalist is defined very democratically. In particular, the right to information is guaranteed with the exception of information that constitutes a state or military secret. On the one hand, it is necessary to safeguard information that should not be made public but on the other hand the journalist must be protected against departmental tyranny.

M. PISKOTIN: It seems to me that the right to information must be interpreted more broadly. I refer to foreign experience. Appropriate laws exist in Sweden and the USA, for example. Any citizen can obtain any non-secret document from any state agency (the secrecy classification, incidentally has precisely limited time parameters). There are special services and civil servants who are obligated to give the citizen the interest that interests him. What is more, if he does not receive a given document, he has the right to sue. The secret classification of a document can be contested and the court can render a decision declassifying it.

K. SHEREMET: Of course, responsibility should be established for the refusal to issue unclassified information. The right to information must be guaranteed. That is the alpha and omega. But I want to talk about something else. Once again, concerning the social status of the journalist. He also demands information that goes beyond the limits of documentation. For example, evaluations, opinions, the prehistory of an issue. Can we punish a manager who refuses to grant such an interview? That is the question. In order to answer it, I want to repeat the idea I previously expressed—that we live in a society filled with paradoxes: we either ignore the norms of the law (out of ignorance or lack of legal sophistication) or else we place hopes in it that it cannot

meet because of its nature. I therefore believe that it is inadmissible to refuse to grant interviews. Other democratic mechanisms must be operative here together with the atmosphere of democracy: the absence of fear of higher authority, belief in one's own common sense, confidence in the journalist, and certainty that no one is setting traps for you. We must raise the moral potential and the level of social relations—then much will function without any kind of punitive sword of Damocles.

M. PISKOTIN: You are right. We must reach such a level of public opinion where a manager cannot turn a correspondent away for fear of losing prestige in the public's eyes. I am similarly disposed toward legislatively established responsibility for failure to react to items in the press. It seems to me that criticism of any official or department leader should be followed by society's political reaction. In what form? Example: the reaction of the Soviet of People's Deputies which, at the request of a deputy, expresses lack of confidence in an official.

K. SHEREMET: Another example. The Supreme Soviet through its commissions submits claims against a minister whose department has been seriously criticized in the press. Social prevention will work much more actively here. Knowing that public opinion will react, that an official will have to bear responsibility, that this will harm his career, will be considered by the collective in his professional advancement, that his standing in the eyes of people will be compromised...In a word, these factors will be stronger than fear of the law.

A. SHCHIGLIK: Permit me to disagree with you. We have not yet grown to such a level of understanding. Nor do I think this will happen soon. And then there are various types of items in the press. Some of them are devoted to complex social problems while others address specific scandalous practices. The newspaper is entitled to demand their elimination as well as a meaningful response. The reaction here must be absolutely specific. And the present demand for the need for a prompt response from officials or departments must be preserved. It is another matter that readers are irritated by "hollow" answers. Glasnost must also be used to combat formal replies.

M. PISKOTIN: But I would understand all this as the result of the normal functioning of the democratic system which primarily emphasizes the motivations of civic honor and the defense of the dignity of one's institution...After all, such values as honor, dignity, and respect for people's opinion in society must receive new content. Today we talk a great deal about what we have grown to and what we have not. I am convinced that political sophistication is won through experience and in born in political practice. And it is based on the foundation of general culture. Our foundation is social. And when our potential is expanded, we will quite quickly acquire the necessary political sophistication. We have made a great spurt forward in the last 2 years.

K. SHEREMET: I recall a recent conference on self-management at which considerable doubt was expressed regarding our readiness for it. But at that time, I countered my skeptically minded comrades: if we had the social practice! After all, the revolution is continuing. And we must remember how quickly the people acquired political sophistication during the years of revolution, joined in the political movement, understood its goals, and how they supported Soviet power. Today, too, the most important thing for us is to gain experience. Then we will find answers to many of our current questions in our real development.

From The Editors

As we see, social reforms have also activated thinking in the creation of new legislation. There are many serious problems in this area, many things are knocking at the door, there is much that has not yet been expunged from obsolete legislative acts. But it is important that legal scholars feel the need for new solutions that will raise the authority of our law. Readers have probably noticed that the roundtable participants do not entirely agree on all points, that there are things that are not entirely clear to them. **WE CALL UPON OUR READERS TO EXPRESS THEIR OPINIONS AND TO TAKE PART IN THE DISCUSSION.**

5013

Arbat Becomes Youth Group Forum; Official Reactions Vary

18000099a Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 27 Nov 87 p 2

[Article by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA special correspondents S. Avdeyev, M. Korchagin, V. Larin, A. Trushkin, and A. Chudakov: "Onslaught in Arbat"; first two paragraphs are KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Today it is possible to say for certain: the time of many experiments which were dreamed of before restructuring has come. It is even possible to sum up the first results. To discuss, without coming into conflict with the law, has become possible everywhere.

If it is not forbidden, that means it is permitted.

The first address—the Moscow Arbat. Very many people, in both formal and informal social organizations, have dreamed of a "new" Arbat.

"A wonderful social experiment!" The voices of enthusiasts gushed through the telephone of the editorial office.

Old Arbat—a half-kilometer-long paved street—became the new Arbat.

The leaders of various youth directions received a tribune. Talk! Debate! What happened?

Every argument is unthinkable without different points of view—this is an axiom.

Every argument lives only until the truth comes out.

Without searches for the truth an argument is scholastic, unnatural, and unnecessary. The oratory threatens to draw people in with a superficially attractive bright cover, behind which there is nothing.

If an opponent is timid and prefers to observe the rhetorician from a distance, the discussion is threatened with danger.

It may turn into a sermon. The preacher will lead his flock to a denial of the moral values for the sake of which the Arbat was created.

Then there comes a natural opportunity to cut off the argument—without opponents, the flow of scholasticism and rhetoric is without protest.

Forbid it?

"The order in our Arbat has become much greater," the deputy commander of the political section of the militia, Captain Mikhalev, recently informed the newspaper, not without pride. "Overall, we are imposing order, don't worry about that."

Associates of the militia, patrolling the short street day and night, have become all but natural opponents in the innumerable discussions. Young officials come up, guided by their Komsomol honor. When no one wants to interfere in a malicious harangue, they interfere. Using, of course, the capacities available to them.

Arbat, in the concise expression of one of its inhabitants, is turning into a street of strollers and ruminators.

We must investigate into why this has happened in our Arbat.

How It Began

Nature will not tolerate a vacuum. Coming on the heels of bricklayers, house painters, and electricians, a motley crowd organized by no one advanced on the Arbat this spring. Step by step the repairmen turned over the blocks and people there and then moved into them. From the neighboring Kalininskiy, the distant Izmaylovskiy, from the side streets and alleyways, the streams flow into the Arbat in a human river.

"We were standing by the Vakhtangov Theater," recalls one of the admirers of the new street, "and playing rock and roll on our guitars. A dense ring of people surrounded us and threw 'silver' on the road. We tried as

hard as we could, but then someone to the side began a low, melodious singing of a Russian folk song, a flute appeared, a violin, and...our audience rushed over to our 'rivals.'"

A poet read his poems.

Dozens of poets read their poems.

Arbat became a city within a city: with its own artists, poets and musicians, its own sharp operators in endless conflict with organs of law enforcement, its own residents and "welcoming service" with telephones, stores with lines, 500-ruble stuffed crocodiles and 3-kopeck glasses of tea.

It was not crocodiles, of course, by which Arbat attracted young men and women from a multitude of informal youth groups. Komsomol activists (and not only they) have been observing for years the semi-underground activity of these groups, without any attempt to assist them or investigate problems in them. They did not notice that they had simply labeled people instead of thinking about the issues which concern these Soviet young men and women. But if necessary, we must argue honestly and openly about this issue: how should we live in the future?

Arbat attracted the young with the chance to become well-known. They do not refuse to debate.

And they have come here.

Them

A man with a female companion. Sackcloth bags, tired glances. Long hair, ragged clothing. Hippies.

A circle of young people. Music. Break dancers.

Tall hairdos. Shaved heads. Punks. Alongside—the spiked-leather heavy-metal fans.

A youth in blue jeans. He beats a small drum with his hands and drags out an endless refrain: "Hare, Hare, Krishna, Hare...." He is a Hare Krishna. A crowd collects—they are curious. An agitator appears from the small knot of Hare Krishnas. He speaks passionately and with conviction—the interest of the audience is obvious.

There were many such scenes last summer. People agitated for various ideas both by word and by music. The agitators were talented to varying degrees—the public walked away from some immediately (for no clear reason), they were drawn to others. Among the many schemes which were alive in Arbat during those days, there were some which were contradictory to our spiritual values. There were also ugly, destructive ones which could only grow up in an atmosphere of stagnation—without debates, discussions, the open and spirited clash of opinions.

In the Arbat there was almost never a rebuttal to them.

"It is strange," said one of the militia members with surprise, "the Hare Krishnas preach openly, but the Komsomol members, whom we expect, do not appear...."

The militiaman dreamed of Pavka Korchagin....

Again we return to the militia—forced, in the Arbat, to become masters of the situation. Whether for better or for worse—that is not the main point here.

...Stanislav, gently touching the strings, began to sing. Passersby smiled and, stopping, approached the singer. A large circle of willing listeners formed....

And now the very same event, but in a somewhat different rendition. The report was compiled by Captain Kuchinskiy from the fifth department of the militia:

"...At 1930 hours, Citizen Bulkovskiy, S. V., on Arbat Street by Building No 30 was playing the guitar, he collected a large number of people around himself, failed to respond to a reprimand by militia members, and continued to play and sing....

"Let us make one remark at once—there was no whiff of sedition that evening. It was simply that the struggle against the Hare Krishnas, the punks, and the hippies being conducted by the efforts of just one militia group, acquired a new scale. In the arrest log, the young bard Bulkovskiy, S. V., who decided to perform a comic song, appears under No 5316."

But in what way was he culpable under the law?

"He collected a disorganized crowd with his singing," one of the sergeants eagerly explains. "By doing this he committed an administrative violation as established by Moscow Soviet Decree No 2,075 of 11 August of this year."

A political club was interested in the aforementioned document, which is called, incidentally, "Temporary Regulations." And if one believes the sergeant, then according to the regulations, playing on a guitar, for example, or singing, or reading poems is nothing other than a "public event."

The arrested bard read the regulations noted in the report. And he no longer wants to sing for passersby.

Well, but what if suddenly some other young carefree person suddenly gets a strong desire to strum a ballad on the guitar? We asked this question in the Moscow Soviet, where they were frankly astonished by it.

"It is not forbidden to strum ballads," they assured us there. "As long as there is no disturbance of the public peace after 10 pm...."

"And what about disorganized crowds of idlers?..." We had clearly astonished our interlocutors with our next question, which further disturbed the militia workers.

And it turned out that Decree No 2,075 referred exclusively to "the conducting of rallies, gatherings, street parades, demonstrations," and similar functions carried out with the permission of the ispolkom. To perform ballads, to read poems, no permission, naturally, was required.

This year within only 8 months 3,000 individuals (80 percent of whom were under 30 years old) were arrested in the Arbat for various administrative violations.

Of course, among them there were ordinary hooligans, and drunkards, and even thieves. But for some reason, from time to time, individuals fell into the hands of the militia who cannot easily be regarded as being in the ranks of law violators. Is this right?

"If you start to play the guitar, they grab you immediately, but not for the harmonica. It's a matter of taste!" says a young musician indignantly.

And the Hare Krishnas are no longer in the Arbat. And the hippies, the rockers, the poets. They have gone to other places—doorways, basements, empty lots. They have gone away to attract new members into their ranks—those with a newly formed consciousness, the politically illiterate. Forbidden fruit is sweet. Komsomol propagandists have lost a splendid opportunity to become seasoned in discussions and debates. To attract new youngsters into their ranks.

"We let the Arbat slip through our fingers," one of the Komsomol workers self-critically acknowledged, going out with his wife to stroll along the street. "We missed the opportunity...."

He did not name any names. Does he feel it is his own—and our—fault?

Us

For now we are represented in this by Aleksandr Makarov, who set up a meeting with the militia department. Makarov is a secretary of the Kievskiy Raykom of the Komsomol.

"Let's agree about one thing immediately: the problem of the Arbat is not only our problem in this rayon. It is citywide and, if you will, nationwide. And the least pleasing aspect of our activity is the work with various "figures" of the asocial persuasion—Hare Krishnas, Christian evangelists.

"The raykom has plans to collect all the poets and artists under one roof. The 'Our Arbat' Association has been created. Some 15 to 20 individuals from the Komsomol Aktiv are on the street every day."

Aleksandr is a likable person. And his plans are likable. But when we walked with him from the beginning of the street to the end, we did not notice the aktiv.

In general, are there constructive suggestions?

Yes, there are. Here is the opinion of Aleksey Kiselev from Brezhnevskiy Raykom of the Komsomol, who is a member of the Vernisazh Creative Association.

"Currently we throw teen-agers out of school, out of a vocational-technical school, or out of the apartment house, and onto the street. What are they supposed to do in the mazes of the microrayons, how can they help but devise their own, artificial world? Look at the GDR—there there is a youth hostel in every district center. Any young man or woman can go there. Discussions, discotheques, rehearsals—all of these can be carried out in the youth hostel. Whatever anyone says, we don't have enough of this.

"And even more. Once informal associations exist, then official organs should determine what attitude to take toward them and what more to do. Could it be that a committee or a state association for youth affairs is needed?"

Here is yet another suggestion. A Law on Youth is being prepared. It will scarcely be able to avoid all the problems which cropped up in the Arbat. Perhaps it is this document which will protect the social initiatives of young people. After all, at present no one bears the responsibility for ruined beginnings.

And the last thing. Among these very hippies, punks, and heavy metalists are many trade union members. Why does the AUCCTU not open the doors of palaces of culture to young people? To admit all, without consideration for hair length or clothing? Otherwise, we will be racing around in a circle: the day before yesterday, young people loitered about in Izmaylovskiy Park, yesterday they migrated to the Arbat, and what will happen tomorrow?

And so, the main point—a propagandist is needed. Someone modern. Educated. Who can make contacts easily with young people. Where to find such propagandists, if each new day demands a political battle not in the lecture hall but in the dozens of small "arbats" into which the larger Arbat has dispersed? Where to train them?

What might happen?

The person who puts the spoke

in our wheel

Is the one who in turns up on the trash heap.

We saw a poster with this caption in the Arbat store "Plakat," by the publishing house of the same name. Approximately 1,040 such anti-religious posters were received back in February, explains commodities expert Tanya Polyanskaya.

And all of them with the same dusty old text.

"But are there any posters about the Hare Krishnas, the hippies, or the punks?" we asked in the store.

"What can you be thinking?" replied store director T. S. Shchukina. "We do not get involved in politics!"

"Politics"—this, probably, is the image of a crooked star floating somewhere out in the cosmos with the caption "The Course of Creation Is the Course of Acceleration"? In a prominent place in the store. Or is politics a triptych depicting a muscular worker in a hard hat? It has been here for 3 years now.... And the posters concerning the fight against drunkenness are purchased most readily of all...by foreigners.

It appears that "Plakat" does not operate on the life which is boiling in the "arbat-like" streets. It would be interesting to see how a triptych would look on the topic "Politics Is Also a Concern for Young People," to do it in the old, antiquated method.

It is necessary to work in a new way. The workers in the "Plakat" store are in agreement with this. But how? What if a political club were created directly in the store? Sociologists, psychologists, and propagandists could be invited there. This should be the goal: to study the demands of the public, to make recommendations to the publishing house. To make the store a constantly active discussion club.

The old approach toward youth problems has become the primary reason for the targeting of the Arbat by Komsomol agitators and propagandists. This is most noticeable of all here—how many dozens of little "arbats" in cities and villages are subject to the very same fate!

No matter where we go in the Arbat, everywhere there are the traces of an attack without a battle. A video salon, one of the first, incidentally, in the country. There were many grand schemes: it was planned to have videos both for private owners and for organizations. Today behind the beautiful display window there is only a bored salesgirl. What to get for discussions, for debates? Something that isn't in the movie theaters. Perhaps "A Love Revealed" (the French version) or "Games of the Young" (Film Studio imeni Gorkiy)?

A bookstore. Something about the Hare Krishnas? In the Atheist's Pocket Dictionary there is not a word. But a pocket dictionary means one which covers all aspects of life! Let us open the more solid Atheist's Desk Reference. The explanations are no less murky than those which the

Krishnas themselves give, and moreover, there is not a word about this sect in our country. Would it seem that we have no Hare Krishnas? But we ourselves saw them this summer with our own eyes: the young man in jeans, his friends alongside: "Hare, Hare...."

Last Saturday an abstract artist had an exhibit in the Arbat. People crowded around the pictures and exchanged opinions: Good!—said some; It has nothing in common with art!—others asserted. Who is to judge?

We turned the corner and after a minute we were in the entryway to the USSR Ministry of Culture. "Where to?" the watchman asked us. "The Komsomol committee," we replied. "The Komsomol is off today. It's Saturday." Nevertheless, we used the inside telephone to call the secretary of the Komsomol committee. It rang for a long time.

Indeed, this Komsomol committee was off work.

But just think, in a spare moment, about new forms of work with young people. For example, creating an initiative group from employees of the Ministry of Culture and going out into the streets. Debating with those same abstract artists concerning the paths of development of art. And the onlookers—we will not be participants in the debate—would be everyone who comes into the Arbat.

The windows of the Komsomol Committee of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade look out directly onto the Arbat. One of the most socially complex streets in Moscow. One of the most important ministries in the country. What sort of interrelationships have they built up?

"Back at the beginning of the year, the idea for a political club came up," said Valeriy Tarakanov, secretary of the Komsomol Committee of the Ministry of Foreign Trade. "We got videos, we made contacts with specialists in some very different spheres—from religion to 'heavy metal.' Then a fine point came up: was the political club to be created for ourselves or for everyone? Nevertheless, the ministry decided not to lock itself in. We went out into the Arbat. Along with youngsters from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Directorate of Buildings Operation [DEZ] No 14, we found unoccupied buildings. We made repairs. Now there is a sports complex, a music room, even a zoo. Just imagine it—many people come to us.

"But after all, there are thousands of teen-agers in the Arbat...."

"Those are ideas!" The secretary's fountain pen began running along the page, sketching out the profile of the Arbat. "The second stories of buildings will be handed over to creative societies and cooperatives. I am sure that a public council will spring up here which will regulate the life of the street. With such an arrangement,

I think, the militia would not have to waste so much ink on reports. We must show what a center of youth culture can be like. And, of course, in a major city, one Arbat is not enough. For example, restoration of Stolesnikov Lane is going on, and then it will be populated with young people. Can we manage not to repeat all the mistakes there?"

It must be acknowledged honestly—the old, approved propagandistic devices have long since proved unsuitable for a new phenomenon such as the Arbat. And after all, life provides material for reflection almost every day. To debate until a conclusion is reached means to take a step forward on the path. On the path which is called restructuring.

It must also be acknowledged and understood that the basic mass of political clubs today simply are not prepared to become fellow travelers on this path. We must understand and we must act. Today. Now.

12255

Estonians Debate Problems of Russian Integration

Znaniye Official's Article

18000148a Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in
Russian 18 Dec 87 p 2

[Letter from B. Matveyev, member of the buro of the board of the republic Knowledge Society, under the rubric "Resonance": "To Make Our Common Home Better"; first three paragraphs are unattributed source introduction:]

[Text] As we had anticipated, publication of the editorial board's round-table discussion (SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 9 December 1987), and of the letter from USSR Armed Services veteran U. Khelme, "We Heard the Call—" (SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 10 December 1987) elicited a wide response from readers. The editors have already received dozens of letters, and they continue to come in. People express their views on many aspects of the topic that has been raised and pose questions of their own.

Their opinions are the most diverse, sometimes diametrically opposite. This, too, is natural—even the views of like-minded people cannot be absolutely identical.

Today we are beginning publication of readers' responses. And the only condition of their editing was OBSERVATION OF THE STANDARDS OF DEBATE. Other than that—absolute freedom of expression.

What attracted me in that material? People are frankly saying what they think. It is another question whether all participants in the discussion are right. Most likely, other readers will express their own opinion, too. The topic is

always timely, for it is our everyday life. Although among lecturers in the Knowledge Society and propagandists, it is so far less popular than other topics.

Why, in my view?

In my opinion, in the past few decades no one has taken up the nationalities question seriously and in depth. In any case, there are extremely few scholarly works about it. I was recently asked to prepare material on that topic. I went through all of Tallinn's main libraries. The only thing suitable proved to be a brochure by Comrade V. Valjas, but it was written more than 10 years ago. Everything else dealt perfunctorily with the topic.

The place where there is no unanimity is in the area of nationality relations. And maybe that is not so bad, for "living life is woven of contradictions."

For many years these relations were painted in a rosy light, and it is only in the past few years that a candid discussion of them has been published. Evidently, this is why there is sometimes such a sharp reaction. We simply are not used to it.

In the opinion of K. Hallik, it is vulgar and primitive to reduce everything to meat and consumer goods. Indeed, it is unnecessary to reduce everything to that. But in my opinion, the material aspect is not least of the reasons giving rise to contradictions. That is especially true here, in Tallinn, a large port city where the influence of the foreign mass media is significant. Here, as perhaps nowhere else, it is possible to compare what "they have" and what "we have."

The proverb "even a shack is heavenly paradise when you're with the one you love" has long been unpopular. Is it unusual for misunderstandings to begin, even between loving members of the same family, when material difficulties arise? Doesn't the housing problem have an impact on the exacerbation of relations? For some reason some people are starting to figure how many times a given nation has been bypassed in the allocation of housing.

The general indices in the republic are flabbergasting—20.3 square meters per capita (for comparison: the figure for the Union as a whole is 4.9 square meters). In Tallinn the figure is 17.9 square meters. One wonders: why build housing in Tallinn if each of us has almost 18 square meters?

But there is a problem. What, then, is the reason? Evidently there are many reasons, but they include the following: Very many people (not including those who live in dormitories) have six square meters or less "per capita." If you take the average figure of 18 meters into account, it turns out that there are no fewer residents who have 20-30 meters or more. Can it possibly be called normal when one person lives for 10 to 20 years in four to six meters of space, while all that time another has a

separate room for his dog? Are there all that few cases in which the first to have their housing improved are those whose conditions are considerably better than others' in the first place? There's where the reserve is. It turns out that it is not the "newcomers" who are to blame for the housing problem. That is where the fight for social justice needs to be fought. Otherwise we will not solve the housing problem.

But there is, in my opinion, another reason for the housing problem among Tallinn's native residents.

Everyone knows that the shortest waiting period for obtaining housing is among builders, i.e., among those who **build** that housing. But what is happening with that category in Tallinstroy today?

The workers of indigenous nationality there constitute fewer than 10 percent, and for the republic as a whole they constitute just over 20 percent of all workers in the construction industry. That must also be talked about.

And since we have touched on that issue: There are some years in which there are no representatives of the indigenous nationality at all among students at the Tallinn Militia School. And these are future officers who will be entrusted with the most difficult work. There's no use even talking about the rank-in-file personnel. That is why the republic is forced to invite people "from outside." Some one has to build our housing, protect our order, and care for us in hospitals. And after all, they all need housing.

I recalled an article recently published in VECHERNIY TALLIN that really did point out a vulgar reason for the lack of desire on the part of young people of indigenous nationality to enter the military academies. Let people accuse me, but I cannot help drawing the conclusion that one of the main reasons is the difficulty of the officer's profession. The service of young officers, who are carrying out in reality the reliable defense of our gains, takes place in the forests and the mountains, the desert and the tundra, in both northern and southern latitudes.

And on the other hand: if you look at the breakdown of students at the conservatory, the music school, the art institute, etc., you will see that they are mainly Estonian young men and women.

Now a word about bilingualism. Unquestionably there is no justification for living in Estonia 20 or 30 years without knowing Estonian. We are not on a business trip and not in a foreign colony; we are living and working in this specific republic.

For that reason we lose a great deal. How much good and interesting material bypasses us in newspapers and books, and on radio and television. We find out about the Lakhemaas Nature Preserve only when we are reminded that we are entering its grounds in our car.

But on the other hand, not all the potential for increasing the number of people who know the language has yet been tapped.

"Why," I ask my daughter, "is it back to the second lesson again?" "I don't know Estonian," she replies. And that constantly happens. Textbooks are scarce, too.

Why is there no examination in Estonian in the schools? Why isn't Estonian taught at the Tallinn Polytechnical Institute?

Both history and culture must be studied. Have all of us been in Tallinn's museums?

We are acquainted with M. Vojtes, N. Liaets, K. Tenno-saar, A. Veski, J. Joala, G. Graps, T. Miagi, I. Linn and the Orange only through Central Television.

But there are also artificial barriers, in my opinion. Take, for example, the "Timely Camera" in Russian on Estonian Television. It starts at 6:30 pm. Yet many people get off work at 6:00 and are on their way home at that time. I would watch "Timely Camera" with pleasure, but for that reason I cannot. Yet if the program began at 7:30 or even at 8:00, what a lot more viewers it would have!

Or take radio programs in Russian. At 1:25 pm on Wednesdays there is the program, "Do We Know Estonian Music?" But most listeners are in class in schools, technicums or institutes, or at work at that time. I have repeatedly suggested that it be repeated on Sundays. But evidently someone is not particularly interested in doing so.

We quite rightly talked at the round table about the ruinous consequences of excessively centralized management. Unfortunately, that depends on people who almost surely do not read SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA.

I know that many people were perplexed by K. Hallik's turning for experience to the 20 years before the war. She said what she thought, and in my opinion there is nothing seditious here.

On the word "nationalist," the S. Ozhegov dictionary says: "NATIONALISM- -the ideology and policy aimed at inflaming national enmity by appealing to the principle of defending one's national interests and national exclusiveness." And in the same dictionary: "PATRIOTISM—devotion to and love for one's Fatherland and one's people."

As we see, these are not at all identical words. The interests of the people are incompatible with enmity among nationalities.

At the 27th CPSU Congress and at ceremonies devoted to the 70th anniversary of Great October, it was stated that it is necessary to eliminate the blank spots in our history. Of course, it would be better if there had never

been any. But since it has happened that there are, the sooner they are eliminated, the better. Simply fewer generations will be injured by this.

But some people simply lack the patience to wait. And it is not for the sake of establishing the truth that they are hurrying events but for the sake of exacerbating that same enmity among nationalities.

The main thing is that all these debates not distract us from the main task—**carrying out restructuring through our joint efforts**. For there is simply no other way for our life.

Yes, in the period of the next two to three years we all should give up something. But how can you remodel a house without doing without some conveniences? It doesn't happen.

And after all, our grandfathers and fathers sacrificed a lot for the sake of our life.

Various Readers' Letters

18000148b Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in
Russian 27 Dec 87 p2

[Selected passages from readers' letters, with commentary by V. Ivanov: "And Once Again, Concerning Respect".]

[Text] In beginning the publication of letters responding to the editors' round-table discussion ("A Sober and Objective View," SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 9 December 1987), we stated that the main—and only—condition for editing the mail the paper received on that topic would be OBSERVATION OF THE STANDARDS OF DEBATE. And the very first letter we received ("To Make Our Common Home Better," by B. Matveyev, SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 18 December 1987), despite the controversial nature and importance of the issues it raised, maintained a proper, respectful tone. Indeed, most of our volunteer correspondents, quite naturally following their own inner convictions, have expressed themselves, albeit candidly and not always with partiality, in that same restrained spirit of goodwill.

Unfortunately, however, there have also been letters of a different sort. And many of them share a single distinguishing feature: they are signed either with nothing but initials or with some sort of surname but without a return address, which permits one to doubt both the authenticity of the signature and the good intentions of the authors.

Perhaps there would be no reason to pay attention to them (is there any sense, one might ask, in arguing with the author of an anonymous letter or a spiteful person?), if it were not for three factors:

—in the first place, these letters include some that are signed with a full first name and surname and include the author's address;

—in the second place, some of the reproaches and attacks contained in them, if one disregards their intolerable form, are rather fundamental and deserve attention;

—and in the third place, in the case of blatantly malicious writers of anonymous letters, it is somehow humanly distressing, after hearing or reading their offensive statements (regardless of whether they are directed to you or someone else), to remain silent. After all, the person who writes abusive epithets does not live in a vacuum. And unless he receives a worthy rebuttal, he will probably tell his relatives, acquaintances and fellow workers: I expressed criticism and the editors hushed it up and are afraid to answer me openly, which means that the truth hurts, and only I am so bold that I can tell anyone what I want and how I want.

That is why we decided to make a first and only exception to the rule and publish (deleting, of course, the absolutely indecent expressions) some of the most typical—in terms of the three features mentioned—letters, while reserving the right to provide them with our own commentary.

1. "See How Bold I Am—"

From this group, the letter from P. Premudrov, a Tallinn resident who included his full return address, seems typical to us. Here is what he writes:

"Greetings!

"Lately the question of 'nationality relations' has started to be raised frequently in the press.

"The problems of migration do not worry me, but I can understand the Estonian population in this regard.

"As for language, personally I do not want to study Estonian. I am not interested in Estonian literature, cinema, stage, etc. An utterly incompetent stylistics (evidently what is meant is stylization—ED.) in the Western manner. Of course, that is not national culture.

"All in all, I know English 100 times better than Estonian. A paradox?

"The main thing is that I do not feel any need to associate with Estonians. Even though I was born and grew up in Tallinn. On the basis of my own example (and I am not the only such person), I can suggest that a kind of form of apartheid exists in Estonia. An inner, intellectual apartheid.

"Maybe that's bad, but I have not yet noticed that it hurts me.— [signed] Pavel Premudrov, 23 years of age.

"P.S. I wouldn't be a bad idea to publish my letter in full. I'm certain that an interesting discussion would ensue."

We are carrying out the author's wish and publishing his letter as it was written, including grammar and punctuation. Naturally, not to show P. Premudrov that the newspaper yields nothing to him in boldness.

The short and quarrelsome letter contains the whole world view of a 23-year-old citizen.

Let us reflect on this response from the "audience."

I do not want to study Estonian, and that's that! I'm not interested. But how can you be interested or not interested in what you **do not know**?

And how can you reject wholesale, once again without knowing it, an **entire** national culture, assigning it in its **entirety** to "stylistics" in the Western manner. And incidentally, while announcing in the same breath, without any logic, that you know **English** (not even Russian) "100 times better than Estonian."

And then: if a person does not want to study Estonian, it must be that he does not know it. And what, then, does 100 times better mean? Zero remains zero, even if you multiply it by a billion.

In a sort letter there are probably more such absurdities than there are lines. But in the final analysis, they are not the point. If P. Premudrov had written his opinion to a friend in a private letter, then God bless him. But he writes to a newspaper and even insists that his writing be published in full. Most likely he doesn't conceal his views in conversation, either. He even boasts about them.

But comrades, let us finally learn to **think**! And not with our backbone but, as we ought to, with our brain. Let us learn to remember that every one of our words, while uttered sometimes in vain, nonetheless finds a resonance in other people's minds and hearts.

But enough abstract discussion. It seems that the best answer to P. Premudrov is provided by another of our readers, **M. M. Zarutskiy**, a scientific associate at the Estonian Research Institute of Forestry and Nature Conservation. His letter, let us immediately make clear, does not belong to any of the three categories we have mentioned above. He expresses his thoughts and feelings in what is precisely an adequately respectful form. Here is what he writes:

"...you speak to a stranger on the street in Estonian, and you hear in reply, 'I don't understand.' Then you ask another question in Russian: 'You're not a local, are you?' That is sometimes answered: 'Yes, why not? I've been living in Estonia for 25 years now.' People will even say 35 to 40 years, but they do not know Estonian, either. As to why they do not know it, the answer is usually: 'I

don't want to know it,' or, 'Why do I need it?' People do not want to know a single word of Estonian, and some of them even boast of it. (A familiar position, isn't it?—ED.) And naturally, this attitude elicits a corresponding reaction on the part of the republic's indigenous population."

It would probably be hard to put it more precisely and more reasonably.

Incidentally, Comrade Zarutskiy is fairly objective in his opinions. He does not limit himself to reproaches directed solely at those who, while living in Estonia, do not want to study Estonian. The desire for mutual understanding and mutual respect, the reader believes, should absolutely be **mutual**. And in this sense the absence of information in Estonian on radio about the arrival of long-distance trains (the Valga Railroad Station) and the lack of signs in Russian on hotel buildings, at the collective-farm market, at the Passage, at the truck depot and in other public centers (in the city of Tartu) are equally intolerable.

So let us, in any case, remember the impact of what we say.

2. That Cannot Be, Because That Can Never Be!

The editors mail also contains letters that are striking for their categorical form of expression and absolute intolerance toward another person's opinion. They draw their "arguments" arbitrarily from any sphere that's convenient according to the principle that the more there are and the more scathing they are, the better, and if the result is a series of non sequiturs, that does not bother the authors in the least.

Here is a model of that style (the author, unfortunately, wished to hide behind the initials **K. D.**):

"The ignorance of Russian cost dearly in Afghanistan. A question arises as to why all the fuss over Estonian. There was very great persecution of Shvarts the director of the Tallinn Housing Construction Combine (incidentally, the former director's name was Shvartser—ED.) and of the whole collective because of the fact that the executive was a Russian speaker. It is time for a public apology, in the press, to the collective of the Tallinn Housing Construction Combine. Studying Estonian is fine, but it should not be demanded in the form of such an ultimatum. The country has turned 180 degrees toward the bourgeois system and capitalism. No one is disturbing Estonian culture, and let it develop to the good of our homeland."

We cite the letter incompletely, and that may be why it gives the impression of a certain lack of agreement among some of its statements. Believe us, the full text is logically connected, and one statement seemingly flows from the other. It is simply that, as we already stipulated,

we have deleted expressions that are unfit for publication and contain wholesale and unsubstantiated "criticism," or to call a spade a spade—slander.

And another letter of a similar sort, without any signature at all. Granted, it begins with the words: "The State Bank collective read the article 'A Sober and Objective View' with great interest."

The authors enter into debate with some participants in the round-table discussion. In and of itself, the desire to argue and express one's own opinion can only be welcomed, especially since this is exactly what the editors called for and exactly the sort of reaction on which they counted. But once again the question arises of **how** one argues. An impatience of tone and, even worse, an extreme failure to pay attention to the text of the discussion (or a deliberate distortion of the facts, which is worse) are distinguishing features of this "collective letter."

There is such a thing as a chain reaction of irritation. And it may be that some people, after reading the responses, will want to take up their pens and pour out their **own** dissatisfaction on paper. Believe us, the editors are not counting on **such** a response. What, then, is our purpose in publishing today's material?

In the first place, to give a rebuff to the authors of anonymous letters and ill-wishers. But that is not the main thing. Every such letter, for all its seemingly exceptional nature and atypicality, expresses the opinion not just of the author but of a certain group. And it is usually expounded not just on paper but in conversation. We would like for each of you, in reading today's mail survey, to reflect on the likely consequences of ill-considered statements, and to be able, in the heat of debate, to restrain your emotions and defend your viewpoint without damaging another person's pride, and to remember that each of us has a sense of personal dignity.

8756

Estonian MVD Chief Interviewed On Post-Amnesty Crime Rate

18000144a Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 3 Dec 87 p 4

[Interview with Major General M. Tibar, ESSR Minister of Internal Affairs, conducted by F. Kaazik, ETA correspondent: "And What Are the Facts?"]

[Text] [Question] "A family of deaf-mutes was murdered on Sypruze Boulevard in Tallinn!" All sorts of details have been added to this rumor, even the number of the house where the crime was supposed to have occurred.

[Answer] That rumor is absolutely groundless. Just like the idle talk that the recent amnesty resulted in a sharp increase in crime. Over the past decades amnesties have always been selective and carried out in compliance with

specific articles of the law which state that only those prisoners who have made definite strides toward rehabilitation may be released prior to completion of their sentences. I would like to emphasize that the current amnesty as well did not free the majority of criminals and only applied to those of whom it could be said with confidence that they are longer a danger to society.

[Question] Could you cite any specific facts to support your claim that the amnesty has not resulted in an increase in crime?

[Answer] Certainly. As compared to last year, during the first 10 months of this year there was a 4.5 percent decline in crime in our republic, and a 14.4 percent decline in serious crimes.

[Question] There has been a lot of talk about apartment burglaries. What can you tell us about that?

[Answer] I can report that recently militia organs have broken up several criminal gangs that were involved in the theft of citizens' private property, including apartment burglaries. During the first 10 months of this year, in comparison to last year, the number of apartment burglaries declined by 12.9 percent. But I would like to appeal to people to take greater care with their personal property. It is no secret that very many people's front doors are equipped with primitive locks, despite the fact that good, dependable locks are available.

[Question] Automobiles and spare parts for automobiles are probably a topic in themselves, aren't they?

[Answer] Yes. Although, thanks to the fact that we now have somewhat more paid parking and that more cars have been equipped with anti-theft devices, during the past 10 months, again in comparison with last year, the number of automobile thefts declined by a factor of almost two. However, during the same period there was a sharp increase in the number of thefts of windshields from VAZ automobiles. Over the past 10 months we have had over 400 cases of windshield theft alone. There is no reason to suppose that the supply of glass and rubber parts will improve in the near future. Therefore car owners should seriously consider marking car parts to prevent theft.

[Question] In the central press quite a few articles have been written on the struggle against illegal alcohol production. Do we have illegal distillers here, too?

[Answer] Unfortunately we do. And first of all I would like to state that militia organs are going to intensify their fight both against the people who distill the alcohol, and against those who sell it. So far this year more than 100 illegal distillers have been tried in court, and over 400 have received administrative penalties. I should note that those figures are considerably higher than last year's.

[Question] A question about another rumor. There has been talk about two bodies found in a van.

[Answer] Unfortunately this time the rumor is true. Two bodies were discovered in a van with an LaSSR license plate in Lillekyula Rayon, Tallinn. We have identified the bodies as those of a driver and an expeditor from the Uzvara Agroindustrial Association; both were shot to death. Since the investigation is still under way it would be premature to go into greater detail about the crime at this time.

12825

Azeri MVD Chief Discusses Restructuring of Militia

18000144c Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian
3 Dec 87 pp 3-4

[Responses by Aydyn Israfilovich Mamedov, AzSSR Minister of Internal Affairs, to questions from BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY readers: "Dialogues About Restructuring: What Is the Militia Doing About It?"]

[Text] A large number of our readers responded to our invitation to participate in a discussion with Aydyn Israfilovich Mamedov, AzSSR minister of internal affairs. Over the course of three days they submitted more than one hundred questions by telephone and by mail. Their questions pertained to various aspects of militia operations under restructuring and to reinforcement of law and order and socialist legality. There were also many complaints concerning specific problems.

Space does not permit us to print the replies to all those questions; therefore we have selected for publication those which, in our opinion, are of interest to the widest range of readers. But we would like to report that every one of the questions and complaints not published here will also be given attention. They will be carefully considered, and the MVD will provide the questioners with complete replies.

"What is the militia doing about it?" That is what we usually ask when we are upset about disorder or law-breaking. And it is no coincidence that that question is the focal point of a majority of the questions we are publishing here today and sets the tone of the conversation.

So, on the line now we have the readers of BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY and the minister of internal affairs.

[Question] How is restructuring progressing in internal affairs organs? (N. Nagiyev, scientist)

[Answer] Our republic MVD is working consistently to implement the party's demands with regard to restructuring of law enforcement work. Above all we are taking

steps to update our forms and methods of administration, reduce paperwork, improve organization and effectiveness and ensure that each person has a sense of responsibility for his or her job. The focus of all our work is being shifted directly to city and rayon internal affairs departments; they are the nodal point for all problems relating to strengthening of legality and law and order. Work to prevent, solve and investigate crimes is being improved and ties with labor collectives and the public strengthened. We have an urgent need to learn how to operate under conditions of glasnost and democracy, criticism and self-criticism, while unswervingly observing socialist legality. To a decisive extent our success in strengthening law and order and stepping up our struggle against negative phenomena will depend on our cadres. Therefore we are reviewing the system of measures by which we select, train, certify and promote members of the militia. Our political organs and party organizations are devoting greater attention to the instilling lofty political, moral and ethical qualities in our personnel.

I should note that so far restructuring in internal affairs organs is proceeding too slowly; we are still seeing the effects of outdated methods, habit, red tape, irresponsibility and violations of socialist legality and professional ethics. We are still not working hard enough to prevent crime, and there are problems with the solving and investigation of crimes. We are very seriously concerned by all these things and they have prompted to take more resolute measures.

[Question] How does the militia handle citizens' letters and statements? It is a well-known fact that in that respect there are sometimes attempts to avoid registering complaints, so as not to worsen crime rate statistics. What measures are being taken against this? (V. Sarkisyan)

[Answer] Work with citizens' letters and statements is an important component of our operations. We have a clear-cut system in place for handling that job. All statements and crime reports received by a militia unit are recorded in a special log located at the dispatcher's office. Such messages are recorded around the clock. If a statement is delivered by someone in person, the dispatcher must give the petitioner a slip showing that it was received.

In accordance with the requirements of the AzSSR Criminal Procedures Code, these statements must be investigated within three days, or within 10 days in exceptional cases.

Unfortunately, we are still seeing instances of red tape at the local level in connection with processing of statements and crime reports, and cases of improper actions being taken in regard to them. There are also cases in which, as you correctly noted, complaints are not registered in order to avoid upsetting the status quo. Currently we are resolutely combatting that. An internal investigation is conducted into each incident of this

type, and each person found guilty is subject to strict disciplinary measures, including removal from internal affairs organs. Under aggravating circumstances criminal prosecution may also be called for.

[Question] In what specific ways is the militia combating crimes in the social sector: in trade and household services? (S. Azimov, engineer; L. Simonov, security guard; A. Proshina, retiree; A. Gabibov, engineer at the Baku Radio Plant)

[Answer] I think this question must be looked at from a broader perspective, within the framework of the whole fight against unearned income. That is one of the main thrusts of work by internal affairs organs. And we must admit that in this respect we have quite a few resources which remain unutilized. And, of course, we are not satisfied with the results of our work. Embezzlement, speculation, theft, extortion and other abuses in the service sector are still widespread and are the cause of justified reproaches by citizens. Each year we uncover more than 1,000 cases of abuses in that sector. That is intolerable.

We propose that along with intensified militia activity we must do everything we can to step up crime prevention work in the areas of trade and household services. That will in turn require that each of us be more civically active and not tolerate such monstrous phenomena. At the same time we need to improve substantially our work to create a healthy atmosphere throughout the entire service system.

[Question] What steps are being taken to eliminate shortcomings in work by the State Motor Vehicle Inspectorate [GAI]? (R. Rasul-zade, senior radio broadcasting editor; P. Savchenko)

[Answer] The situation with regard to accidents and lack of discipline on the part of drivers, and GAI's unsatisfactory work in that regard, cause us great concern. By a decision of our ministry's board the heads of our republic GAI and the Baku GAI were removed from their positions. Steps are being taken to strengthen the service and restructure its operations. Incidentally, a detailed article on that subject has appeared in BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY.

But at this point I would like to say that it will be impossible to enforce order on streets and highways without active participation by citizens and by every driver, without a high degree of discipline and responsibility on their part.

[Question] Is it true that GAI inspectors give drivers severe penalties for not wearing safety belts? That would seem to be something which should be left up to the driver. (A. Akhundov, physician)

[Answer] Experience shows that safety belts are an important factor in reducing major injuries in highway accidents. The wearing of safety belts is mandatory under the Traffic Regulations Statute (paragraph 3.3). Drivers can be fined up to three rubles if they are found to be in violation of those regulations.

[Question] Does the minister drive on Baku streets? What is his opinion of them? Probably negative. And my question: why does the GAI not perform its function of monitoring the condition of roads? (M. Kerimov, veteran of the Great Patriotic War)

[Answer] I will not disagree with you. Indeed, many streets in Baku are in such poor condition that driving over them is not only difficult, but hazardous as well. There are many reasons for that, among them the slowness of repair work and poor maintenance of road surfaces. This gives us a right to express the most serious criticism to the city organizations responsible for highway maintenance. GAI employees conduct systematic studies of streets and street lighting. Quite a few shortcomings are revealed. Thereupon notice of those shortcomings is sent to ispolkoms and other organizations. But, unfortunately, those organizations do not always respond as they should, and GAI employees are not as persistent as they should be and do not see their job through to conclusion. Hence the results which we see.

[Question] Certain members of the militia behave immodestly and provocatively in their private lives, live in luxury and do not place much value on their honor. This undermines the militia's authority in the eyes of the public. What is your opinion on this problem?

[Answer] I am of the opinion that there is no place for such individuals in the ranks of the militia. And currently we are in the process of purging internal affairs organs of individuals who are indifferent toward their jobs, are pursuing selfish goals or have lost the trust of the public. Incidentally, in their letters and telephone calls BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY readers have named several militia members who, in their opinion, are behaving improperly. We will investigate those cases most carefully and, if necessary, take the strictest measures.

[Question] In the MVD system there are quite a few people with higher legal education who are serving as ordinary militiamen and who have no prospects of career advancement. Why are they treated like that?

[Answer] That is a serious problem. Many of our employees in low-level positions graduate from the evening and correspondence sections of higher and secondary educational institutions. We are not always in a position to promote all such individuals to officer's rank, because each year we receive a large contingent of

officers from the graduating classes of higher and secondary specialized educational institutions. But insofar as possible we actively attempt to find a suitable solution in all such situations.

[Question] I am a store manager with higher education. Could I get a job in the administrative apparatus of the Department for the Struggle Against Theft of Socialist Property and Speculation [BKSS]? (K. Alekperov)

[Answer] We have people from various specialized fields working in the BKSS administrative apparatus: engineers, economists, technologists... We also have a need for persons with a thorough knowledge of the trade system. But you should also bear in mind that hiring at the BKSS, as for all officer-level positions in internal affairs organs, is conducted on a strictly individual basis, on the basis of recommendations from labor collectives and party and Komsomol organizations. Age is also a factor — the applicant should be no older than 30 — and so is the state of the applicant's health.

[Question] As a result of restructuring many ministries and departments are undergoing personnel cutbacks. Is that expected in our republic MVD as well? (G. Safarov, secretary of Zhdanovskiy Rayispolkom)

[Answer] The republic MVD is working constantly to improve its structure and reduce the size of its administrative apparatus. As a result of that work the precinct-level militia inspector service has been reinforced in particular.

[Question] Does the militia have a shortage of cadres? (B. Mikailyan, veteran of labor and the Great Patriotic War)

[Answer] No, we are not experiencing a cadre shortage.

[Question] The newspaper TRUD published an article on shortcomings in the cadre policy of the MVD system. In particular that article pointed out that the MVD is comprised only of persons of native nationality. What is the militia administration's position on this issue? (V. Arzumanyan)

[Answer] In Azerbaijan's internal affairs organs there are members of virtually every nationality in our republic. That is true of both administrators and low-level employees. However, I cannot claim that all problems in that respect have been resolved. At the present time we are paying careful attention to a given region's ethnic composition when selecting local cadres.

[Question] What is the basis for selection of precinct inspectors, how is their work evaluated, and what is currently being done to improve the operations of their service? (V. Zenin, instructor at the Azerbaijan Agricultural Institute)

[Answer] The precinct militia inspector service is one of the basic services in the MVD system. It is the militia unit which has the closest contact with the public. It is precinct inspectors' job to maintain public order within their jurisdictions and to conduct crime prevention work designed to prevent drunkenness and alcoholism, drug addiction, parasitism and other antisocial phenomena, working in close cooperation with members of the public and of voluntary people's militias. It is also their task to combat unearned income, monitor compliance with passport regulations, etc. As you can see, these are broad, weighty responsibilities, and their successful performance is dependent upon the ideological temper and competence of precinct inspectors. In our republic virtually all of them have higher and secondary specialized education, more than half of them are CPSU members and many have been selected as deputies of local soviets. Precinct inspectors are assigned to serve in internal affairs organs by party and soviet organs, and all have worked in labor collectives and served in the Armed Forces. In their ranks there are also former internationalist soldiers who have received military orders and medals.

The work of precinct militia inspectors is evaluated on the basis of the actual status of law and order and legality within their jurisdictions, their ability to keep in close contact with the public and their work with citizens' letters and statements.

Unfortunately, some precinct inspectors are still working below their capacity. The service's role in preventing domestic crimes, drinking and drug addiction remains inadequate. We have not eliminated cases of an unconscious attitude toward official duties, rudeness and violation of socialist legality. We are taking steps to eradicate these phenomena. At the present time restructuring of the operations of precinct inspectors is under way and that service is being strengthened. We are getting rid of people who work poorly or have lost the public's trust.

[Question] The militia has had the same uniform for many years now. Isn't it time to change it? (G. Ilyasov, Agdash)

[Answer] Members of the militia have been wearing the present uniform since 1969. In our opinion it is sufficiently attractive, elegant and comfortable, and we see no need to update it.

[Question] Is income tax going to be deducted from the pay of MVD officers? (S. Aliyeva, educator)

[Answer] Rank-and-file militiamen and junior officers had income tax deducted starting in 1986, and precinct militia inspectors became subject to income tax beginning this year. As for other militia members, this question has not as yet been considered.

[Question] What is the situation in our republic with regard to apartment burglaries, and what is the militia doing to put an end to them? (N. Allakhverdiyev, Armed Forces veteran)

[Answer] Quite frankly, apartment burglaries are still widespread, particularly in Baku, Kirovabad, Sumgait and a number of rayons. Despite the fact that recently a number of burglary rings have been broken up, we must admit that the struggle against this type of crime has not yet yielded the desired effect. There are several reasons for that, of which the most important is poor crime prevention work by the militia, and by precinct inspectors and criminal investigation units in particular. We are also dissatisfied with the work being done to uncover and investigate burglaries. But I would also like to bring up another point. Burglaries are greatly encouraged by the poor condition of our apartment doors. It presents no great difficulty to break in the doors found in any new building. If builders are not thinking about this, then residents must themselves give thought to their doors. In addition, placing apartments under the protection of off-duty militia provides reliable protection against break-ins. Virtually no burglaries are committed in apartments with such protection. The practice of having retired residents keep watch has also proven effective.

[Question] When will the speculators and beggars often seen in street underpasses and at subway entrances disappear from the streets of Baku? (A. Rustamov, physician; M. Guseynov, safety inspector of Baku Tramway and Trolley Administration)

[Answer] We are fighting that, but we have still not achieved the effect we would like. It seems that one day we pick up a large group of speculators and beggars, and the next day there they are again. I will not cite legal limitations, but instead will take the blame myself. Our personnel should be more active in this respect, and make greater use of public participation. Currently we are reviewing militia units' patrol routes in order to better combat this sort of antisocial phenomena, and we are improving the operations of a special dispatcher unit. In this connection greater responsibility has been placed on the heads of rayon internal affairs departments.

[Question] What is the militia doing to ensure the safety of taxi drivers, who are still subject to armed assault? (Seidov, driver for Baku Taxi Service #5)

[Answer] This year and last year several taxi drivers were assaulted by robbers. We have reported the arrest of these criminals in the republic press, and just a few days ago another gang in Leninskiy Rayon was broken up. But a number of such crimes remain unsolved, and they are under investigation. Special groups have been formed to prevent such crimes.

[Question] A gang of thieves is at work among dachas around Apsheron; they are well-organized and have their own vehicle. When can we expect peace to return to our dachas? (Yu. Aliyev)

[Answer] The militia is trying to combat dacha burglaries. Last year two gangs, consisting of eight individuals, were broken up; together they had committed 18 burglaries in Azizbekovskiy, Kirovskiy and other rayons. However, the situation there remains alarming and, obviously, militia efforts alone will not suffice. I feel that the dacha owners need to follow the example of people in Moscow and Leningrad and hire security guards on a cooperative basis and, whenever possible, install burglar alarms in their dachas.

[Question] What is the ministry doing to reinforce socialist legality among its own staff and to eliminate violations? (V. Zverev; D. Abramyan, Lt. Col., Ret.)

[Answer] We regard the strengthening of socialist legality as our most important social and political task. All our work in that direction is based on unconditional realization of the requirements of the CPSU Central Committee resolution entitled "On Further Strengthening of Socialist Legality and Law and Order and Intensification of Protection of Citizens' Rights and Legitimate Interests." That resolution was widely discussed at staff meetings, and specific measures toward its realization were drawn up and are currently being implemented. The role and activism of party organizations in this regard have been increased. Party and bureau meetings regularly include reports by administrators concerning reinforcement of socialist legality and public order, and a resolute struggle is being conducted against any deviations from the standards of law and morality, irresponsibility or rudeness in interaction with citizens. Last year two staff members of the Nakhichevanskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department were tried for fighting, and three staff members of the Shaumyanovskiy Department were indicted for concealment of crimes. During the current year 11 persons have been fired for violations of socialist legality, and a number of them have been put on trial.

I should note that the overwhelming majority of those working in internal affairs organs perform their official duties with a sense of responsibility and understand that restructuring is unimaginable without eradication of all violations of the law.

In conclusion I would like to thank the readers who participated in this discussion. The staff of our republic militia make every possible effort to carry out their duties and will vigilantly protect law and order.

Jurist Urges Use of Videos to Improve Work of Courts

18000147a Moscow *SOTSIALISTHCHESKAYA ZAKONNOST* in Russian No 11, Nov 87 (signed to press 23 Oct 87) pp 26-27

[Article by A. Karanadze, chairman of the Supreme Court of the Georgian SSR: "Video Technology in Judicial Work"]

[Text] The GeSSR Supreme Court has been working on the introduction of modern scientific-technical means for a long time. After the 27th CPSU Congress, which adopted the policy of maximum utilization of the achievements of scientific-technical progress in all spheres of the life of socialist society, the intensity and direction of this work increased noticeably and it became more productive.

In May and July 1986 training methods seminars for management and practical employees of the ministries of justice and Supreme Courts of all the Union republics were held, by decision of the USSR Ministry of Justice, at the GeSSR Supreme Court for the purpose of acquainting people with the experience accumulated here. Participants in the seminar were familiarized in detail with various forms and methods of using modern scientific-technical means in court proceedings, in particular with experience in using sound recording.¹

Videorecorders had already begun to be introduced in the GeSSR Supreme Court in the 1970's, and all the specific capabilities offered by video technology were used. They were used above all to better the professional habits and qualifications of judges and improve the administration of justice.

But the video technology that we had at that time was unable to become a fixture in court activities then because it was not on the required level, the quality of the picture was poor and unstable, and difficulties in tuning the equipment greatly limited the possibilities for using it effectively.

Then it became possible to buy high-quality modern video equipment, and this enabled us to carry out a program of measures in the activity of the republic Supreme Court to employ video recording in organizing and streamlining court work.

Technical means are used quite broadly in the GeSSR Supreme Court today. This refers above all to sound recording equipment, which is used extensively in the process of administering justice. But even in this setting the impact from using video technology in judicial proceedings appears—and this has already been confirmed in practice—to be completely exceptional in its potential for a positive influence on the activity of the judicial system.

And the introduction of video technology into the judicial process creates qualitatively new possibilities that make it possible to solve the problems of ensuring legality while administering justice on a fundamentally higher level.

It is not difficult to trace the degree and nature of the qualitative improvement in judicial proceedings using scientific-technical means retrospectively, so to speak. It should be noted first that the old, traditional form of keeping the record of a court session by hand involved losing 30-40 and sometimes even 50 percent of the substantive, legally significant information. It is not hard to imagine what a negative effect this has on the quality of administration of justice and ensuring legality.

The technique used at the republic Supreme Court of compiling the record using sound recording equipment and parallel to this keeping a phonogram record of the course of the entire proceeding from start to finish made it possible to practically exclude the loss of substantive information received during a court session and to eliminate the likelihood of a mistaken or subjective recording of the course and content of the court proceeding. From the standpoint of ensuring legality in the administration of justice the technical possibilities of aural replay of the entire course of the court proceeding, which are in effect new means of judicial monitoring, self-monitoring, and supervision, are extremely important factors.

And finally, combining all these positive features of sound recording of the court proceeding with video recording offers a real basis to take one more important step toward a further qualitative improvement in the judicial system.

It is not hard to imagine how greatly the possibilities of ensuring legality and working out optimal methods of improving the quality of the administration of justice are increased when the course of the court proceeding is studied not by familiarization with a record compiled by hand and not free of subjective elements, but when the proceeding can be listened to, or even better watched, from start to finish.

The court panel can go back to any phase of the proceeding, recreate it in the most minute detail, and thoughtfully and thoroughly comprehend any facet of the court hearing, using the most objective and expressive information, which is provided by video recording.

The practical significance of this possibility is exceptionally great in reviewing complex, multi-phased cases. Judges know very well that during the proceeding situations very often arise where information received by them earlier during the court investigation takes on a special, sometimes entirely new coloring and significance. This requires one to go back to it and reinterpret it in light of the new information. There can even be cases where members of the court for various reasons

were not able to give proper attention to particular phases of the proceeding or to outwardly insignificant details in the statements of participants.

All these and many other complexities and problems which are encountered in such number in practically every court proceeding can be resolved after viewing the video recording of the appropriate segment of the court hearing.

The court panel also has the possibility of making broader use of video recording of a proceeding in practically any situation where it finds it to be necessary or expedient. For example, a video recording may be shown during the court investigation (at the initiative of the judge or at the request of the procurator, the defendant, or his attorney) in order to recreate for the participants in the proceeding some fragment of an earlier part of the proceeding.

The panel may use video recording of the judicial proceeding in the deliberation room as well, during work on the verdict.

It is hard to overestimate the significance of the video recorder when a court case is being studied on an appeal or supervisory basis. With a video recording at its disposal, the higher court is able to create for itself the effect of being present at the court proceeding and can watch and listen to it, in full from start to finish or only that part which they consider necessary. One certainly must agree that such working conditions when studying a court case are the best possible and, where other conditions are equal, can ensure the best appeal and supervisory activity.

Video recording of court proceedings has enormous, practically unlimited potential in another extremely important area, improving the professional qualifications of judges. It is extremely important for the judges to see themselves from outside. Both the judges themselves and their leader (the chairman of the court) can clearly see and correctly evaluate all mistakes and shortcomings in conducting the judicial proceeding, and therefore can eliminate them more quickly.

A video recording of a proceeding helps judges monitor their facial expressions, gestures, and manner of speaking and listening. The sophistication of the judicial proceeding as a whole benefits: the judge sees graphically what must be done to give the proper solemnity, representative quality, and authority to the hearing of the case.

Thus we may conclude that video recording of the court proceeding is, in its form and content, acquiring the qualities of documentary video film, which can be used with great benefit and effectiveness in solving the broadest range of procedural, methodological, and training problems related to the administration of justice.

FOOTNOTE

1. See SOTSIALISTICHSKAYA ZAKONNOST, No 11, 1986, pp 14-16.

COPYRIGHT: "Sotsialisticheskaya zakonnost", 1987
11176

Translator Warned Against Contact With Foreign Citizens

18000147b Moscow OGONEK in Russian No 48,
Nov 87 (signed to press 24 Nov 87) p 7

[Letter to OGONEK from V.V. Ustich, 33 years old, Krasnodar]

[Text] I worked for about 4 years as an interpreter at the Krasnodar Chamber of Commerce while various kinds of equipment was being installed. Different people would come to us, but I established friendly relations with only a few, those who had an interest in our country and liked us. When our son was born we received congratulations from friends and acquaintances, including some abroad.

One of the West German specialists with whom I had corresponded for a long time was traveling through Krasnodar to Novorossiysk. He informed us of this by telegram and asked us to meet him. He immediately wanted to give me a present for the birth of the child—baby pants and booties knitted by his wife, but we had to go to the Chamber of Commerce in the center of town, not far from our building. The West German specialist asked A. S. Zapunyan, who was meeting him, for permission to drop by our house for 10-15 minutes and personally congratulate my wife, present the gift from his family, and take pictures. From the first minute he was with us to the last—about 25 minutes in all—Zapunyan was right there, and he immediately wrote down my passport data even though he has already known me for 3 years.

A week later we were seeing the West German specialist off and at the airport, in Zapunyan's presence, gave him a set of knives and forks as a memento.

On 8 May of this year I was invited to the militia, and there Nina Nikolayevna Kirichenko, an OVIR employee, in the presence of the deputy chief of the Krasnodar OVIR (I did not get his name) "talked" with me about violation of the law, about the mistake of friendly relations with citizens from abroad, especially from the capitalist countries. The "talk" used this kind of language: "They killed our 20 million..." "Sell out your native land for rags." "What kind of suit is that you're wearing?" (Incidentally, I bought it in a Soviet store.) "Things are pretty obvious with this guy."

Nina Nikolayevna read me the Ukase which I supposedly violated, but I had not violated a single point of anything that she read: offering housing, services, dealing. Finally the deputy chief of OVIR let me go with the statement that I had created the preconditions for a violation—deviation from the program.

"We have warned you for the first time," they said to me in conclusion. "You do not have the right to meet with foreigners in off-duty time. We will always find out if anyone else visits you. For the second offense the fine is up to 50 rubles." And then they poured on the threats against my future.

That is how I turned into a criminal and internal enemy of our country. I.V. Milovanov, chief of the Chamber of Commerce, prohibited me from doing even written work. Some friends began to avoid me. How can what happened to me be correlated with our initiatives aimed at trust and cooperation in the international arena, with television bridges where it is said that people from different countries should know each other better, and finally, with simplification of the procedure for traveling to the socialist countries?

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

11176

**Tajik Press Conference On Family Planning,
Women's Roles**

18300147a Dushanbe KOMMUNIST
TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 28 Jan 88 p 2

[TadzhikTA report: "Concern about Mother and Child Care"]

[Text] Conversation ran along the lines of this important theme at a press conference held here in Dushanbe, in which activists of the Republic Women's Council, representatives

of the news media, and republic propagandists took part. TaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Secretary and Republic Women's Council Chairman A. T. Kasymova opened the press conference, a multi-faceted dialogue on the problems of mothers and children, the legal aspects of families, and the struggles with harmful traditions.

A large portion of the press conference was allotted to questions of family planning, hygiene, and cultural life. It covered increasing the role of women in the socioeconomic and public life of the republic, and the necessity of actively involving the women's councils in rural areas. It was noted that the process of restructuring taking place in the country and in the republic, democratization, and the broadening of glasnost require new approaches to illuminate the problems of the women's movement.

Answering journalists' questions were Tajik Minister of Public Health G. K. Pulatova, and the director of the Scientific Research Institute for the Care of Mothers and Children, S. Kh. Khakimova.

**Religious Belief Given As Reason for Breakup of
Families**

18300150 [Editorial Report] Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian on 9 February 1988 carries on page 1 a 100-word article by special correspondent N. Mesropyan describing a sociological study in Kirovakan which revealed that "a number of families break up due to the religious belief of the husband or wife." The author notes that this response was completely unexpected.

**Proposals For Amu-Darya Delta Ecological,
Economic Improvement**

18300094 Tashkent OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI
V UZBEKISTANE in Russian No 8, Aug 87 pp 21-28

[Article by A. P. Yurits: "On Restoring the Economic Potential and Conducting Environmental Protection Measures in the Amu-Darya Delta"]

[Text] The popular expression: "Nature does not tolerate any rude interference and can take tough vengeance for it," should be close to all of us. It is necessary to approach the problem of the Aral Sea and the Amu-Darya and Syr-Darya deltas with all seriousness and responsibility.

I am far from the thought that — as they say — it is not necessary to gather all the water of the great Central Asian rivers for irrigation agriculture and to leave a significant amount of it for the preservation of the Aral Sea. It would be incorrect from the point of view of rationally using water and land resources to insure the optimum social and economic living standards for the population in the entire Aral basin, including that of the Amu-Darya, where approximately 15 million people live.

However, this has not given anyone the right to ignore the interest of the autonomous republic, which has a population of 1,100,000 people and which has now been forced to take upon itself the entire blow from the degradation of the ecological systems, the desertification of the Amu-Darya delta in connection with the drying up of the Aral Sea, dust storms, water not fit to drink, and the — at times — very difficult conditions for human activity.

Within the framework of this article, we will only dwell on certain questions concerning this complicated problem.

1. The need for compensating measures in the Amu-Darya delta. The question consists of the fact that the problem of the Aral Sea would not exist in such an exceptionally difficult form if the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources had carried out compensating measures in its delta as the expenditure of water from the Amu-Darya for irrigation agriculture increased. Basically, this would have involved the transfer of collector drainage water to the delta in order to fill and establish a number of hydraulic engineering projects. In 1975, more than 40 of the country's scientific research and other institutes were enlisted under the direction of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology in the development of measures for the Aral Sea problem. Over the course of five years, these institutes prepared material and compiled recommendations that permitted the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources to begin compiling a technical

economic report — "A Series of Measures To Regulate Water Conditions in the Aral Sea and To Prevent the Desertification and Salinization of the Amu-Darya and Syr-Darya Deltas."

Unfortunately, the opinion of scientific institutes is one thing and that of the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, which thought that there would be no entropogenic desertification of the Amu-Darya and Syr-Darya deltas, were separate matters. As a result, work on the technical economic report was not conducted for more than two years, generally speaking; it was resumed only in June 1984 after an appropriate USSR Gosplan directive. The compilation of the technical economic report, which has still not been approved by the ministry, was completed in December 1985, but no compensating work in the Amu-Darya delta is being performed.

Let us take, for example, the efficient use of the unregulated flow of the river water. To do this, it is necessary to construct in the lower reaches of the river the Mezhdurechenskiy water divider and accumulator to collect river water during the non-growing period and to distribute it between the animal husbandry and fish-breeding farms. During three years alone (1983-1985) 13 cubic kilometers of unregulated flow was discharged in the direction of the sea below the Takhiatashskiy integrated water power development.

However, this water did not provide any addition to the Aral Sea since it did not get to the sea. The sea had retreated more than 30 kilometers and the river water, spreading out in the depressions of the dried-up river bed, formed salt-marsh lakes there.

The same thing can be said about the urgent need to reconstruct the end sections of the collector dischargers located in the northern part of the autonomous republic; their designing has still not been begun. That is why collector water in an amount of more than one cubic kilometer is discharged without any benefit into the dry portion of the sea, forming new salt-marsh lakes in the depressions.

The reconstruction of the end sections of the KS-1, KS-3, KS-4, KS-5, and KKS collector dischargers should have provided for the supply of collector water to irrigate the delta's pasture and hay-growing tracts and fishing ponds — and after the use of this water — its discharge into the deep-water (western) part of the Aral Sea which in the future will be maintained as a salt receiver from the irrigated lands of the Amu-Darya basin.

Two of these facts provide graphic examples of the irresponsible attitude of the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources toward the problem of the southern Aral Sea area. These questions must be solved based on the economic advisability and rational

use of water resources, without waiting for the approval of the technical economic report and without allowing the criminal squandering of water resources.

Meanwhile, these questions have been posed to the USSR and Uzbek SSR ministries of land reclamation and water resources for many years. They have also been reflected in the decrees of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers entitled "On Measures To Accelerate the Economic and Social Development of the Kara-Kalpak ASSR" in its section on the construction of hydraulic engineering structures in the Amu-Darya delta in order to irrigate the pastures and fish-breeding ponds.(1)

However, the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources (the construction designer and contractor) has still not begun to design these projects. As a result, the autonomous republic annually fails to produce thousands of tons of meat and fish, and tens of thousands of hectares of delta land are being subjected to further desertification.

2. Economic and social losses in the Amu-Darya delta. In connection with the drying up of the Aral Sea and the entropogenic desertification of the Amu-Darya delta, the economic potential of the southern Aral Sea area has been sharply reduced.

During 1958-1985, the fish catch decreased 10-fold (from 244,000 quintals to 23,000 quintals). In view of the increase in the mineral content of the sea water (up to 14 grams per liter) the fishing industry in the Aral Sea was completely halted in 1983 and fish were caught only in the intradelta lakes and in Lake Sarykamysh (from 1980).

The muskrat industry occupied a significant place in the Amu-Darya delta. The procurement of skins began in 1947 and reached a maximum limit in 1957 when 1,130,000 were procured. Subsequently, a sharp decrease in muskrat lands occurred in connection with the halting of the water's arrival in the delta. This led to the complete cessation of the muskrat industry in 1977-1978.

The presence in the Amu-Darya delta of excellent pasture and hay-growing tracts contributed to the breeding of beef cattle there. The animal husbandry of the kolhoz was highly profitable (the cost of one quintal of meat was 70-80 rubles) although it was conducted using primitive methods. The raising of the cattle to age and the fattening of the calves on the pastures were the main reserve for efficiency. A correct (for the times) cow calving organization permitted the calves to be pastured with the adult cattle from April to late autumn.

During 25 years (from 1960), 75,000 tons of meat were produced on the farms located in the Amu-Darya delta. Production costs grew from 70-80 rubles per quintal in 1960 to 240-250 rubles in 1984.

The desertification and salinization of the delta have already led to losses in the natural potential of the land over an area of 500,000 hectares (the overall area of the delta is 1,300,000 hectares). The fertility coefficient has been reduced over 26 years by 30 points and the potential losses due to this cause have reached 360 million rubles.

In addition, workers have been deprived of an opportunity to relax on the coast of the sea (in the holiday homes of the city of Muynak) where more than 20,000 people vacationed in 1973-1982.

Thus, the economic and social losses, which have been taken into account for 20 years in Muynakskiy Rayon, have reached (in millions of rubles):

For the fishing industry — 127
For the muskrat industry — 10
For animal husbandry — 128
From reducing the fertility of the land — 360
From losses in the sea's recreational value — 8
Total: — 633

What are the possible ways to restore the economic potential of the southern Aral Sea area?

This question must be examined only in combination with the implementation of environmental protection measures. One should not forget that the autonomous republic is now already surrounded on three sides by deserts (Kara-Kum, Kizil-Kum and Ust-Yurt), and the formation of a fourth, the Aral desert, can threaten the existence of the entire Khorezmskiy Oasis — the more so since more than 10 billion tons of different types of salt have accumulated in the sea for many millennia. As the sea dries out, they are carried to the cultivated areas of the Kara-Kalpak ASSR and the Tashauz and Khorezm oblasts.

Moreover, the process of its desertification will also increase as a result of the lowering of the delta's ground water level. This will involve a further fall in the fertility of the land measured in an amount of 1.4-1.5 billion rubles.

In connection with the drying up of the Aral Sea, the climate in the Aral area has become much more continental. Maximum summer temperatures have increased to +44.6 - 45.8 degrees Centigrade, and the minimum winter ones have decreased to -33.7 - -34.0 degrees Centigrade. Vast areas of the dried-up seabed (40 percent) and delta have become sources for constantly intensifying dust storms (up to 30 a year) with their wind-carried fine dirt and salts that have a ruinous effect on the health of people and the condition of the animals and vegetation. The drinking qualities of the water have been worsened quite a bit in connection with the pollution of the river waters by the collector dischargers and the absence of underground fresh water lenses. In Muynakskiy Rayon, the medical and epidemiological situation has become extremely complicated. The migration

of the population to other rayons is intensifying. The number of people in Muynakskiy Rayon has been sharply reduced during the last 20 years.

Thus, we are not only talking about the restoration of the economic potential of the Amu-Darya delta but also about the fact that it is necessary to maintain as much as possible the natural conditions required there for the activity of man and for the development of the animal and vegetation world based on water resource and other measures.

3. Solving the economic, social and ecological tasks in the Amu-Darya delta based on its being supplied with water. For the complete restoration of the economic potential and the implementation of environmental protection measures based on using river and collector-drainage water in the Amu-Darya basin, it is necessary to supply the delta with water over an area of no less than 600,000 hectares, including (in thousands of hectares): 300 pasture and hay-growing tracts on animal husbandry beef sovkhozes;

50 for the establishment of sweet-root animal husbandry sovkhozes;

150 for organizing lake commodity industries;

100 for establishing a water-protection belt (a polder system) with a length of 225 kilometers and a width of 4-5 kilometers along the southern portion of the dried-up bed of the Aral Sea.

In order to avoid the desertification of the remaining portion of the delta, phytoreclamation work must be done on it over an area of 700,000 hectares by planting black saksaul, kandym, grebenshchik, dzhantak, and other drought and salt resistant vegetation.

According to calculations, 14 cubic kilometers of water are required to irrigate a delta area of 600,000 hectares. This amount must be obtained from the river flow and the collector-drainage waters of the Amu-Darya basin.

In order to irrigate the above-mentioned delta area, the product cost will be 119 million rubles a year, including:

beef production — 48

fish production — 36

procurement of sweet roots — 32

procurement of muskrat skins — 3

The total capital expenditures for transferring the collector-drainage water into the Amu-Darya delta and constructing a number of projects will be 1.4 - 1.5 billion rubles. The estimated profit is defined at 65 million rubles a year; this means that the capital expenditures will be repaid in 23 years.

4. Sarykamysh or the Southern Aral Sea area? A total of 4.0-4.7 cubic kilometers of collector-drainage water is discharged annually from the territory of the Khorezm and Tashauz oblasts and the Amudarinskiy Rayon of the Kara-Kalpak ASSR into Lake Sarykamysh whose area is equal to 3,000 square kilometers. Of this amount, 3.6

cubic kilometers evaporates and the remaining portion is dispersed on increasing its level. When its area increases to 3,800 square kilometers (after two-three years), all of the water entering the lake will completely evaporate.

Considering the lack of flow in the lake and the annual arrival of 14 million tons of salt into it with the water, the mineral content of its water is increasing constantly. It is now equal to 10-11 grams per liter, and by 1990 it will be 14-15 grams per liter. As a result, the importance of this basin for the fishing industry will be completely lost. Consequently, the significance of the lake will be equal to zero from an economic point of view.

Lake Sarykamysh is a gigantic evaporator of the collector-drainage water entering it. Consequently, all of this flow must be turned to irrigating the Amu-Darya delta for the purpose of carrying out complex environmental protection measures and restoring the economic potential in the southern Aral Sea area. That is why the position of the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources and the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute for Water Problems regarding Lake Sarykamysh is simply not understandable.

It is being asked how it happened that the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute for Water Problems, which — with 40 other scientific research establishments — has been engaged since 1975 on instructions from the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology in developing a series of measures to regulate the water conditions of the Aral Sea and prevent the desertification of the Amu-Darya and Syr-Darya deltas, only sent an expedition in 1986 to Sarykamysh to study this question?

The question of transferring the collector-drainage waters (KDV) from Khorezm and Tashauz oblasts to the Amu-Darya delta has been repeatedly posed by the autonomous republic to the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources; however, the ministry has still not solved it.

In 1980, Uzgiprovodkhoz [Uzbek State Water Resource Design Institute] developed five methods for transferring the KDV, which were formed in an amount of 2.2 cubic kilometers in Khorezm Oblast alone, to the delta (the cost of the versions ranged from 35 to 169 million rubles). However, the question was not resolved because of the refusal of the appropriate agencies in Turkmenia to set aside territory for the construction of a gravity-fed collector (with a length of 15.8 kilometers) having an area of 580 hectares.

In 1983, this same institute developed a plan for transferring KDV in an amount of 2.2 cubic kilometers over a route passing completely over the territory of the Uzbek SSR with the construction of an expensive tunnel across the Amu-Darya. However, even this version was not accepted by the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources. All of this procrastination can

be explained only by the ignoring of the autonomous republic's interest and by the absence of a desire to investigate questions concerning the entropogenic desertification of the Amu-Darya delta. That is why it is not worthwhile to be surprised by the fact that articles have appeared in newspapers which have pointed out that allegedly Lake Sarykamysh should not only be retained but its area also be increased threefold. They say that this would permit the level of the lake to be raised by 50 meters, the lake to be made a running-water one, and its waters to be sent over the old Uzboy channel to irrigate the Caspian steppes. Only, the question of where the 300 cubic kilometers of water required to fill up the lake plus the 10-11 cubic kilometers, which would evaporate annually from the lake's area, would be taken from, is not being broached.

5. Let us preserve the purity of the Amu-Darya. According to Uzbek SSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources data, 9.2 cubic kilometers of collector-drainage water were discharged into the Amu-Darya from the territory of the republic in 1980, and 9.4 cubic kilometers in 1985. In addition, 2.2 cubic kilometers of water are being discharged into the river from the right bank portion of Chardzhou Oblast. Thus, the total discharge reaches 11.4-11.6 cubic kilometers and this represents 30 percent of the average river flow at the Dargan-Ata post — 38.1 cubic kilometers (1976-1985).

The highest mineral content of Amu-Darya water is observed during the lowering of the river's water content (March-April and September-October) when the flow in the Dargan-Ata stretch is reduced to 200 cubic meters per second. The discharge of collector-drainage water is the same and, as a result, the mineral content of the water in the river reaches 2.5-2.8 grams per liter.

According to a Soyuzvodproyekt [All-Union Association for Water Resource Designing] forecast (1985), with a further discharge of collector-drainage waters into the Amu-Darya the mineral content will increase by 1990 to 2.46 grams per liter (instead of 0.80 grams per liter with the stopping of KDV discharges into the river) in the stretches of the Tuyamuyunskiy and Takhiatashskiy integrated water power developments. As a result, the water in the river will become unsuitable not only for the population's drinking needs but also for irrigating the land.

However, despite the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree entitled "On Measures To Accelerate the Economic and Social Development of the Kara-Kalpak ASSR" where the inadmissibility of discharging drainage waters into the Amu-Darya is pointed out, the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources is now building the Main Water Catchment Section (GVST) with a length of 200 kilometers and a capacity of 120 cubic meters per second for discharging into the Amu-Darya 2.6-3.0 cubic kilometers of the collector-drainage water formed in the Bukhara and Kashka-Darya oblasts. This is completely

intolerable. It is necessary to change the design and extend the water section to 70 kilometers for the discharge of KDV into the Amu-Darya delta.

Preserving the purity of the Amu-Darya will also permit the use of its water resources for economic and drinking purposes in the future.

The halting of the discharge of collector-drainage water into the river also has a purely economic significance.

According to Central Asian Scientific Research Institute for Irrigation data, in order to insure the stable water-salt conditions of the soil during the increase in the mineral content of the irrigation waters, it is required that expenditures per hectare of sown area be significantly increased. With an increase in the irrigation water's mineral content of one gram per liter (with an identical ground water depth), the irrigation norm should be increased to 20 percent because there will not be any increase in the potential water resources for the expansion of irrigation agriculture due to of the mixing of the river water with the collector-drainage water. The salt balance of the land in the Amu-Darya basin is significantly worsening, even up to the complete removal of the land from cultivation; and the river water is becoming completely unsuitable for drinking needs.

6. On compiling scientific and technical recommendations for design institutes. In view of the complex composition of the soils and the differences in the degree of mineralization and depth of ground waters in the Amu-Darya delta, the delta's economic development must be accomplished with a continuous observation of the soil's salt balance, the position of ground water, and its mineralization. This requirement must be even stronger when using collector-drainage water for irrigation.

That is why scientific research organizations must accelerate the performance of the appropriate work and transmit the necessary recommendations to design institutes.

Unfortunately, a number of questions are being solved slowly or not being solved at all. The following are related to the primary topics of the scientific research work that is connected with the development of the delta:

- the use of KDV for irrigating pastures, hay-growing areas and fodder crop sown areas;
- the biological cleansing of KDV of pesticides;
- the effect of wind-blown salts and fine soil from the dried-up bed of the Aral Sea on the yield of agricultural crops and natural grasses;
- increasing the yield of natural grass on the delta's pasture and hay- growing areas;
- phytoreclamation on the dried-up portion of the Aral Sea.

Regarding the biological cleansing of KDV of harmful chemicals (pesticides and herbicides), a letter was sent in December 1985 from the autonomous republic to the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources with a suggestion to include this question in the ministry's plan for scientific research work during 1986 and subsequent years. A negative reply was received after two months.

Two letters were also sent in December 1985 to the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Agroindustrial Committee about including questions on the effect of wind-blown salts and fine soil on the yield of agricultural crops and about using KDV to irrigate pastures in the Agroindustrial Committee's plan for scientific research work during 1986 and subsequent years. No answer to them has been received in general.

In accordance with a contract with SANIIRI, the topic "Development of Recommendations for Increasing the Productivity of Natural Pastures in the Amu-Darya" was included at the beginning of 1986 in the plan of the Complex Institute for Natural Sciences in the Kara-Kalpak Branch of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences. Unfortunately the institute did not perform this work although the advantages of keeping beef cattle on pastures for seven-eight months of the year were well known. Uzgiprovodkhoz designed 20,000 hectares of land under basin irrigation for the delta's animal husbandry sovkhozes without scientifically justifying the use of KDV for irrigating pastures and fodder crops.

7. Restoring the flora and fauna. Recreational measures. Along with restoring the natural potential and stopping further desertification, the irrigation of the Amu-Darya delta will also permit the restoration of the flora and fauna in the southern Aral Sea area.

Until recently, old plants such as swamp telipteris — a member of the fern family, wild sugar-cane, floating sylvia, water-lillies of various colors, senna-pods, etc., were widely represented in the delta's water basins. They had not only a scientific but also a general ecological importance. In particular, the rhizomes of much of this vegetation serve as the main nourishment for muskrats and the seed as a food for water fowl. At the present time, they are on the verge of disappearing.

The Kara Kalpak animal world has already undergone considerable negative changes before the eyes of our generation. The Turan tiger, bustard and Aral thorn have disappeared. The Ust-Yurt ram (arkal), dzheyran, black stork, swan, beautiful bustard, and barbel have been placed in a particularly threatening position. Colonies of pelicans, cormorants and white herons have disappeared; the nesting of the grey goose is noted very rarely; and the number of pheasants and keklik in the Tugay area has been sharply reduced.

The delta's ecology can be (basically) restored through its irrigation, in particular, by organizing large preserve areas. The restoration of the flora and fauna in the delta is one of the main environmental protection measure tasks in the southern Aral Sea area.

Considering the significant recreational value of the southern Aral Sea area, it is necessary to solve two questions first:

1. To organize a climatic sanitarium for the treatment of nephritic and other illnesses in the city of Muynak in the former Kara-Kalpak Material Technical Supply Administration of the Uzbek SSR Main Material and Technical Supply Administration vacation area (a complex of premises for 200 people), using the bromide sodium chloride mineral waters with their temperature of +40 degrees centigrade.

2. To design and construct a sanitarium for the treatment of painful diseases of the support, motor and nervous systems, gastrointestinal tract, skin, etc., on the First of May Sovkhoz in Chimbayskiy Rayon based on its thermal waters (+39.5 - +41 degrees centigrade).

Regarding both sources of mineral waters, there exists a positive finding of the Institute for Health Resort Studies and Physiotherapy imeni Semashko (1983) on using them for treatment purposes.

There is another question. In connection with the possibility of maintaining the western deep-water portion of the sea where the collector-drainage water will come after its use in the delta, there exists the possibility of organizing a coastal rest zone where it is necessary to build a 60-kilometer highway from Muynak.

The Central Asian Scientific Research Institute for Forestry and the Uzbek SSR Ministry of the Forestry Industry must improve the designing and conducting of phytoreclamation work on the dried-up portion of the Aral Sea and also in the delta itself. In 1985, the institute compiled and approved a research program and methodology for 1985-1987, in which it was proposed to develop and incorporate methods for the afforestation of the sandy areas of the dried-up bed of the Aral Sea in order to prevent negative ecological consequences and to establish shrub pastures.

According to the institute's data, 80 percent of the total area of 20,000 square kilometers of dried-up bed is loam and clay soil at the present time and approximately 20 percent is sand and subsand deposits which represent more than 300,000 hectares. The sand and subsand deposits are freshened considerably more rapidly and that is why the institute planned to conduct phytoreclamation work on this land first. At the present time, the institute is basically engaged in developing agrotechnical methods, for which four base sections have been established; however, it has still not begun phytoreclamation

work despite the existing recommendations of the institute. In our view, the Uzbek SSR Ministry of the Forestry Industry must immediately establish a powerful machine reclamation station in the city of Muynak and equip it with the necessary equipment.

Considerable work has been performed during the past 11 years by the country's scientific research institutes to carry out the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology task that is connected with the problems of the Aral Sea and the Amu-Darya and Syr-Darya deltas. Everyone has come to the same conclusion that an extremely critical ecological situation has been created in the southern Aral Sea area in connection with the drying up of the sea as a result of entropogenic desertification; it is necessary to supply the delta with water.

The entire trouble, however, is that the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources is not taking any practical actions to carry out the complicated measures to reduce the social and economic loss and to restore conditions for human activity and environmental protection in this region.

With regard to the questions that have been touched upon, the decisive words belongs to the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources and to the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute for Water Problems.

Conclusion and proposals. 1. Regarding the drying up of the Aral Sea, it is necessary to preserve its western deep-water part (the depth is 65 meters with a sea level of +53 meters absolute). In the future, this part will become a salt receiver for the irrigated lands of the Amu-Darya basin where the collector and drainage water must be discharged into a unifying collector after its secondary use in the Amu-Darya delta.

2. It is only possible to solve the economic and social tasks in the delta by irrigating it. To do this, it is necessary to insure the transfer of collector-drainage water to the delta from the zones of the middle and lower reaches in a amount of nine cubic kilometers. In addition, five cubic kilometers of river water must be transferred from the Amu-Darya to the delta.

3. It is necessary to accelerate the performance of scientific research on developing recommendations regarding the use of KDV for irrigating the pasture and hay-growing tracts, for biologically cleansing them of harmful chemicals, for increasing the yield of crop pastures and hay-growing tracts, for transferring salt, and for performing phytoreclamation work on the bed of the dried-up sea and in the delta.

4. The primary projects in developing the delta should be the Mezhdurechenskiy water divider and storage area, a breast-wall coffer-dam on the Amu-Darya in the vicinity of Kyzyl-Dzhar, a unifying collector, and the reconstruction of the mouth sections of the discharge collectors.

5. To consider the fact that the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources is building the Main Water Catchment Section (GVST) for the discharge of collector drainage waters into the Amu-Darya from the Kashka- Darya and Bukhara oblasts in an amount of 2.5-3.0 cubic kilometers despite the direct orders of directive agencies, to be intolerable.

6. To expand phytoreclamation work on the dried-up bed of the sea. To do this, the Uzbek SSR Ministry of the Forestry Industry must organize a powerful machine land reclamation station in the city of Muymak.

7. To accelerate the approval of the technical economic report on the Aral Sea and the river deltas, which was completed back in December 1985. To determine the general designers, contractors and customers as well as sources for financing the performance of construction and other work.

Footnote

1. Cf. PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 18 Apr 1986

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Fan" Uzbekskoy SSR, 1987
08802

Uzbek Officials Fight Recognition of Disease Problem

Doctor's Work Denied for 17 Years
18300120a Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
12 Dec 87 pp 3-4

[Article by PRAVDA VOSTOKA correspondent O. Lukyanchikov, under rubric "Let's Speak Frankly: "The Fungus of Bureaucratism"]

[Text]A rather large number of problems have accumulated in the job of health protection in our republic. One such problem that stands out sharply here is the problem of the disease and mortality rate among children. Judged on the basis of this indicator, individual rayons in Uzbekistan have been equated with the poorly developed countries. Hundreds of physicians have come to our republic to render emergency aid to children.

Today we shall discuss a story which, against that background, looks strange...

"A previously unknown disease has been detected," Professor N. A. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva asserts. "Its widespread development in the republic is one of the reasons why the disease and mortality rate among children has risen."

"Nothing of the sort!", people at UzSSR Minzdrav [Ministry of Health deny.

This confrontation has lasted for many years, and continues to this day.

Exactly who is this Professor N. A. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva?

A student of the eminent Soviet parasitologist, Academician N. I. Khodukin, Nazima Abdullayevna Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva devoted her candidate and doctoral dissertations to a study of *Lamblia*. Her path to recognition was not a smooth one, since the research by the young scientist from Uzbekistan refuted a point of view that prevailed at that time, to the effect that *Lamblia* are not pathogenes. She emerged as the victor from that dispute and received a license certifying her discovery, and the World Health Organization bases itself on it in its recommendations dealing with lambliaiasis.

But this argument has lasted, all told, 18 years (the license was issued in 1977, with discovery priority in 1959). The first to recognize the worldwide importance of N. Dekhkan-Khodzyayeva's research were scientists from the United States.

It was precisely then, in 1971, that USSR State Committee for Science and Technology organized the Protozoal Diseases Department of the NII of Medical Parasitology imeni L. M. Isayev, of Uzbek Minzdrav, which Nazima Abdullayevna has headed since that time.

It should also be added that N. Dekhkan-Khodzyayeva has engaged, and continues to engage, in science in the clinic, deep in the midst of medical practice, and that during the past 15 years she has trained nine candidates of sciences and two doctors of sciences in parasitology.

What else should one say about a person at the mention of whose name the associates at UzSSR Minzdrav immediately advice "be a bit cautious," "don't rely on her words," etc.? Probably the only thing that one should add is that it is difficult to suspect Nazima Abdullayevna of being mercenary. She is a person who is materially well provided for and she is a scientist with a world name.

"Since the beginning of the 1970's," N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva says, "there has been a noticeable increase in the number of patients with anemia, and more frequent occurrences of acute respiratory diseases and pneumonia, especially among children — and practically from birth itself. For a long time they failed to recover and continued to have a high temperature — the organism's defense mechanisms had dropped. As a parasitologist, I was interested in finding out whether this could have been caused by a protozoal pathogene. In 1972 I discovered in patients' blood some structures that were unknown to me.

"Soon physician A. Tashmatova came from Zaamin. She too had detected strange structures in her patients' blood. After we compared notes, we were convinced that we were dealing with one and the same formations."

On 22 November 1972, after listening to a report by N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva and her associates at a united conference of several laboratories at the institute, O. V. Baroyan, the director of the Institute of Epidemiology and Microbiology, USSR Academy of Medical Sciences [AMN], USSR AMN Academician, and chairman of the Committee to Eliminate Infections, under USSR AMN, wrote to K. Zairov, the then UzSSR Minister of Health, "The Institute of Epidemiology and Microbiology feels that this research deserves a large amount of attention, and she needs assistance in continuing and deepening this research..."

The republic's Minzdrav, by its written order, created a staff to combat and to expand the research. A special 50-bed department was opened at the hospital in Zaamin.

"The research confirmed the hypothesis concerning the existence of a new pathogene," N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva recalls, "and then the Uzbek minister of health chose the position, 'We've got enough diseases in our republic already — we don't need a new one!'"

But the researchers worked and informed the scientific public about their finds. Some supported the researchers, but others did not see any necessity to do this. Thus, a commission under the leadership of N. Plotnikov, professor at the NII of Medical Parasitology and Tropical Medicine, which commission had been invited by the republic's Minzdrav, felt that the formations that had been detected by N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva were "remnants of erythrocytes." Giving this conclusion as its reason, the ministry abolished the expedition and reduced the number of beds at the Zaamin hospital to ten.

Nazima Abdullayevna and her associates did not agree with the conclusions of the commission, the members of which did not even include a person specializing in hematology. They got in touch with the Central Institute of Blood Transfusion, where G. I. Kozinets, then a scientist and now professor, gave his conclusion: "'remnants of erythrocytes' have nothing to do with this."

UzSSR Minzdrav became feverish. First they renewed the expedition and increased the number of beds back to 30. After half a year, referring to the same prior decision by the commission, they issued another order that suspended the research. Once again N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva and her associates went to Zaamin and continued the job that they had begun, except that now it was at their own risk.

Then the year 1974 brought the researchers important results. Innoculations of patients' blood on an especially sensitive material, which had been made at Nazima Abdullayevna's request at the NII of Pediatrics, UzSSR Minzdrav, had yielded fungal cultures. But what kind were they?

An electronic microscope which had been obtained at one time by the department with the aid of the USSR Committee for Science and Technology made it possible to photograph the "stranger" and even the moment that that fungus emerged from the envelope which incompletely dissolves in the blood. And these, then, were those very "formations."

When the enemy had been recognized, it proved to be possible to cure the first patient.

The therapeutic effect confirmed the fungal nature of the pathogene. It was now necessary to identify it.

The finding that was made by U. Belukha, chief of the Mycology Department, Uzbek NII of Skin and Venereological Diseases, and doctor of medical sciences, states, "In these patients one suspects the presence of the pathogene of a rarely encountered disease of deep mycosis — histoplasmosis."

The search for qualified specialists in mycology led Nazima Abdullayevna to Leningrad, to Professor P. Kashkin, RSFSR Honored Scientist, and State Prize winner, who at that time headed the Deep Mycoses Department at the Leningrad State Institute for Physician Refresher Courses.

After becoming acquainted with the materials that had been brought from Uzbekistan, he convoked a combined session of the associates at the Deep Mycosis Department, the Microbiology Department, the Mycology Department, the Pathological Anatomy Department, and the Histology Department of Leningrad State Institute for Physician Refresher Courses [LENGIDUV], and members of the Mycotic Section of the Leningrad Society of Dermatologists. At that meeting Nazima Abdullayevna gave a report, showed electronic photographs, and answered questions. The scientists evaluated the entire seriousness of the situation. They recommended that she extend the study of the disease that had been discovered, and requested UzSSR Minzdrav to allocate funds for the necessary research.

At the ministry, this decision was felt to be erroneous. The person who was sent to the city on the Neva with the assignment of persuading the Leningrad mycologists to change their conclusions was... U. Belukha, who, it would seem, understood his "blunder."

The Leningraders remained firm on their principles, confirmed the previous decision, and sent a memorandum to P. Burgasov, USSR deputy minister of health. He proposed having the scientist from Uzbekistan give a

report at USSR AMN. That did not occur — once again because of the interference by the republic's Minzdrav — but USSR Minzdrav sent Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva's materials to the NII of Epidemiology and Microbiology, USSR AMN.

"N. A. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva has detected a previously unknown pathogene of a new disease," was the finding made by Professor D. Zasukhin, chief of the Toxicoplasmosis Laboratory, and the World Health Organization expert, and by Professor A. Avakyan, chief of the Department of Morphology of Pathogenic Microorganisms and Electronic Microscopy. Another person who, after analyzing the new experimental data, gave his finding was Professor O. Khmelnitskiy, chief of the Pathological Anatomy Department of LengIDUV, currently corresponding member of USSR AMN. "The 'devastated' forms of the pathogene cells do not have anything in common with erythrocytes and are, more likely, the result of the degeneration of the tissue forms of the fungus (their capsules). The pathogene resembles one of the pathogenic fungi — histoplasma." O. Baroyan, director of the Institute of Epidemiology and Microbiology, USSR AMN, sent the following letter to the UzSSR minister of health: "If it is deemed at the ministry to be desirable, the question can be posed before the presidium of the USSR AMN either concerning joint research with the NII of Medical Parasitology, UzSSR Minzdrav, or even the creation of a branch of one of the academy's institutes in Tashkent, including the Institute of Epidemiology and Microbiology, USSR AMN."

The republic's Minzdrav flatly refused to consider the opinion of the country's leading scientists.

Suddenly a communique was issued: USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries had registered a discovery by Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva dealing with *Lambliæ*!

By now it was difficult to disregard this. Decisions were made concerning the ways to improve the work performed by the department headed by N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva. By official order of UzSSR Minzdrav, the research projects were officially "renewed." True, it was basically at the expense of the department's own internal fund, that is, the research "eroded" the money from State Committee for Science and Technology that had been released for research on parasitology. Thirty-five beds were allocated for research on the new disease at the NII of Regional Medicine, and a special laboratory was organized there. And immediately a flood of commissions and inspectors from UzSSR Minzdrav poured into the new department. By their fault-finding badgerings they exasperated the associates and tried to persuade the patients not to continue treatment there.

The work proceeded with the researchers feeling nervous, but their confidence in their rightness grew stronger. Z. Bekker, MGU [Moscow State University] professor, doctor of biological sciences, and honorary doctor of

the Agricultural School in Vienna, wrote in June 1976: "One can say without exaggeration that this research has discovered the etiology of an acute and global disease that is caused by a pathogene of fungal nature. The disease of this type has been apparently encountered for the first time."

But the Minzdrav leadership, by "power" pressure, kept striving and hoping to obtain the specialists' negative finding. They put their "stakes" on scientific workers from Volgograd, but the findings were the very same: the new disease existed, and it was desirable to continue to develop the study of that disease.

That did not suit UzSSR Minzdrav. It sent to higher administrative levels a "collective letter" which quoted the findings of the 1973 Moscow commission, but did not mention the fact that those findings had already been refuted. Once again references were made to the Tashkent specialists who supported UzSSR Minzdrav's point of view, particularly Doctor of Medical Sciences U. Belukha. But the findings that were unfavorable for UzSSR Minzdrav were qualified only as "partial" ones, which were allegedly "not official documents"; or absolutely nothing was said about them.

It is quite easy to guess the conclusions: "The disease does not exist, and further research is undesirable."

That letter, reproduced many times, went flying to USSR Minzdrav, to medical institutions throughout the country, and to USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries. Getting slightly ahead of ourselves, we might mention that it was because of this fact that N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva's application for a second discovery was postponed and has not yet been considered to this day.

In June 1977 the "campaign" against N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva ended with an official order canceling the scientific research.

The department at the NII of Regional Medicine was closed. With some difficulty it proved to be possible to save from destruction the results of the laboratory research and to transfer them to the Protozoal Disease Department, NII of Medical Parasitology. However, from that time the UzSSR Minzdrav commissions were "registered" there...

This story also included such "scientific arguments" as telephone calls to the scientists who had given findings concerning the existence of the new disease, and visits made to those scientists by people who tried to persuade them to renounce their statements.

The ministry administrators, "hiding" the new pathogene, attempted to prove that the scientist who had discovered it also did not exist. For example, PRAVDA VOSTOKA at that time was preparing material about the discovery involving *Lamblia*. Learning about this,

practically the entire Minzdrav leadership arrived at the editorial office with a "ban." In June 1977 the article "Discovery of a Secret," concerning Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva, nevertheless was published. And Nazima Abdullayevna reported about the opening up of a department and laboratory to USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, and sent there material pertaining to her research. That material was sent to USSR Minzdrav.

Despite the "pressure" from the republic, the presidium of USSR AMN recommended to USSR Minzdrav that it "organize the study of fungi with the purpose of refining their identification by species." This instruction was sent to various scientific institutions. But UzSSR Minzdrav continued to send inquiries to the scientists who had previously considered N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva's materials, and to tell them, "Check this once again to see whether your conclusions might change." L. Belyakova, senior scientific associate, Institute of Microbiology, USSR Academy of Sciences, answered S. Aripov, why by now was the new UzSSR minister of health, "It can be assumed that are dealing with a new variety of the fungus *Pecilamidis Variotti*." T. Sizova, assistant professor, Department of Lower Plants, MGU, and MGU professor Z. Bekker came to a similar conclusion. "The data obtained by Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva and her associates confirm the opinion expressed by us relative to the existence in the Central Asian and Caucasian zone of systemic mycoses which, on the basis of their clinical course, are close to histoplasmosis," Professor A. Ariyevich, scientific director of the Moscow City Mycological Center, wrote to S. Aripov.

After listening to a report by N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva, the buro of the Biological Sciences Department, UzSSR Academy of Sciences, requested the republic's Ministry of Health to render financial assistance to her in developing the problem. Everything was in vain.

Z. Karayev, the new chief of the Deep Mycoses Department of LenGIDUV, who himself had refused to instruct USSR AMN to identify the fungus, giving as his reason for this the fact that "the laboratory does not have the necessary conditions for working with cultures of pathogenic fungi or with experiments on animals," soon went to Tashkent at the head of a commission to verify N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva's materials.

The trip expenses for this commission, by UzSSR Minzdrav order No. 278, dated 31 March 1981, were paid for from the epidemiological fund of Uzbek Republic Sanitary and Epidemiological Station.

What the commission decided was not made known to N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva. But the feeling was that a threat was hanging over her and that the results of her research would be destroyed. Nazima Abdullayevna once again requested the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology to become acquainted with her

materials. Once again the materials were sent for editing to USSR Minzdrav. Then Nazima Abdullayevna herself, with the results of the research and the documents, went to Moscow.

"I went to USSR State Committee for Science and Technology," she states, "to I. Golubev, deputy chief of the Scientific Organizational Administration. He is a physician. After looking attentively at the materials, I. Golubev exclaimed, 'What if you hadn't come here? We would have believed Minzdrav!'"

So USSR State Committee for Science and Technology took the initiative in its hands. "The Committee, jointly with specialists from USSR Academy of Sciences, USSR AMN, and VASKhNIL [All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences], has reviewed the materials submitted by Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva and deems the work that is being carried out by her scientific collective to be extremely pertinent. The high scientific level of the work that has been conducted allows one to agree with the originator's opinion concerning the desirability of introducing the obtained results into the practice of public health." K. Dyumayev, deputy chairman of USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, wrote to the former chairman of the UzSSR Council of Ministers and the former USSR minister of health. He requested an attempt "to find a method for supporting the valuable scientific research."

The State Committee decided to organize a provisional scientific-technical commission to elaborate the recommendations for developing mycological research in the USSR. One of the members of that commission was Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva.

The preparation of the recommendations, modifications, and coordination took more than two years.

In January 1984 USSR State Committee for Science and Technology sent the following statement to A. Khudaybergenov, who by now was the new UzSSR minister of health: "In conformity with the findings of the provisional scientific-technical commission of GKNT [State Committee for Science and Technology], the recommendation has been made to organize, on the basis of the Protozoal Diseases Department of NII of Medical Parasitology, UzSSR Minzdrav, the Central Asian NII of Medical Mycology and Protozoology, of USSR Minzdrav." The GKNT recommended to UzSSR Minzdrav that it submit all the necessary information concerning the proposed structure of the institute. Nazima Abdullayevna sent the appropriate documents to UMS [scientific medical council] of UzSSR Minzdrav.

And it is there that all the documents have remained.

N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva had to contact the Standing Deputy Commission for the Protection of Motherhood and Childhood, USSR Supreme Soviet, and Z. Pukhova, deputy to USSR Supreme Soviet, since the persons who

are chiefly affected by the disease are children. Z. Pukhova sent a query to USSR Minzdrav. Then N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva's materials were sent for review to the presidium of the scientific medical council, USSR Minzdrav.

The presidium of UMS, USSR Minzdrav instructed UMS, UzSSR Minzdrav to develop and submit a program of the scientific-research projects of N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva's department for 1985 and the 12th Five-Year Plan.

Once again the basic development was carried out by N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva herself. The only part of the plan that went to Moscow was the part dealing with parasitology. "But what about the mycosis?", USSR Minzdrav asked. "Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva is being refused," was the report from the republic. But, as the saying goes, "murder will out." And what became obvious was that the crux of the matter dealt not with Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva, but with UzSSR Minzdrav. At that time Moscow authorized Nazima Abdullayevna to send the plan without going through her ministry. And that is what she did.

In July 1985 UMS, USSR Minzdrav, reviewed the plan and noted that, after being reworked with a consideration of the comments and statements that had been made by UzSSR Minzdrav, it "can become the basis for the department's work in the 12th Five-Year Plan." That plan, after being returned to Tashkent, was approved by UzSSR Minzdrav. But UzSSR Minzdrav did not allocate a single kopeck to implement it. Naturally, the plan remained only as a stack of paper.

Well, then, what about S. M. Bakhramov, the current UzSSR minister of health. Is he completely informed about this story?

"Yes, he is, just as all three of his predecessors were," Nazima Abdullayevna says. "And he has been so informed for a long time, since 1972. Back then, when he was the deputy director of the Uzbek NII of Blood Transfusion, he arrived in Zaamin on an assignment from the minister. He carried out laboratory research which isolated in the blood of 40 percent of the examined patients the 'formations' that were at that time still unknown. However, he reported to UMS that this was a completely random situation. And, as the head of the republic's Minzdrav, S. M. Bakhramov had also seen the findings of A. D. Ado, the country's leading allergologist, academician and active member of USSR AMN.

Academician A. D. Ado, at the request of N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva, last year carried out research on patients' blood at the NII of Immunology, USSR Minzdrav, on high-precision apparatus. And he wrote that the pathology caused by the fungus is among the most severe types and definitely requires further study.

January 1987. Excerpt from a letter from USSR GKNT, addressed to S. M. Bakhramov, UzSSR minister of health: "Please report the progress of research on strains of the new unregistered species of fungi with very high biological aggressiveness, and also report specifically what kind of assistance is being rendered to the department on the part of the ministry in developing the search-initiative topic 'New Disease of Fungal Etiology in Uzbekistan.'"

What kind of assistance are we talking about?

Only one kind is tangible: for the past three or four years, UzSSR Minzdrav commissions have stopped exasperating people. But for three years the researchers have not been able to use the electronic microscope — the number of specialists has been reduced by seven...

"There is no new disease, and therefore all these worries are needless," the people at UzSSR Minzdrav continue to state.

Let us assume that no new disease exists. But what if it did?

Patients exist. The very same ones who come every day to Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva and her scientific associations for consultation, with a suspicion concerning the fungal nature of a disease such as pneumonia. They are sent there by physicians from the most varied medical institutions. And some of those patients have also been sent there by UzSSR Minzdrav — isn't that paradoxical?

The diagnoses are confirmed in the laboratory. An entire "collection" of cultures of the fungus has been isolated from the patients' blood.

The department headed by Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva has become a place where people who have obtained no results from trying many types of medicine, start to recover after the treatment has been carried out. During these 15 years Nazima Abdullayevna and her associates have rendered assistance to 5000 patients, of whom 4000 were children. (This is in addition to the patients with protozoal diseases.) It proves to be possible to "knock" the fungus out of the organism in approximately 80 percent of the cases. But neglected forms of the disease are also encountered, since every physician does not yet know about the disease or is able to recognize it.

In a department with 60 beds (20 for adults and 40 for children) that are intended primarily for patients with protozoal diseases, it is necessary to squeeze out some space for persons suffering from mycosis. They are forced to wait their turn for months at a time.

In 1983 USSR Minzdrav issued order No. 750, concerning the rendering of medical assistance to persons suffering from deep mycoses, in which mention was made of

the creation of consultative sessions and inpatient assistance. There appeared yet another reason for UzSSR Minzdrav to engage in some deep thinking, because it is precisely among the deep mycoses that affect the internal organs that the specialists include the disease that was discovered by Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva. But it has happened that, until the present time, that order has been fulfilled only by the professor herself, and even that has been on her personal initiative.

On 17 August a visiting session of the board of governors of USSR Minzdrav arrived in Tashkent under the chairmanship of Ye. I. Chazov, USSR minister of health. The agenda included the question: "Serious shortcomings in organizing therapeutic and prophylactic aid to mothers and young children in Uzbek SSR, and the measures to eliminate them." There was a discussion about the high indicators of the disease and mortality rate among children, and about the incompletely ascertained reasons for them.

"According to data from the World Health Organization, one can observe the spread of fungal diseases," Nazima Abdullayevna says. "In England more than a hundred scientific medical institutes are working on the problem, and more than 200 in the United States. Diseases with fungal etiology are already being well diagnosed there, but, as the statistics indicate, the mortality rate from those diseases has been rising. Soviet science is lagging seriously behind in the field of medical mycology, and practical public health is lagging behind immeasurably. It would be criminal to slow down."

And so the scientist is working to improve the diagnostic methods. She and her associates are thinking about the creation of a vaccine. But, for the time being, she simply does not have enough manpower.

All this time she had also had to wage a struggle against the fungus of stagnation, the fear of assuming responsibility.

Editor's note: Is it possible to wave away the problem that has been raised by Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva? We have answered that question unambiguously — by publishing this article.

UzSSR Minzdrav has also answered unambiguously — by its reply to the official query made by the editorial office of PRAVDA VOSTOKA before the article was printed. That reply did not leave any hope that the position of UzSSR Ministry of Health would change today in any way.

That position, as it has for the entire 15 years, does not permit any dialogue, any comparison of opinions. It is intolerant of the facts that contradict the only opinion — "there is no disease." Thus, the ministry completely ignores patients who suffer from it, and ignores the vast amount of clinical and laboratory material and the numerous authoritative findings of specialists who have

analyzed it and have come to the conclusion that "yes, it does exist." Among the specialists themselves, there are also opinions "no," and in this regard we naturally cannot act as arbitrators. But we also cannot agree with the situation when this "no" alone is elevated to the rank of indisputable truth. (An indisputable fact is that the positive findings are obviously in the majority — we did not quote all of them.)

It is startling that the position taken by UzSSR Minzdrav does not allow a question that would seem to be such a natural one in such a serious matter: "But what if..."

During these years documents of a purely organizational nature, such as USSR Minzdrav order No. 750 concerning the rendering of medical assistance to persons suffering from deep mycoses, have already been enacted. It is only today, four years after that order was published, and also after the query by the editorial office, that UzSSR Minzdrav has enacted a similar order. According to that order, the NII of Dermatology and Venerology, UzSSR Minzdrav, has been established as the consultative and diagnostic center for deep mycoses. But what about the letter from USSR GKNT concerning the creation in Tashkent of the Central Asian NII of Medical Mycology and Parasitology, of USSR Minzdrav, which letter was based on the findings of the provisional scientific-technical commission that included the country's leading specialists? Their conclusions, which have been supported by USSR GKNT, have been ignored. And the plan for the department's scientific-research work in the 12th Five-Year Plan remains just a meaningless piece of paper.

Meanwhile the years keep passing...

People's Control Committee Investigates

*18300120b Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
27 Dec 87 p 3*

[Article by U. Maksumova, inspector, Science, Culture, and Public Health Department, Tashkent People's Control Committee, under rubric "Response": "The Fungus of Bureaucratism"]

[Text]"The Fungus of Bureaucratism" — that was the name of the article published on 12 December 1987. The article dealt with the research and therapeutic work of Doctor of Medical Sciences, Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva, and with the obstacles that had been put in the scientist's path over a period of many years.

The editorial office received a large number of responses to the article: the authors have been persons who have been cured by Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva, and physicians who have become convinced of the effectiveness of her treatment.

This letter is from the people's control agencies. A year and a half ago the Tashkent City People's Control Committee, in response to a letter written by V. Stulova,

one of Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva's patients, check to see the extent to which beds and medicines were being provided to the Protozoal Diseases Department of the NII of Medical Parasitology, UzSSR Minzdrav. The people's controllers came to the same conclusions that the editorial office had. But even after the commission's decision had been sent to UzSSR Minzdrav, everything remained unchanged...

In order to check the facts reported by V. Stulova, the city people's control committee created a commission consisting of medical workers. It included, in particular, specialists from the NII of Obstetrics and Gynecology, UzSSR Minzdrav, and NII of Blood Transfusion.

After visiting the Protozoal Diseases Department headed by Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva, the commission members analyzed the medical documentation, chatted with the patients and physicians, and were present at consultative sessions.

It became obvious that the department was actually too small to accept everyone who requires treatment, because, in addition to patients with protozoal diseases, physicians send her everyone whom they suspect of having fungal diseases of the internal organs — deep mycoses. People come from various oblasts in Uzbekistan and many cities throughout the country.

As the commission noted, the large influx of patients is caused by the fact that in the republic the deep mycoses are diagnosed and treated only in Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva's department, despite official order No. 750 of USSR Minzdrav, according to which a network of consultative services was supposed to be created.

Because of the lack of beds, many patients have to be assigned to outpatient treatment, although they actually require inpatient treatment. According to data for 1985 and the first half of 1986, the number of beds in the department (60) made it possible to place less than 30 percent of the patients who had come for assistance. On the inspection day, 200 persons were on the hospitalization waiting list, and some of them had been on that list for half a year.

The problem of antifungal preparations is acute. The requisitions for some of them are satisfied by the Main Pharmaceutical Administration of UzSSR Minzdrav only partially, and the department is unable, because of the shortage of money, to buy expensive medicines in the necessary quantity. Patients told the commission members that frequently they are forced to purchase the antifungal preparations on the outside.

The commission was convinced that, despite the letter of USSR State Committee for Science and Technology concerning the creation in Tashkent of the NII of Medical Mycology and Parasitology, of USSR Minzdrav, on the basis of the Protozoal Diseases Department of the NII of Medical Parasitology imeni L. Isayev, despite

USSR Minzdrav Order No. 750 concerning the rendering of medical assistance to persons suffering from deep mycoses, and despite the frequent requests made by Professor N. Dekhkan-Khodzhayeva to the administrators of UzSSR Minzdrav, the department has not been allocated even a single kopeck of additional funds and not a single personnel billet has been added.

The Tashkent People's Control Committee sent the results of the inspection to UzSSR Minzdrav. It was recommended to the ministry that it study and review the questions of expanding the department, the more complete providing of it with medicines and funds to purchase them, and the improvement of the scientific-research base, because, as the inspection showed, there is a large number of persons suffering from fungal diseases and, consequently, it is necessary to develop new diagnostic and treatment methods.

UzSSR Minzdrav was also informed of the need to "take the load off" the department by creating a consultative-diagnostic service to locate persons suffering from deep mycoses in the oblasts.

However, it is obvious from the article "The Fungus of Bureaucratism" that the shortcomings revealed by us have not yet been eliminated.

5075

Doctors Review Uzbek Health Care Shortcomings
Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 10 Dec 87
p 4

[Article by A. Narziyev, UzSSR Deputy Minister of Social Security: "Health 'Barometer'"]

[Text] The first congress of Uzbek physicians of the Medical Commission for the Determination of Disability [VTEK] and the Medical Control Commission [VKK] opens its first session today in Tashkent.

There is much to be discussed. Experience has been gained, and there are acute problems as well.

In the course of the last two years the medical commissions for the determination of disability have been reorganized. VTEKs with small work loads have been eliminated while the network of specialized VTEKs has been enlarged. An inspectorate for medical disability determination has been organized on an experimental basis at the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Social Security. The inspectorate will review workers' complaints and claims and offer suggestions for improving operations. A republic scientific society of VTEK and VKK physicians has also been organized.

Measures have been adopted to improve the professional level of personnel. The Central Certification Commission of the Uzbek Ministry of Health now has a subcommission for the certification of physicians working

within the social security system. During the past year alone more than 100 physicians raised the level of their qualifications. A concise reference manual was published with standardized tables for disability groups, and has been designed for young experts.

However, progress in the restructuring of service operations has been slow. Far from all of the amassed problems are easily amenable to resolution, and a critical evaluation of the situation from the viewpoint of greater exactingness is revealing a continual flow of additional shortcomings.

The competence and official responsibility of many VTEK physicians are still not a sufficiently high level. This is indicated by the increase in the number of decisions made by the primary VTEK organizations that have been rescinded by higher authorities. This has happened with particular frequency in Tashkent, the Fergan Oblast, and the Kara-Kalpak ASSR. Gross violations of rules regarding disability determination and rehabilitation have been disclosed. It must be admitted that VTEK physicians have at times failed to demonstrate even the most elementary facets required by their official duties, i.e., attentiveness to people and courtesy.

All of this has meant that the number of complaints received by the republic's Ministry of Social Security has been more this year than last.

Among the reasons that seriously impede the operations of the VTEK is the fact that the Ministry of Social Security is not able to resolve those problems alone. This particularly relates to the personnel problem. The medical VUZ's do not offer orientation courses for working in social-medical institutions and do not provide special physician training in disability determination, internships, and graduate work.

Many young physician specialists who are assigned to the social security system still do not come to us. Others are dismissed after having served the required term of duty..

What is reflected here is the difficult psychological atmosphere of work in the VTEK and its established reputation of being "non-prestigious." Unfortunately, there are grounds to support that attitude.

The material-technical base of the medical commissions for the determination of disability is extremely poor. Their stock of medical equipment and supplies is only a small percentage of the established standard, and dozens of commissions are cramped into one or two rooms. The health authorities are supposed to provide the VTEK with all their essential needs in accordance with the directive documents, but we have not seen any significant assistance.

A higher quality of medical disability commissions largely depends too on the effectiveness of scientific plans and their practical implementation. However,

many scientific projects at the Uzbek Scientific-Research Institute for the Disability Determination and Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons are of a trivial nature, and there are employees there who have not produced any "products" for years.

A more rapid rectification of the situation at the VTEKs is also important for the additional reason that they act as a certain kind of barometer of adverse conditions in any one particular facet of life. Many causes of disability in the republic still require analysis. But one can with confidence single out occupational and transportation-road accidents as the leading causes. Disability has also frequently been the direct result of poor public health system operations and the lack of attention given to rehabilitation therapy.

Once the VTEK physicians have solved their internal problems they will be able not only to ascertain work capacity disruption, but also be able to render active assistance in the prevention of disability as well as in medical and social-industrial rehabilitation. These are the aims of the first republic congress.

6289

Uzbek Pharmacists Face Drug, Vitamin Supply Problems

*Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 11 Dec 87
p 4*

[Article by Sh. Sagatov, Chief of the Uzbek Ministry of Health Main Pharmacy Administration: "What Should Be 'Prescribed' for Pharmacies"]

[Text] **A better supply of medicines available to the public was one of the principal problems brought up for discussion at the 3rd Conference of Uzbekistan Pharmacists which opened today.**

It must be said that the supply of medicinals received by pharmacies and therapeutic-preventive institutions of the republic over the last five years has increased by one and one-half times. During this year alone the Main Pharmacy Administration of the USSR Ministry of Health has helped in that matter by sending to Uzbekistan almost four million additional rubles worth of medicinals which were in particularly short supply. New types of preparations have been made available to physicians. We are getting more drugs produced in the socialist community countries.

However, many preparations still remain in short supply, including those in greatest demand. Our requisitions are not being fully fulfilled by industry and delivery dates are often not met.

We also have our own shortcomings. For example, as it turned out we did not take a full accounting of our needs for vitamin B₆ ampules, magnesium sulfate ampules, and the multivitamin Undevit and Dekamevit complexes.

There has also been disproportionate distribution of medicines. An effective juggling of drug stocks will help to eliminate such discrepancies. During the last two years alone drugs totaling three million rubles were redistributed.

We are taking notice of the errors made. Associates at the Main Pharmacy Administration together with principal specialists at the republic Ministry of Health have this year reexamined the distribution system for many medicines in short supply between the oblast subdivisions and the therapeutic-preventive institutions.

One must admit that at times the short supply is artificially created by pharmacy supervisors who do not receive adequate quantities of drugs from the warehouses in a timely fashion. We have been applying rigid disciplinary penalties against such persons, including dismissals from their positions. Thus, 21 pharmacy supervisors were relieved of their duties last year for serious work violations. To a large extent the level at which medicines are available to the public depends on the physicians and on the degree to which they fully and reasonably utilize available resources. After all, today they have over 2,000 different drugs at their disposal. Moreover, in practically every case they have a choice of several preparations with similar actions. But that selection must be made correctly.

We are striving to provide physicians with the fullest possible information about medicinal agents. Pharmaceutical information offices have been organized at more than 200 polyclinics and hospitals of the republic. Associates at those offices will offer advice as to what is available in the pharmacy, what would be the best substitutes for preparations that are not available, and what new pharmaceutical products have been received.

Information bureaus for identifying needed drugs have been organized at 34 major pharmacies of which 12 are in Tashkent. There is where the republic's first automated information bureau has been opened.

Special medicinal reserves have been created in pharmacies for disabled veterans of the Great Fatherland War and Soviet Army disabled persons as well as for children under one year. The type and quantity of such medicines are coordinated with physicians and account for the diagnoses and population size of these groups being serviced by a specific pharmacy.

We have been assigned major tasks by the Basic Directions for the restructuring of the public health sector. For example, by 1995 we are scheduled to double the sales of

medicinals and medical supplies. This will require an expansion of the pharmacy network, an increased warehouse capacity, and better personnel training.

This too will be discussed at the congress.

6289

KiSSR Insensitive to Language Needs of Ethnic Germans

18300117 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 9 Jan 88 p 3

[Article by Viktor Kriger, VUZ instructor, Komsomol member: "No Problems at All?"]

[Text] I was attracted by the articles in your newspaper by A. Konstantinov, "Without Authority" in the issue of 22 September 1987, and "Consign to Oblivion?" in the selection "Different Fates" of 23 August. I would like to express my personal opinion as a reader with respect to these and similar articles in SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA.

There is no doubt about it: such articles are necessary; they help overcome the illusion which still exists among some Soviet Germans about their "half-Brothers," who are awaiting them with outstretched arms in the "land of their ancestors." But to reduce the entire problem of political passiveness, the rise in religiosity, and the tendency for emigration just to the "harmful influences of the West" or to the "naivete" of certain citizens would not be entirely correct. A. Rozanov depicted another aspect of this phenomenon very well in his article "On Native Soil" (NAUKA I RELIGIYA, 1986, No 8), on the unsatisfactory organization of training and the conduct of political-educational and cultural work in one's native language—which, incidentally, is utilized by clericals of all hues. "Yes, German speech is constantly heard in the house of prayer... But is it really impossible to satisfy the need for intercourse in one's native language, or to assimilate German national culture outside the religious community? There are difficulties here..." As the author subsequently points out, the disregard of this problem is directly associated with the desire to emigrate. And here shortcomings are noted in maintaining the culture of their native language for Germans in Kirgiziya as well.

Since the unhappy events in Alma Ata in December 1986, a great deal of work has been conducted in Kazakhstan on the international and patriotic education of the public and in restoring Leninist standards in national relations; a great deal of attention is being devoted to the language structure of those nations and nationalities which dwell in Kazakhstan, to include the Soviet Germans. The Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet adopted the decree, "On the State of The Study of German as One's Native Language in the Republic" (an account of which was published in KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA on 3 June 1987). This decree criticizes the situation which has come to

pass in the study of German as one's native language, in the training of teacher cadres, in the process of training itself; and in providing textbooks, training aids, and so on. A complex of measures has been worked out for raising the prestige of one's native language, to include holding a competition among the students who are studying German as their native language. It was decided to increase the enrollment at the Kokchetav Pedagogical Institute for the specialty of German (as a Native) Language and Literature; beginning next year to organize the training of native language teachers not only by correspondence course, but also at the daytime department of the Alma Ata Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages; and, to significantly increase recruitment for the German group at the Saran Pedagogical Institute in Karaganda Oblast. It was also decided to organize an additional group at the latter location for teaching German to the children in pre-school institutions. In the 35 rayons with the largest concentration of German populace, the position of methods specialist in native German has been created at the rayon department of national education.

Not long ago, FREUNDSCHAFT, the German-language newspaper of the Kazakh CP Central Committee, was transferred from Tselinograd to Alma-Ata. Beginning last year a special group was established at the Kazakh State University for training journalists who write in the German language, for the newspapers FREUNDSCHAFT, NEUES LEBEN (Moscow) and ROTE FANE (Slavgorod, in Altay Kray); and also for German sections at the Kazakhstan Publishing House and others (KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 2 July 1987).

The decision was made to significantly increase the amount of books published by Soviet German writers, and to set up a German language department in republic television.

Recently attention to national amateur talent activities has increased significantly. All of these steps, and others, have had a favorable influence on the moral-psychological atmosphere in the republic, and promote the strengthening of national friendships.

On the agenda is the question of the necessity to study the culture and the history of the peoples who have settled Kazakhstan, and their influences on one another, and to place this matter on a firm foundation. For example, V. Auman's book, "Our Motherland is Here" will be published in 1988. The author examines the history of the settlement of German colonists from Russia, and their cooperation with other nations.

But what is being done in this direction in Kirgiziya, where more than 100,000 people of German nationality dwell?

Unfortunately, over the course of the year I have not seen one single press article examining the situation in the republic on, for example, the study of German as one's native language, work on German language radio programs, national amateur talent activities, and the like.

Could it be that there are no problems here at all?

Unfortunately, the article by A. Vogt, "Problems are Being Solved, But Problems Remain..." (NEUES LEBEN, 9 September 1987), speaks to the contrary. The article concerns the request by four citizens of the republic to the correspondent's bureau of NEUES LEBEN to explain why for many years now, German-language programs from Frunze have been aired for only a half hour per week and are not being expanded (whereas broadcast time for other languages is increasing), and why they are not interesting, and so on.

The first deputy chairman of the republic State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting had promised that the broadcast time would be increased to an hour, but cited the lack of staff personnel. However, the author notes, just recently E. Eicholtz, an experienced journalist was forced to depart; for three years he had traveled 25 kilometers to Frunze, and they could not provide him normal living accommodations. And you see he recently joined the staff of the newspaper FREUNDSCHAFT, and immediately received an apartment in Alma Ata. Such is the attitude toward experienced staff personnel, when at the very same time they have such a severe shortage.

Subsequently the journalist calls attention to the fact that in fact no attention is paid to German amateur talent activities in the republic, no support is rendered, and they do not appear on television. And there is no opportunity for German language authors to publish their works.

Nor is everything well in the republic in the study of German as one's native language; addressing this point are letters from teachers to NEUES LEBEN. There is not a single group for training such pedagogical cadres in the republic academic institutions. But you see, in those places where the German populace lives in large, compact groups; and where there are national elementary schools—cadres are being trained to teach German as a native language: at pedagogical institutes in Barnaul, Novosibirsk, Omsk, and Orenburg (and at the pedagogical institutions in Slavgorod, Kazakh SSR; and Isilkul in Omsk Oblast).

I think it is necessary for a native language newspaper to be published for the German population of Kirgiziya, which numbers over 100,000, albeit a small one like ROTE FANE. For a start.

An article by the writer V. Herd was published in this newspaper, in response to the discussion of an essay entitled, "We are Strange to Them." Fully supporting the author, the writer at the same time notes, that "Such essays usually deal with the main reason which causes certain Soviet citizens of German descent to emigrate... No one abandons his motherland for material reasons, since Soviet Germans, just like all citizens of our country, live comfortably. But man does not live by bread alone; he seeks spiritual food as well, and above all in his own native language. And from this point of view we have hardly made use of all our possibilities; and this "adds grist to the mill of the foreign 'soul-savers'" ("What do I Think of This?", ROTE FANE, 15 April 1987).

The newspaper SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA has a great opportunity before it in education on items of history. The first German colonist-settlers on the territory of contemporary Kirgiziya appeared in 1882, more than 100 years ago. This includes the present-day villages of Leninpol, Orlovka and others in Talas Oblast; Lyuksemburg and Internatsionalnoye (I can't understand why it was necessary to rename the village of Friedenfeld and Mirnoye Polye as Internatsionalnoye; one would think that internationalism was hardly enhanced by this), and others, founded in 1921 by refugees from the famine in the Volga basin.

After all, these peasants—and according to the census of 1926 there were more than 4,000 of them—have also made their contribution to establishing the economy and culture of the republic. German settlers in the Talas Valley laid the foundation for establishing the Auliye-Ata breed of dairy cattle there. I can offer you historical materials on the appearance of the first German settlements.

I don't entirely understand why such a "phrase-mongering" expression as "Germans in the USSR" exists. You see, at present many newspapers, including PRAVDA, are publishing articles about our fellow countrymen abroad; they write about: "Russians in America and Canada," "Ukrainians in Canada," or Russian-Americans, Ukrainian-Canadians. Moreover, the word-combination "Germans in the USSR" has entered the scientific lexicon—for example, in T.D. Filimonov's article, "On the Ethno-Cultural Development of Germans in the USSR" (SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA, 1986, No 4). I advise A. Konstantinov to familiarize himself with it, as well as with A. Rozanov's article.

Once again, I express my readiness to assist the editors as much as I can with materials on Kirgiziya. I will be pleased if my letter is helpful to you in even a small way.

09006

Growth in Sudak Area Results in Water Supply Shortages

18000167a Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
23 Dec 87 p 2

[Article by Yu. Yenov, PRAVDA UKRAINY correspondent, Crimean Oblast: "Sudak Is Waiting For Water, But the Canal Builders Have Been Endlessly Awaiting the Necessary Equipment"]

[Text]As you ride into Sudak from the direction of Simferopol, you see a single file of water trucks. The trucks are loading up with drinking water for the city. But the well cannot provide more than 1500 cubic meters of water a day. Sudak needs no less than 20,000 cubic meters of water. There is only one way out of the difficult situation — to bring in water from the North Crimean Canal. The first phase of this job is from the Frontovoye Reservoir to the purification structures in Feodosiya and then over a 65-kilometer pipeline to Sudak and the settlement of Novyy Svet. The second phase is a canal from Sudak to the vilage of Privetnoye and a number of other villages. Its length will be more than 30 kilometers.

Ten years ago the Crimean branch of the Ukrpgiprovdkhov Institute of the UkSSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources designed the first phase of the canal. Its construction was begun, under principles of shared participation, by 11 interested ministries and departments. Determination was also made of the general contractor — the Krymgidrospetsstroy Trust.

Four years ago an extremely complicated situation developed in the Sudak area. There was a lack of precipitation, the underground water disappeared, and wells ran dry. That is why the start-up complex was taken out of the first phase and in 1985 water from the Feodosiya purification structures arrived in Sudak. For the residents of the city that was not the solution to the problem — the artery was not big enough.

The contractor and the customer continued to work to complete the entire construction of the first phase. The contractor did not have any complaints about the customer. The customer provided the construction site with documentation, financed the site, and promptly resolved the questions involving the delivery of the technological equipment. But the contractor — Krymgidrospetsstroy Trust — failed to cope with the assignments, and that led to prolonging the periods of construction and to the incomplete use of the financial limits for contract operations in a volume of 2.4 million rubles.

This year the construction plans stipulate the activation of the first phase of the Feodosiya-Sudak canal. This is not a stream, but a mighty river. Unfortunately, however, the activation of the canal is threatened with disruption. It has been planned for the trust to use 605,000 rubles, provided there is an activation of 2.4 million

rubles of fixed assets: housing, the canal, and energy-supply facilities. During the past 10 months, only 315,000 rubles have been used.

The construction site is being managed, factually speaking, by the in-house method. Therefore the customer has an almost complete lack of funds for all types of materials and equipment. The other ten ministries and departments do not render any assistance at all in providing or manufacturing nonstandard electrical-engineering and technological equipment, and fail to provide the construction site with transportation or with construction vehicles and machinery. And yet the delivery of the equipment was scheduled in detail among the various ministries. However, the customer has not received even a single bolt or nut. Where is the customer supposed to get the nonstandard equipment — welded structurals, large-diameter flanges, and many other items? The customer is deeply grateful to the Krasnyy Proletariy Plant in Moscow, which is rendering a large amount of assistance. But that flange that costs 400 rubles becomes 3 times as expensive after it is delivered to the Crimea. This is truly an example of the saying, "You can buy a heifer for less than a kopeck on the other side of the ocean, but it will cost you a lot to ship it here." Because there are many things that could be manufactured at plants in our very own oblast.

The Krymgidrospetsstroy Trust has proven to be a weak contractor. Perhaps the time has come for the oblast ispolkom and the UkSSR Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work to analyze the state of affairs in detail, to decide how to help the trust, and to decide whether it is possible for the oblast ispolkom, through Krymsnabsbyt, which is located under its jurisdiction, to render assistance to the customer in obtaining the complete set of equipment, and to the contractor in allocating manpower and technology.

In recent years Sudak has been changing its appearance sharply. The popularity of this resort has been increasing. A number of new guest homes are currently under construction, and the existing convalescent homes have been expanding. By the end of the five-year plan more than 127,000 square meters of housing will be activated. This exceeds by a factor of 4 the planned indicator for the five-year plan.

It is obvious that the time for bringing water to Sudak by animal-drawn and motor transportation has passed. By 1995, after the completion of the entire canal, the city is supposed to receive 75,000 cubic meters every day. That will be the complete resolution of the problem concerning the prospects of the city and the entire Sudak area. However, the people of Sudak, who have repeatedly heard such assurances and official statements, can see with their own eyes that, from day to day, less than a dozen construction workers show up at the major project, and even those workers throw up their hands in

desperation while awaiting the equipment. Therefore they do not display any particular optimism when looking at the "very promising" construction site.

5075

Dneprovskiy Rayon Residents Protest Chemical Plant Pollution

*18000167b Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
24 Dec 87 p 2*

[Article by V. Shestakov, Chief State Sanitation Physician for Kiev, under rubric "Photoaccusation": "Facing the Problem"]

[Text] For several years both our service and many of the city, republic, and union agencies have been receiving heaps of letters from residents of Dneprovskiy Rayon in Kiev. The people are very concerned about the ecological situation in the area that abuts the Kiev Chemical Plant of USSR Ministry of Mineral Fertilizer Production.

That enterprise, which was built about 40 years ago, dumps aggressive production runoffs. Moreover, the enterprise does so in rather considerable volume — 2.2 million cubic meters a year. The runoffs contain a high concentration of substances that are hazardous to people's health.

It is also necessary to mention in particular the unfavorable air situation around the plant. According to generally accepted standards, a protective-sanitation area with a radius of no less than 1000 meters should be maintained around an enterprise of this kind. And yet the

housing here is located only 600 meters from the shops. "We can't go out on our balcony. The poisonous gases seep into the apartments, and therefore we have to stand indoors all day. Please help us to get the chemical plant shut down," people write.

The city ispolkom and the environmental protection organizations forwarded requests to various higher administrative levels, asking to have the enterprise's area of specialization redefined and to transfer the most harmful production entities outside the city limits. But in his answer to the city ispolkom, Comrade Kochetkov, first deputy minister of Minudobreniy [Ministry of Mineral Fertilizer Production], did not indicate any specific measures or deadlines. He only noted that the ministry was continuing the work of looking for a place to build a similar enterprise somewhere else in the republic. Then a year and a half passed, but things have not moved ahead a single step.

The sanitation service has decided to ban the operation of Shop No. 1 at the chemical plant. But in order to improve the ecological situation in Kiev, and especially in the left-bank section of the city, it is necessary to move the production of chlorine, caustic soda, and all chlorine-consuming production entities outside the city line, and subsequently to redefine the enterprise's area of specialization for the production of output with the application of technological schemes without waste products. The question requires immediate resolution.

5075

END