

JPRS-UPA-89-003
11 JANUARY 1989



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

19991022 199

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DATE STAMPED 10/22/99

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-003

CONTENTS

11 JANUARY 1989

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

New Instructions on Conducting Party Elections Published [PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN No 16, Aug 88]	1
MOSCOW NEWS Views Ethnic Issues at USSR Supreme Soviet Session	4
Estonian, Latvian Deputies' Comments [Y. Teplyakov; MOSCOW NEWS No 50, 18-25 Dec]	4
Gorbachev's Republic Approach Lauded [Y. Ambartsumov; MOSCOW NEWS No 50, 18-25 Dec]	6
BSSR Obkom Chiefs on Political, Economic State of Oblasts [SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 6 Oct 88]	7

RELIGION

Archbishop Discusses Siberian Religious Concerns [S. Bychkov; MOSCOW NEWS No 48, 4-11 Dec 88]	12
Local Official Conducts Poll on Return of Church To Believers [A. Romanov; MOSCOW NEWS No 48, 4-11 Dec 88]	13

CULTURE

Literature Publishing Policy Questioned [V. Vigilyanskiy; OGONEK No 43, 22-29 Oct 88]	15
Films on Bukharin, Filipp Mironov Described [T. Cheremina, M. Kudryavtseva; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 5 Nov 88]	20
Likhachev Proposes Restructuring of Authority Over Cultural Preservation [D. Likhachev, Yu. Platonov, et al.; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 17 Nov 88]	21
Belorussian Cultural Club Gets Official Status [A. Ezerin; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 15 Oct 88]	22
BSSR CP CC Approves Bilingual Education Plans for the Republic [SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 15 Oct 88]	23
UkSSR Cultural Fund Chief on Support of Ukrainian Culture [B. Oleynik; PRAVDA, 25 Nov 88]	27

SOCIAL ISSUES

State, Law Institute Professor on Formation of Rule-of-Law State [A. M. Yakovlev; OGONEK No 43, 22-29 Oct 88]	32
Trial by Jury Urged for Serious Crimes [I. Petrukhin; MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 12 Nov 88]	43
Poll Reveals Judges', Prosecutors' Views on Legal Reforms [V. Kogan; SOVETSKAYA YUSTITSIYA No 19, Oct 88]	45
Kirghiz MVD Chief on Corruption, Internal Reforms [A. Galunichev; SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA, 10 Nov 88]	47
Mironenko on Komsomol, Youth Problems [V. I. Mironenko; OGONEK No 44, Oct 88]	50
Health Official Denies Widespread Psychiatric Abuses [A. Churkin; NEW TIMES No 43, Oct 88]	55

REGIONAL ISSUES

Lithuania's Cardinal, Party Officials on Church-State Relations [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 13 Oct 88]	59
Brazauskas Speaks at Lithuanian Creative Unions Meetings [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 29 Oct 88]	60
Russian Culture Informal Association Formed In Lithuania	62
Founding Meeting [V. Mikhailov; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 3 Nov 88]	62
Initiator Comments on Goals [V. Yanov; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 8 Nov 88]	62
Medvedev Visits Alfa, VEF Plants in Riga [LATINFORM; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 13 Nov 88]	64

New Instructions on Conducting Party Elections Published

18000629 Moscow *PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN* in Russian
No 16, Aug 88 (signed to press 12 Aug 88) p 30-35

[Instruction ratified by the CPSU Central Committee on 12 August 1988]

[Text]

General Stipulations

1. Elections for leading party authorities will take place as follows:

In primary and shop party organizations with less than 15 members and in party groups, once a year;

In primary and shop party organizations with party committees and party buros, once every 2-3 years;

In rayon, city, okrug, oblast and kray party organizations and communist parties of Union republics, once every 5 years (to be enacted after the corresponding amendments to the CPSU Statutes have been made).

2. Each 2 or 3 years following accountability and election conferences and congresses, party conferences may be held with the right to a partial renovation—up to 20 percent—of party authorities. This right is also extended to the CPSU All-Union Conference (to be enacted after the corresponding amendments to the CPSU Statutes have been made).

3. In the primary and shop party organizations elections of party committees and buros and, wherever no such bodies exist, of secretaries and their deputies, will take place at general party meetings. In individual cases, in large party organizations, party committee elections may be held, by permission of the party raykom or gorkom, at party conferences. The rates of representation at the conferences will be set by the party committee of the primary organization.

Elections for rayon, city, okrug, oblast and kray party committees will take place at the respective party conferences and, for the central committees of communist parties of Union republics, at congresses of communist parties of Union republics. Auditing (control-auditing) commissions will be elected at party conferences and congresses at the same time as party committees and will be accountable to conferences and congresses.

The rates of representation at conferences and congresses will be set by the respective party committees.

4. Long-term—in periods between reports and elections—re-election of committees (buros) of primary party organizations, should their activities be considered unsatisfactory, or partial renovation and by-elections could take place also at meetings and conferences and,

for buros of raykoms, gorkoms, okruzhkoms, obkoms, kraykoms and central committees of communist parties of Union republics, at plenums of the respective party committees, in discussing the reports submitted by these authorities.

5. The primary party organization of which any given member of the superior elective party authority is a member, has the right, at any time, to raise the question of removing from the leading body a party member who has compromised himself or lost the confidence of the party organization.

6. Delegates to rayon, city and okrug party conferences will be elected at general meetings (conferences) of primary party organizations.

Delegates to oblast and kray party conferences and congresses of communist parties of Union republics will be elected at rayon, city or okrug party conferences. Delegates to congresses held by communist parties of Union republics may be elected at oblast party conferences.

In party organizations of cities and okrugs with rayon divisions elections of delegates to city, okrug, oblast or kray party organizations and congresses of communist parties of Union republics may, by decision of the gorkoms, okruzhkoms, obkoms and kraykoms of the party and the central committees of communist parties of Union republics, take place directly at rayon party conferences.

7. Delegates to republic or all-Union party conferences will be elected on the basis of the same procedure as delegates to congresses of communist parties of Union republics and CPSU Congresses.

8. At the same time as the election of delegates to a conference or congress, the party organizations may submit nominations for candidates for membership in superior party bodies and make decisions by open vote. The final decision will be that of the delegates to the respective conference or congress.

9. Party members and candidate party members who are temporary members of primary party organizations will participate in the accountability and election meetings of such party organizations on an equal footing.

10. The accountability reports of party bodies will be discussed and ratified at plenums of the respective committees and, in the primary party organizations, at sessions of party committees and party organization buros; the reports of auditing (control-auditing) commissions will be discussed at commission sessions. This does not deprive the members of party bodies of the right to address party meetings, conferences and congresses with criticism of the leadership of the party organization.

11. As a rule, accountability and election party meetings and conferences will take place during nonworking time.

12. Presidiums and other bodies will be elected to chair the proceedings of accountability and election party conferences and congresses by open vote; a presidium or a chairman and secretary will be elected to guide the proceedings of a party meeting. Representatives of superior party committees may be elected members of the presidium.

13. In accordance with Article 24 of the CPSU Statutes, in the election of any party body, from a primary organization to the CPSU Central Committee, the principle of systematic renovation of their membership and continuity of leadership will be observed.

A party member may serve in the same elected position in party bodies, from party raykom to CPSU Central Committee, for no more than 2 consecutive terms.

14. In the election of all leading party bodies, including the CPSU Central Committee, candidacies will be subject to extensive discussion and secret vote; it will be possible to include in the ballots a greater number of candidates than there are available mandates.

Nomination and Discussion of Candidacies by Party Bodies

15. Elections to leading party bodies take place after hearing and discussing at meetings, conferences and congresses of the accountability reports submitted by the respective party authorities and the reports of the auditing (control-auditing) commissions, and the adoption of resolutions based on them.

Prior to elections at party meetings, conferences or congresses, the number of members of the elected party body will be determined in advance. This does not limit the right of participants in a meeting, conference or congress to enter any number of candidacies in the list for secret voting.

The resolutions of meetings, conferences and congresses, related to determining the quantitative structure and the nomination and discussion of candidacies for the elected party authority are adopted by open vote.

16. Nominations of new members of party bodies may be submitted by the participants in party meetings, and by conference delegates and delegates to congresses, separately for members and candidate members of a party committee or members of the auditing (control-auditing) commission.

17. At accountability and election meetings, conferences and congresses, conferences may be summoned by representatives of delegations (shop party organizations) to determine in advance the candidacies for the new structure of the party body or the auditing (control-auditing) commission.

To this effect the meeting, conference or congress can set up a commission. In the primary party organizations, such commissions may be elected at party meetings preceding the accountability-election meeting. The commissions will submit a list of all nominations and their suggestions to the meeting, conference or congress.

Nominations of candidates submitted on behalf of the conference of representatives of delegations (commissions) for the new membership of the party body will not limit the right of participants in meetings and delegates to nominate other candidates at the meeting, conference or congress itself.

18. Party members, who are not delegates in the given party conference or congress, may be nominated as candidates for membership in elected party bodies.

Motions on ending nominations will be submitted for decision by the meetings, conferences or congresses.

19. Participants in the meetings and delegates to conferences and congresses will discuss at their meetings all individual nominees. Every participant in the meeting or delegate to the conference of congress will have the unrestricted right to criticize and call for the removal of a candidate.

Motions on closing the discussion of a candidacy will be submitted to the meeting, conference or congress for its decision.

20. Following the discussion of candidacies the withdrawal of which has been requested, on each separate case the question must be decided as to whether or not the name of a given candidate will be entered in the slate for secret voting.

Candidates the withdrawal of which has not been requested will not be subject to a vote and will be included in the electoral slate.

21. CPSU candidate members attending the meetings of primary party organizations will participate in the discussions of the candidates by the party body in an advisory capacity.

Voting Procedure

22. The following will be elected by closed (secret) vote:

a. Members of party committees and of buros of primary and shop party organizations, members and candidate members of party raykoms, gorkoms, okruzhkoms,

obkoms and kraykoms and central committees of communist parties of Union republics, members of the respective auditing (control-auditing) commission, and delegates to conferences of primary party organizations and rayon, city, okrug, oblast and kray party conferences and congresses of communist parties of Union republics, at party meetings, conferences and congresses;

Remark: A promotion from candidate to member of a party committee will take place at the plenum of the respective party committee by open vote.

b. Secretaries and deputy secretaries of party committees with rights of party raykoms: at party committee sessions;

Remark: Elections of secretaries and deputy secretaries of primary and shop party organizations with less than 15 members and party group organizers at party meetings, secretaries and deputy secretaries of party buros and party committees with no rights of party raykoms, at the sessions of said buros and committees, if so stipulated by the party members, could take place by open vote.

c. Members of buros and secretaries of party raykoms, gorkoms, okruzhkoms, obkoms and kraykoms and central committees of communist parties of Union republics, at plenums of the respective party committees; chairmen of auditing (control-auditing) commissions, at commission sessions. Elections of secretaries of party committees and chairmen of auditing (control-auditing) commissions may include several candidates.

23. If necessary, by recommendation or the agreement of the superior party authority, on an exceptional basis, some party members may be co-opted as members of a party raykom, gorkom, okruzhkom, obkom or kraykom or central committee of communist party of a Union republic. Co-opted will be party members approved by secret vote by the majority of members of the party committee.

24. Should a member of the party body be elected outside the rayon, city, oblast and republic and submits a request to be relieved from his obligations as member (candidate member) of the party committee, the matter must be resolved at the plenum by open vote.

25. The question of the removal of a member of the party committee of a primary organization, elected at the party conference, from the membership of the party committee, must be solved at a meeting of the given party committee by closed (secret) vote. Members of party committees and primary party organization buros, elected at meetings, can be removed from membership of the party committee or buro at party meetings by open vote. In the primary party organizations such problems are solved by a two-third majority vote.

26. In order to hold a closed (secret) vote and assess its results, the party meeting, conference, congress or party committee plenum or auditing (control-auditing) commission will elect a balloting commission by open vote. The balloting commission will elect a chairman and a secretary.

Prior to the balloting, the chairman of the balloting commission will explain to the participants in the meeting and delegates to the conference and congress, to the members of the party committee and members of the auditing (control-auditing) commission the procedure for holding a closed (secret) vote.

Prior to the closed vote, the balloting commission will draw up ballots (slates) for secret vote in which the names of the candidates will be listed alphabetically. In holding party conferences and congresses, the ballots will also indicate the position and the place of work of the candidate. The ballot boxes will be sealed and placed in such a way that the party members can reach them after passing through a booth (booths) for secret voting.

In holding a secret vote in the party organizations of less than 15 party members and in party groups, the tallying of the results may be assigned by the party meeting to the chair of the meeting or to any one party member of this party organization. The results of the vote will be entered in the minutes of the meeting.

27. At multiple-shift enterprises or enterprises spread over a vast territory the discussion of the accountability reports, and the nomination and discussion of candidacies for the new membership of party bodies will take place at meetings of party members by shifts or cluster meetings of several shop party organizations. As a result of the discussions, a single slate will be drawn up for holding elections by closed (secret) vote, at shift (cluster) party meetings.

At each of the shift (cluster) meetings a balloting commission will be elected and the sum total of votes will be tallied at a joint session of the balloting commissions. The results of the vote will be announced to the party members at shift (cluster) or shop party meetings.

28. The secret vote in the election of party bodies will take place at closed meetings and closed sessions of conferences and congresses, which may be attended only by CPSU members or delegates.

Representatives of superior party bodies have the right to attend both open and closed sessions.

29. Every party member attending a meeting or every conference or congress delegate will be issued a single ballot (slate) of candidates nominated for membership and individually candidates for members of the elected party authority, members of the auditing (control-auditing) commission and delegates to the party conference and congress.

30. Every participant in a meeting or conference or congress delegate will have the right, at a closed (secret) vote to strike out in the ballot any candidate and add new candidates regardless of the predetermined number, in the election to one party authority or another.

31. After the voting, the balloting commission will seal the ballot boxes, tally the results of the vote for each slate, and draw up minutes in which it will enter the results of the vote, indicating the number of votes cast "for" or "against" each candidate. The minutes will be signed by all members of the commission.

Remark: Ballots (slates) which do not meet the stipulated form will be considered invalid; in the case of the election of secretaries of party committee plenums and of chairman of auditing (control-auditing) commissions at commission sessions, also invalid will be ballots in which two or more candidacies have been entered.

32. The balloting commission will report to the meeting, conference or congress (party committee plenum or auditing (control-auditing) commission) the results of the vote for each separate candidacy.

The candidates who have garnered more than one-half of the votes cast by the CPSU members participating in the meeting or by the delegates to a conference or congress, or members of the party committee or auditing (control-auditing) commission shall be considered elected.

33. The announcement of electoral results by the balloting commission must be approved by the meeting, conference, congress, party committee plenum or auditing (control-auditing) commission.

If as a result of the secret balloting several more or fewer members (candidates) than stipulated in advance have been elected, the meeting, conference or congress could pass by open vote a resolution ratifying the membership of the party body with its new membership, consistent with the results of the secret balloting. Should the majority of the participants in a meeting, conference or congress vote for retaining the stipulated number of members of the party authority established in advance, the question of the candidacies must be discussed once again and a second closed (secret) balloting must take place.

Note 1: If on the basis of the results of the balloting the number of delegates to a conference or congress turn out to be more than should have been elected on the basis of a rate of representation, the nominations must be discussed once again and a second secret balloting round must take place.

Note 2: If in the election of a secretary of a raykom, gorkom, okruzhkom, obkom, raykom or central committee of communist party of Union republic or chairman of an auditing (control-auditing) commission no single candidate has garnered more than one-half of the vote, a

renomination of candidates must take place with discussions and voting in accordance with the procedure stipulated in the present instruction.

34. All the materials of the closed (secret) balloting must be stored by the party authorities as confidential documents until the next elections, after which they must be officially destroyed.

35. In the case of violations of the stipulated procedure for the election of leading party authorities, the superior party committee must consider the fact and, if necessary, annul the results and pass a resolution on holding new elections.

(The ratification of the present instruction nullifies the Instruction on the Holding of Elections for Leading Party Bodies, ratified by the CPSU Central Committee on 29 March 1962, and the partial amendments introduced on 2 July 1966 and 7 August 1973).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Partiynaya zhizn", 1988.

MOSCOW NEWS Views Ethnic Issues at USSR Supreme Soviet Session

Estonian, Latvian Deputies' Comments
18120047 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 50, 18-25 Dec 88 p 4

[Article by Yuri Teplyakov: "Supreme Soviet: Work in a New Way"]

[Text] For nearly ten years I have walked the red carpet of St. George's Hall in the Kremlin. My job is to report on sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Honestly, this work was never complicated. I knew in advance who would say what, and when. Everything was assigned down to the last comma, all the roles were distributed. I even wrote my reports before sessions opened and was never mistaken: "Why is for?" "Against?" "Abstained?—none", "Adopted unanimously".

But I went to the last session of the previous-model Supreme Soviet without a scenario. For the first time I was at a loss: what to write, whom to speak to, what developments to anticipate, how to approach the discussion of the proposed drafts? No one knew.

Before the session deputies were reticent. They tried to avoid the press and kept to particular groups: some by profession, some by titles, some by territory and some by previous work. I spotted Yevgeny Velikhov in his academic circle. At the window there were writers, including Sergei Mikhalkov and Alexander Chakovsky, for some reason without his invariable cigar. Standing off to one side were former CPSU Central Committee Secretaries Vladimir Dolgikh and Mikhail Zimyanin, whom we used to see only in the presidium. In the crowd of

deputies there was even the previously inaccessible Geidar Aliyev. His lips, tightly pressed, he walked quickly past his former colleagues, as if not noticing. Maybe he was simply in a hurry to take his seat in the hall.

The following day heated debates erupted and different opinions clashed in the meeting hall. The debates continued in the corridors, in the unofficial atmosphere of a friendly argument. I sensed that deputies would soon start talking to journalists, too. I was right.

The morning before the final session, I literally snatched Arnold Ruutel, President of the Presidium of Estonia's Supreme Soviet, from out of a crowd of foreign journalists.

"I have the impression that some have tried to lecture you here on the difference between federation and confederation. Do you really confuse these notions?"

"The Estonian delegation was perfectly aware that; the amendments to the Republic's Constitution transcended the framework of all-Union laws. But we could not afford to ignore the views of thousands upon thousands of people and their desire to be masters on the land of their ancestors, not to take food from the hands of government departments which do not reckon with anyone. In the Ukraine with Ukrainians, in Estonia with Estonians. I have been reproached for passivity at this session, for not giving assessments, for not admitting mistakes. I had a different purpose. Here, in the Kremlin, I wanted objectively to convey the real situation in the Republic.

"We are quite satisfied with the decision of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union concerning the need to elaborate legislation which would eliminate problems in relations between the Republics and the central bodies. This is what we sought."

"But in Tallinn anti-Soviet calls are also heard at meetings".

"Political culture has failed many people today. Or rather, this culture could not appear from anywhere—pluralism previously was non-existent. The extreme right and the extreme left are rocking the boat and stirring people up. Extremism ruins democracy. This has to be combatted without fail. Maybe, also through compulsion in respect of some individuals going to extremes. I have been asked: are there people arrested in Estonia? No, there are not. The State Security Committee believes that there is no threat to Soviet power. I subscribe to this view."

...I had the impression that Ruutel was somewhat at a loss and tired—too stormy was the whirlpool of events round the latest decisions of Estonia's Supreme Soviet.

Anatoly Gorbunov, President of the Presidium of Latvia's Supreme Soviet, was in a different mood:

"I am satisfied. Most of our proposals have been included in the final wording of the laws. Thus, we raised

the question about guarantees of the Republic's representation in the future Soviet of the Union of the country's Supreme Soviet. Now such guarantees exist. Second: we suggested that the Republican Supreme Soviet should be in a position to protest a decision of the USSR Council of Ministers if it is at variance with the Republic's basic interests. And this has been heard. There are also other smaller victories.

"Our demands did not originate spontaneously. Latvia's deputies accepted as a mandate the immense 'no' voiced by Latvians vis-a-vis the centralization of power in the draft laws under discussion. We defended this position here as well, in the Kremlin."

The final session was presided over by Yuri Khristoradnov, Chairman of the Soviet of the Union. He put the Law on Amendments and Addenda to the Constitution of the USSR to a vote. Suddenly the Latvian artist Dzemina Skulme requested the floor from her seat to make an amendment. She suggested that the resolutions and laws, affecting the interest of the Republics be passed not by the majority vote of all deputies but put to a vote separately, by groups of deputies from different Union Republics. And the law should be considered adopted if all the Republican groups voted for it.

The proposal was unexpected. Khristoradnov immediately assessed it: "I believe that this will gravely compound decision making for the highest bodies of authority. Let us decide by voting that this proposal is inadvisable." The hall hummed in displeasure; a deputy introduced an amendment and it was up to the Supreme Soviet to decide whether or not it was advisable.

"So, who is for the first wording of the law without deputy Skulme's amendment? Are there those who are against or who abstain?"—a second-long pause—"No."

The hall replied with a burst of laughter. There were some who were against. Khristoradnov raised his eyes and saw them himself. And he said: "Please, count."

A count was taken.

"Taking part in the vote were 1,376 deputies. Voted for—1,353, abstained—23," the Chairman announced ultimately. And again there was noise in the hall. As it turned out, the 23 did not abstain, but voted against.

How difficult it is to pronounce this "against". How difficult it is to study even at the initial classes of the school of democracy when you have graduated from totally different universities.

Gorbachev's Republic Approach Lauded
18120047 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 50, 18-25 Dec 88 p 4

[Article by Yevgeny Ambartsumov: "When Politics is Tackled Seriously"]

[Text] We haven't had such a remarkable session for a long time. It was not just lively, there was critical, frank discussion about vital social problems. The laws adopted by the session mark the beginning of a turn in our political life.

Naturally, not all the proposals expressed in the process of nationwide discussion of draft laws were taken into account. But now, we are at the stage where criticism should not become a handicap to constructive work under the adopted system. The time has come to rise above details, which, even if important, are still secondary compared with the general direction. I, too, prefer a one-storey parliament with direct elections. But the essence is not so much in this mechanism, which can also turn into formality. Our future Supreme Soviet with its deputies selected at the congress will most likely have a genuine political life and, in turn, make society dynamic. But the main point, as Mikhail Gorbachev said in his concluding speech at the session of the Supreme Soviet, is that, as we gain experience, opportunities will arise to make corrections in the organization of elections and of the Chambers and in other components of the system. Practice, the dynamics of movement, has always been of a paramount importance in our history.

Nationwide elections are scheduled for spring 1989, and there'll be an election campaign. There's still time left to nominate as candidates more active, capable people with clear-cut civic stands, as the latest Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee appealed. No easy task. At the preliminary meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, it was all too obvious that, even among the presidents of the Republics, there are still men who cannot express their own and their people's views clearly and competently without a paper, without some prompting. So the point at issue is to replace functionaries with a corps of genuine political figures capable of upholding resolutely and boldly the interests of electors and society. This cannot be achieved straightaway, but it is important to start.

The Supreme Soviet session, and society, centered its attention on ethnic problems. You can understand the anxiety of the leaders of the movement in the Baltic Republics. But it is hard to disagree with the decision of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet which declared invalid the obviously unconstitutional decision of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia, which made the USSR laws dependent on their approval by the Republic. Consent would have brought the state to ruin.

It is impossible to ignore one point: the tone of some speakers discussing Estonia's resolution at the meeting of the Presidium and at the session jarred upon me and my colleagues. Unsubstantiated accusations of antisocial aims and of contacts with Western secret services were made. And, how was one to understand the accusations hurled by the Byelorussian deputy Kamal, following his own reference to Lenin on the need for the greatest tact and consideration in ethnic problems?! Or take deputy Tatliyev, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan, who was probably impartial when criticizing Estonians, yet behaved just like Kozma Prutkov, pointing out minor faults in other people while disregarding his own far more serious shortcomings. Also, he seemed to have forgotten that, having been elected in Stepanakert, he represented the electors of Nagorny Karabakh, about whose demands he also kept mum.

The speech by Armenian representative Voskanyan was also rather vague. From the published text it is impossible to understand why the people of his Republic are "in an extremely excited state". In general, our glasnost regularly malfunctions precisely on the issue of ethnic problems.

On the other hand, it was gratifying to read the speech by deputy Lavrov, who resolutely rejected statements in which he saw, not without reason, an "indictment in the familiar tones of the past". Lavrov, a remarkable theatre figure, reflected the high moral prestige and traditional conscientiousness of our intelligentsia, the genuine herald of perestroika, to whom Mikhail Gorbachev has repeatedly done justice.

So Koblin's speech sounded strange to me, reflecting the desire to possess the absolute truth. That, as we know for sure, restricts the efficiency of socialist pluralism. And this is all the more distressing given Koblin's part in normalizing the situation in Kazakhstan and, before that, in the Ulyanovsk Region. Although, it is gratifying that Kolbin himself does not like the former ostentatious unanimity, behind which, according to him, lies the indifference of the broad masses.

Mikhail Gorbachev's speeches were particularly hopeful. Criticizing the decision of Estonia, unlike many other speakers, he didn't brush it aside straightaway but tried to bring to light the motives behind it. He also spoke sharply about the aggravation of the ecological situation—a problem not only for Estonia—and about the irresponsible diktat of departments violating the interests of the Republics and the country as a whole. And, of particular importance, he advanced a principled proposal to broaden the powers of Republics, a proposal approved by the session.

Strong Republics but with a strong centre—this is the essence of Gorbachev's approach. You can therefore understand its sharpness, directed at negative speeches

and centrifugal tendencies which have manifested themselves of late. Such tendencies are dangerous for a state going through a crisis. If they are not suppressed, conservative forces will have a pretext to discredit and even to wreck perestroika, and to attempt to throw the country back. What would the thoughtless advocates of boundless ethnic and Republican sovereignty then tell their peoples? Do they really not understand that the best future for the people depends on the success of perestroika?

Gorbachev also spoke of the reproaches for spinelessness, made in letters sent by the working people to the centre. I think this spinelessness was there right from the start in connection with the Sumgait massacre. What happened in that city was not immediately called by the proper name, and the exposure of the guilty and of the organizers of the pogrom has been dragged out. This was obviously interpreted by the chauvinists who had staged the pogrom as connivance. In addition, criticizing with good reason nationalistic and parochial misapprehensions, but within the framework of a democratic discussion (inasmuch as its regulations are not violated), we must give an urgent and resolute rebuff to illegal and, moreover, violent actions and calls. And we must not confuse the real supporters of perestroika and glasnost—even those who make mistakes—with the shameless demagogues ostensibly praising perestroika but in reality undermining it.

During my recent meetings in Western Europe I noticed that many of our sincere friends showed mounting concern over the fate of M. Gorbachev's policy. Why are you exerting such pressure on him, this could wreck perestroika, they repeated. Our senior officials have also noticed the pressure from left and right by irresponsible extremist and conservative forces. Such pressure restricts freedom of action, a must for leaders. Today, a sense of responsibility and self-criticism is needed more than ever before, a sense which M. Gorbachev himself has; in his concluding speech he talked about the lesson learned by the centre.

The advance of perestroika is indeed more difficult than expected. True, no decisive changes have taken place in the economy. In the political sphere, too, there have been pauses in development, tactical manoeuvres and reshuffles. But there has been no retreat, no surrender of positions on matters of principle. More than that—the offensive continues. This is rare in crisis situations. The conclusion: at this crucial moment in our history we have to back, resolutely and actively, the policy proposed by the country's leadership.

BSSR Obkom Chiefs on Political, Economic State of Oblasts

18000184 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 6 Oct 88 p 3

[Excerpts from the debates over Ye.Ye. Sokolov's speech at the 11th Plenum of the Belorussian CP Central Committee: "Debates Over Ye.Ye. Sokolov's Speech"]

[Excerpts]

Speech of the first secretary of the Belorussian CP Brest obkom A. A. Zelenovskiy

The election campaign in the Party organizations is step-by-step getting stronger. A profound, concerned discussion is taking place about both the most urgent everyday problems and the fate of decisions that have been already made. People raise many questions. However, workers' collectives often are dissatisfied and disagree with our decisions and answers. They expect deep and fast changes. Indeed, there are many problems requiring an urgent resolution. People are right when they speak so critically about them. First of all, it is the food problem. It means that the results of each kolkhoz's work must be more weighty, and especially now, when the oblast performed worse than last year with regard to a number of agricultural indicators.

Taking into account these positions, the oblast's Party organization is determining its future work. We continue the main line toward specialization and concentration, which has justified itself. This means that large enterprises for pork and beef production will be built in every rayon. It will allow us to reach the 350,000 ton level of cattle and poultry sales to the State and that of 1.5 million ton in milk production already toward the end of the 13th five-year-plan period.

These are great tasks but today it cannot be differently. I will tell you frankly that not always things turn out right. Land reclamation still remains one of the most urgent problems. And it is true not only for our oblast. I consider the recently emerged attitudes that we need to reduce the volume of melioration works, to be in conflict with the decisions concerning the increases in agricultural production. Without it we cannot maintain productivity even of those arable lands that we have now. Therefore, we are asking the republican Council of Ministers to maintain melioration volumes at least at the level stipulated by the five-year plan. It is not the embanking of the Pripyat that we are worried about, as some hotly accuse us in the press. Our concern is to improve the water regime of the arable lands in areas having a high probability of flooding. This year, floods caused there many troubles, namely, estimated tens of million rubles in losses.

The oblast's farms poorly feel the economic reform, and the administrative pressure and the equalizing-distributing relations are as strong as before. Judge for yourselves: in 2 years the agricultural gross production has grown by almost one-quarter, while the funds for fuel and lubricants have grown only by 1 percent. And it is true not only for agriculture.

The plenum is discussing the issue of the processing industry. For us, it is especially urgent. At our rates of increasing production, the shortage of meat processing capacities is 42 tons per shift. The milk processing

industry is also greatly stressed. The time has come to have in 3-4 kolkhozes of every rayon their own shops for making sausages, preserves, smoked meats, and other products.

A year ago, an agreement was reached with the BSSR Gosplan to build in Stolin a plant manufacturing small lines for processing agricultural products. However, this project died in the discussion stage among the involved authorities. We think that this project should be revived.

Speaking of the development of processing, I would like to emphasize that we get very little help from the Gosagroprom of the republic. The oblast does not have its own confectionery factory and we have to bring candy and pastry goods from outside. We are asking the Gosplan to consider building such an enterprise in the oblast during the preparation of tasks for the 13th five-year-plan period.

The plenum devoted much of its attention to the problems of self-financing and full cost accounting. And this is correct. Without it we will not be able to develop the economy further. But we think that the principles of self-financing are poorly tied in with the centralized distribution of resources. What kind of self-financing and material incentives in increasing production volumes can be there, if a kolkhoz cannot buy anything for its money.

We think that without a broad development of wholesale trade, there will be neither self-financing, nor a restructuring of the planning system.

The first steps in this direction have been made, but these steps are somewhat hesitating and the actions are indecisive. I have in mind the creation of the oblasts main territorial directorates for material and technical supply. What kind of independence and wholesale trade can be there, when all resources belong to the republican associations for wholesale trade, which were created simultaneously with the territorial directorates, and the oblast has nothing, as before. We even do not know, how much and what goods are planned for us for the next year. We think that it would be expedient to transfer all resources to the oblasts territorial directorates. Starting in 1989, we are ready to take upon ourselves to provide the resources to all oblast's enterprises and organizations, except the agroprom and builders, and to refuse the departmental supply (at the present time, communication services, health care, communal and domestic services, cooperators, directorate of trade, and others have their own large supply bases). Then we will really bring supply closer to the enterprises and will eliminate the unnecessary lines.

**Speech of the first secretary of the Belorussian CP
Gomel obkom A. S. Kamay**

Among other, no less important problems the most urgent one for us is to improve the food supply for the population, in particular, of meat and meat products.

This issue was thoroughly and in principle discussed at the recent meeting of the Party obkom. As self-criticism, I want to say that the Party committees and organizations, and the Party obkom and its buro were unable to establish in all places the new approaches and methods to be used by personnel, to overcome passiveness of actions, and to support the socioeconomic programs for rural development by means of political and organizational work in every collective. And, as a result, 118 enterprises did not reach the planned levels of the Food program for meat production. These critical assessments form the basis of serious corrections being made by the Party leadership of the oblast's agroindustrial complex.

But I also want to talk about other things. Life is urgently demanding to take into consideration that the situation in the Gomel Oblast has been seriously affected by the accident at the Chernobyl AES. During this time, while the total population remained the same, the rural population was reduced by 45,000 people, including reduction in the able-bodied population by 29,600 people. The number of privately owned cows decreased by 41,300.

A substantial number of settlements work in difficult ecological regime. The recommendations issued by the USSR Gosagroprom concerning the production of ecologically clean animal produce using clean feed are not supported in practice by grain supplies. The growing losses in the individual sector's production, first of all, that of meat, are not covered by the increases in production by kolkhozes and sovkhozes. It is difficult to explain to people the following situation: during 3 years meat production (sales) has increased compared with the average annual level of the last five-year-plan period by 29 percent, and the oblast annually sells to the State in addition to the plan 12,000-14,000 tons (practically without one agricultural rayon), but its per capita consumption remains at the 62 kilogram level, which is below the average for the republic.

There are also other problems, which require more active work by the All-Union and the republican commissions. We are asking the government of the republic to petition the USSR Council of Ministers to provide the complete gasification of the rural settlements in the republic due to the existing ecological conditions in the forests and peat bogs, which are the sources of fuel.

Scientists and agricultural specialists must make a sharp turn in their work on modeling more efficient agricultural production under any weather conditions, and refining its organizational, technological, economic, and other parameters. The problem of agricultural stability is especially urgent for the meliorated arable lands of the Gomel Polesye, which have lost for the crop rotation 46,000 hectares of highly productive land due to known circumstances. However, this subject is being unjustifiably closed by the Minvodkhos [Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources] and the BSSR Gosagroprom. The approved for the five-year-plan period

program of complex melioration is being revised to reduce it. We hope that these problems will find proper understanding and resolution.

Two years ago, the Belselstroy [Belorussian agricultural construction authority] and its local design and construction associations were organized at the republican Gosagroprom on the basis of the cooperative-State properties. The correctness of selecting such a structure is being confirmed by its growing effectiveness. At the same time, however, the new system has also serious shortcomings, especially in the practice of planning the capital investments and the material and technical supply.

Belselstroy recognizes its responsibility to supply only those projects which are a part of a State order, and under different pretexts evades the government approved program for liquidating the results of the Chernobyl accident, as well as the Gosagroprom orders that are not supported by the supply of limited materials. And these orders make up almost a quarter of the total program of works in the countryside. As a result, the oblast's association has fulfilled only 66 percent of the yearly works' volume, and has already hampered the putting into operation a series of social and industrial projects.

In our opinion, to bring in order the system of control over the agricultural construction, the Council of Ministers of the republic should give the oblasts a total right to write their yearly plans, and to realize the material and technical supply of the territorial associations through the Gosagroprom and the BSSR Gossnab without the Belselstroy mediation.

We are trying to coordinate the solution of the whole set of economic and social problems with the radical restructuring of the organizational-Party and political-educational work. The Party committees and organizations are searching for such forms and methods, which better meet the new conditions and the line toward democratization and glasnost. At the same time, adherence to the earlier developed style, vulgarization, and stereotypes are not overcome to the full extent. A substantial part of the cadres have found themselves not ready to act in the conditions of democratic changes and increased public activity.

We think that these conditions require a more creative and purposeful work of the Highest Party school, Institute of Party's history, department of improvement of skills of the Party, Soviet, and ideological cadres, and chairs of social sciences of VUZes. It is extremely important to operatively sum up all the new and valuable in the Party practice and to make it available to all.

**Speech of the first secretary of the Belorussian CP
Grodno obkom L. G. Kletskov**

The time adds even more depth and specificity to the discussion over the 19th Party conference's resolutions, which is presently taking place at the meeting held by the

oblast's primary Party organizations to hear reports and elect new officials. A specific feature of these meetings is an increased activity of the Communists and a bolder than before criticism of shortcomings.

This does not mean that the election campaign is free of drawbacks. The renunciation of traditions and stereotypes of the past sometimes is difficult and slow. Communists fearlessly criticize their leaders and higher authorities, including the central ones. However, they are very timidly and confusedly speaking about the shortcomings of their comrades in the same Party organization.

Not everywhere a profound analysis of the organizational and ideological work is taking place. The summary reports and speeches sometimes are mainly devoted to economic activities. Little attention is paid to the work with young people and the development of the social sphere.

At the present time, the improvement of the Party committees' machinery structure is entering the final stage. There is no doubt that the branch departments will be eliminated, and the organizational and ideological departments will be strengthened. A Party committee will accomplish to a great degree its role of the political leadership authority exactly through them. The reduction in the number of personnel will increase its qualitative level.

I want you to pay attention to the fact that the first group obkoms stipulate a 30 percent personnel reduction. However, there are some obkoms, the Grodno and Brest including, which belong to the first group with regard to salaries and to the 2nd group with regard to their staff. It would be fair to cut their staffs as for the 2nd group obkoms, that is, by 20 percent. It would be expedient for the frontier oblasts' obkoms to have foreign ties sections.

The new role of the Party committees as the authorities of political leadership does not mean at all a departure from their role in leading the economic development. I emphasize: leading, not governing. The Soviets must govern the economy. The Party committees must assure the implementation of economic methods of control over economy through the Communists, personnel policy, and education of workers. The main things here are independence, full cost accounting, self-support, and self-financing.

The first steps in this direction show the high efficiency of the new methods. Thus, for the 8 months of this year the labor productivity in the oblast's industry has grown by 6.2 percent, and the planned profit has been fulfilled by 108.9 percent. For half-a-year, the labor productivity in agriculture has grown by 8 percent, and profit has increased by 81 percent.

At the present time, there are many discussions and polemics about implementing the economic methods of control over agriculture. And quite often one particular method is preferred to another. I think that different forms of collective, or individual contracts based on full

cost accounting can be used. And the life, the practice will select the most advantageous of them and will reject those, which are unacceptable and did not pass the practical test. The workers themselves must have the freedom to select them. Pressure and administration are inappropriate.

The transfer to the economic methods of control over the national economy threw light upon our weaknesses and discrepancies. The development of lease relations in agriculture is restrained by the lack of scientifically justified recommendations for developing the accounting prices and the lease payment rates, and by the instability of the present prices for the material and technical resources and services. Therefore, the managers of enterprises and the lessees are afraid to miscalculate during the preparation of long-term mutual agreements. An unsatisfactory supply of kolkhozs and sovkhozs with efficient equipment, spare parts, construction materials, and other resources is a serious obstacle in organizing well coordinated lease relations.

Since 1 January 1988 prices on agricultural equipment, mineral fertilizers, and construction materials have increased, while the purchasing prices on agricultural products remained the same. Practically, a pumping out of money from the countryside is taking place. I think that we will not improve agriculture by using such measures.

Problems with material and technical supply have sharply increased in industry and construction. Contract collectives of builders must often idle due to the lack of cement, bricks, and pipes, which causes a justified discontent of the workers. Obviously, time has come to introduce planning of construction volume based on availability of complete construction materials supply.

One more issue. Production and sales of cattle and poultry to the State are growing in the oblast annually. However, this does not lead to the improvement in meat products supply of the population. The republican Gosplan plans for 1989 to allot 58 kilograms of these products per one city dweller in our oblast, while the same indicator in average for the republic is 72.2 kilograms. Our part of local consumption is only 27.6 percent from the total amount sold to the State, or 10 percent less than in average in the republic (excluding Minsk). And the people reasonably ask us: why is not the growth of meat production stimulated by the growth of its consumption? It is difficult to answer such questions.

Speech of the chairman of the Minsk oblispolkom A. I. Tishkevich

The key question for us remains, as follows: how to adjust in a clear legal way the relations of the Soviets and their branches with the enterprises and organizations located in their territory and belonging to higher authorities? At the present time, this issue is the most painful and intricate.

The incompleteness of the Soviet's power and their local branches accountable to them to a great extent caused by their poverty. The combination of words "poverty of the government branches" itself seems to be absurd, but it is a fact. Where else one can see the government branches almost going round with a hat collecting shares as handouts. Charity is not a bad thing but not at the state level. It is good that the Party conference transferred this issue into a sphere of practical solutions.

The authority and possibilities of the government bodies have always depended and still depend on their economic potential and economic resources they have. By opening to the Soviets a possibility to receive a certain percent in assignments from enterprises, to form outside-budgetary development funds based on additional incomes, and to accumulate assets, the new economic principles will increase their possibilities and, as it follows, responsibility and independence in resolving the problems of the all-round development of the territories within their jurisdiction.

Among other important problems, the life raised the necessity of democratization and renovation of our electoral system. The experimental elections with several candidate system that took place in some rayons, though have increased the interest toward them and raised responsibility of the voters, still have not resolved all problems. Therefore, we need to search for new ways in the election practice.

We studied opinions of many of ispolkoms' and Soviets of deputies' workers. Almost all of them are unanimous that the number of deputies at the local branches of government should be substantially reduced, and that many commissions of the village and settlement Soviets should be abolished. Only recently, oblast 6 structural units were eliminated in the oblast, and the number of personnel was reduced by 560 people in accordance with the general management outline. And this work is continuing. We are stipulating to consolidate a series of Soviets and improving the practice of teaching and certifying the personnel.

However, we have not managed yet to resolve the main task of strengthening the personnel of the link, which implements all our plans and directives, that is, the village and settlement Soviets. There are many reasons for that, but the main one is low salaries of the leaders of these government branches. And if this issue is not resolved by raising the salaries to, at least, the level of kolkhoz and sovkhoz specialists, it will be difficult to increase the role of the village and settlement Soviets.

At the present time, the programs of providing housing to every family in the oblast before the year 2000 are developed and approved during the sessions. This work is approved by the BSSR Gosplan and, after that, by the Council of Ministers of the republic. But it is far from being implemented. The BSSR Gosplan, Gosstroy, Gossnab, Mintorg [Ministry of Trade], and Belkoopsoyuz

[Belorussian Cooperative Union] not only do not plan to assign funds for the program, but for certain items are reducing them compared to this year level. We feel the results of such a supply already now. Today, many building materials are unavailable in the retail trade. As a result, long waiting lines are being formed with preliminary registration, and the people's discontent is growing.

I specifically want to discuss the problems of the countryside construction. During 1986-88 the increase in the volume of construction and assembly works for the oblselstroy [oblast rural construction authority] was more than 65 million rubles. At the same time, the available capital investments for the development of our own production basis, housing, and social sphere are limited, and the construction resources in excess of those provided are not available. All this creates substantial

difficulties in providing the construction sides with complete sets of materials and products, and leads to emergency jobs, rush work, and reduced quality.

The issues of bringing in order and reorganizing the construction industry were raised in the speeches of comrades Malofeyev and Leonov at the 9th Plenum of the Belorussian CP Central Committee in January 1988. Unfortunately, until now these issues have not been resolved.

And now about the reorganization of the Party branches. We think that it would be expedient to create vertical branch administrative sections. In our opinion, this will provide the opportunity to eliminate the remaining aside separate ministries and departments, to reduce administrative personnel, and at the expense of these measures to strengthen the personnel of the Soviet authorities.

Archbishop Discusses Siberian Religious Concerns

18120044a Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 48, 4-11 Dec 88 p 13

[Interview with Archbishop, Right Reverend Feodosiy by Sergi Bychkov, of the MOSCOW NEWS]

[Text] [Question] Last year marked the 400th anniversary of Orthodoxy in Siberia and this year the Millennium of the Baptism of Russ. What role did Orthodoxy play in the history of Siberia? What is its role today?

[Answer] Christianity brought Siberia the same rudiments of statehood, the same ideas which Russia inherited from Byzantium. Of course, the colonization of Siberia did not always proceed in a Christian manner. But I am convinced that the history of the Church is principally the history of its saints. We deeply revere the memory of Siberian saints, many of whom were educated and noble people, such as Metropolitan Ioann of Tobolsk (Maximovich); Metropolitan Pavel (Kanyuchkevich), a martyr who suffered under Catherine II; and Metropolitan Filofei (Leshchinsky), an outstanding enlightener. When Metropolitan Filofei arrived in Tyumen in 1702, he found many of the churches in shambles. He appealed to Peter the Great, with whose permission he built the majestic Holy Trinity Monastery. The Metropolitan oversaw the building of several new churches and the opening of a number of church schools, including one in Tobolsk, Siberia's first theological school. The Metropolitan was buried near the Holy Trinity Cathedral. Said Siberian historian P. A. Slovtsov: "One step over the threshold and there you see the simple tombstone of this hierarch who willed that his ashes be buried there, on the path, so that passersby might tread over it. On the contrary, there is no one who doesn't bow to the resting bones of this Man of God...."

St Sophia of Tobolsk has become dilapidated. There are three other such churches in Russia—in Kiev, Novgorod and Polotsk. They have been turned into museums and are national property. Can't we really restore St Sophia of Tobolsk? The local authorities seem amenable. I hope St Sophia will soon have visitors and worshippers.

[Question] A museum and a church?

[Answer] The Russian Orthodox Church will participate in the restoration of this masterpiece of Russian architecture. We are asking that we be allowed to hold divine services there on holy holidays. The museum and the church coexist in the same building of the Holy Trinity Monastery in Zagorsk and in the Novodevichy Convent in Moscow. We held a festive divine service during the celebrations of the Millennium of the Baptism of Russ near the St Sophia Cathedral in Tobolsk. Many believers gathered, even those who wished to participate in the restoration of this remarkable historical monument.

[Question] What other monuments in Siberia need help?

[Answer] Things are going better in the Tyumen Region than in other regions of the country. When I, as a representative of the Church, have to apply to the local authorities, I usually receive understanding and sympathy and efficient help. Siberia's oldest Monastery, Abalak, is now being examined by the Regional Executive Committee. I hope we will soon start its restoration. Understanding has already been reached on the restoration of the Church of Peter and Paul, which now houses a building organization.

[Question] Do the existing theological schools send you enough priests?

[Answer] That is a sore point. The regions in Siberia are very large. Even so, the Omsk Region has only seven Orthodox associations, and the Tyumen Region eight. We are now discussing registering another three. Even with this comparatively small number of associations, we are in constant need of priests. It is an open secret that hardly anybody comes to Siberia willingly—sometimes only those who have made a slip in the European part of the country. Therefore, at the recent Holy Local Council of the Russian Orthodox Church I suggested that the Siberian theological seminary, which was in Tobolsk before the Revolution, be re-established.

[Question] Won't finances, textbooks and teachers be needed to establish a new theological school?

[Answer] If the matter is resolved positively, we shall cope with this task on our own, without subsidies from the Patriarchy. Teachers will be found, too. I have experience in teaching, as have the cathedral bishops. At the initial stage we are planning to take some 15-20 students. But it is important that they be native Siberians and not chance-comers. After graduating from the seminary they will stay on.

[Question] As far as I know, there are various religions in the Omsk Region.

[Answer] We have 80 Lutheran associations, 60 Baptist. Altogether, there are eleven confessions in the region, among them Adventists, Catholics, Molokans, Muslims, and Judaists. The Russian Orthodox Church has eight associations. Obviously this is a result of complicated migration processes. It is rather difficult to explain the reason for having no Old Believers' community in the region, though the Cossacks who colonized Siberia were mainly Old Believers.

[Question] During the celebrations to mark the Millennium I attended an impressive concert.

[Answer] I am a novice in Siberia. I have been in charge of this post less than two years. but I have already succeeded in forming two wonderful choirs. In the concert you mentioned, the old church songs as well as the works by the composers of the later period—Bortnyansky, Chesnokov and Rakhmaninov—were played. It

was gratifying to see local authorities and reporters at the concert. We decided to transfer the receipts to account No 707—to the Lenin Children's Fund. There were many people in the church and, if you noticed, the Bishop's choir of the Erection of the Holy Cross Church of Omsk was encored. Apparently, we found the way to people's hearts. That is the most important thing for me.

[Question] Do you ever lose heart?

[Answer] Sometimes. Then I repeat the words of Jesus Christ: "Where a man has been given much, much will be expected to him." I work as hard as I can. My age urges me on: I am over 60. Now our society is going through a time of beneficial renovation. The Church can and must participate in this process.

Local Official Conducts Poll on Return of Church To Believers

18120044b Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 48, 4-11 Dec 88 p 16

[Article by Andrei Romanov]

[Text] At the point where two rivers converge, an Orthodox Church stands on a steep bank.

"This is the Church of Praise to the Mother of God," Belyaev explains. "It was built in 1927 and closed in 1937."

An abandoned church. The believers ask for it to be given to them. The local authorities have refused. MN often writes about such situations, trying to figure out what decision would be in keeping with the law, with justice. In nearly every case, it turned out that there was no one else to protect the rights of the believers. That's why I'm so interested in the position taken by Alexander Belyaev, 41, junior research associate at the Laboratory of Computers and Automation of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research. To be perfectly honest, I've never heard of a deputy to the Soviet speaking in favour of transferring a church building to believers.

The Ratminsky Corpse preserve is probably the main historical and cultural landmark here. It is picturesque, situated where the Dubna River flows into the Volga. Before the revolution the estate of the Vyazemsky princes used to stand here. In the 1970s the former manor house partly burned down and partly was disassembled, so that the bricks could be used by the population of nearby villages.

The Church of Praise to the Mother of God was preserved. But in what a shape? Over the last decades, the building has been used for the most varied purposes—a canteen, a hostel, a gym and a cinema. It was even used once as a workshop for repairing tractors—a huge section of wall was removed so that they could be driven in. And, of course, there are no domes, nor crosses or bells.

This "architectural monument of local importance" became the main concern of Alexander Belyaev, a member of the permanent deputy commission on culture. I must say, for justice' sake, that other people, in particular, activists from the Society of Preservation of Relics of History and Culture, and of the Society for Nature Reservation, did a lot for the restoration of the church building. If I keep talking about Belyaev, it's only because I'm interested in how his position developed—as human being and political representative of Soviet power.

The church was covered in scaffolding for many years. Restoration work was sporadic. Belyaev made the restorers in Ratmino work properly. But, if he'd limit himself to writing official letters and travelling around, this would not have yielded great results. Nearly every Sunday, Belyaev himself went to help the restorers.

Soon it was obvious that repairs to the outside would be finished before long. It was time to decide how the building was to be used. Belyaev and many others thought the best use for it would be as a concert-exhibition hall. But Belyaev decided to find out what his electors thought. He wrote out questionnaire in which he tried to envisage all the possible and impossible answers to the proposal that the "building should be torn down".

474 people answered. [as published] Here are some of the questions and results. "For restoration outside, and a modern interior for cultural purposes"—27 per cent. "For complete restoration of the building as a church to be used for cultural purposes"—33.5 per cent. "For handing the building over to the Russian Orthodox Church"—26.6 per cent.

Belyaev says: "The fact that there were many atheists among those who favoured returning the building to the believers was surprising and made me think." According to the law, it could be given over to a definite, officially registered religious commune. But Dubna had no such commune.

The regional newspaper LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA stressed precisely this fact, when it wrote this August about Ratmino and the arguments which, according to the journalists, hindered solution. Then came a surprise.

LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA received and published a letter which said: "At present we believers from the city of Dubna are setting up a commune and want to open a functioning church.... We've collected 450 signatures by September 1, and there will be many more." An explanation by the Dubna City Soviet Executive Committee was also published in the paper. Nothing was said against registration of the commune, but apparently, on the question of handing the church over to believers the answer would be unfavourable. The main reason for this was said to be that the majority of Dubna residents wanted to turn the church into a concert-exhibition hall.

At this moment, Alexander Belyaev had to solve questions which went far beyond the limits of this particular story. What is democracy—does it boil down to the protection of the interests of the majority, or should it also protect the rights of the minority? And whose side should be nonbelievers take, especially those representing power?

Belyaev's answer was "The Church—to the believers!" He and his 15 voluntary helpers have already collected some 1,200 signatures.

I came to Dubna. Several dozen people, invited by Belyaev, were at the House of Culture. I feared that these were exclusively his supporters. But no, it was all honest.

"As a representative of the City Party Committee I can say that the means for turning the church into an exhibition-concert hall have finally been found. The council of the work collective at one of our plants passed a decision to give the necessary sum."

"And why do we need a concert-exhibition hall in the church? We have several suitable halls in the city already, and a sanatorium with a hall seating 400 is being built next to the church."

Even famous musicians perform in semi-empty halls in our city. So, who'll go to the church, four kilometres away?

"Many people probably wouldn't have opted to sign the 'Church over to the believers!' appeal had they known that there was already the money for the concert-exhibition hall."

"They seem to be able to find the money to justify not giving the church back to the believers, though the city cannot even buy a decent grand piano. Even Svyatoslav Richter had to play on a very poor quality instrument."

"A functioning church will be like a knife in the back for me as a communist and school director. But still, I don't see any other real method of preserving and using this building."

"But the queue for wine next to the kindergarten is no knife in the back for you? We're solving a moral problem—what to do with something that doesn't belong to us? The church was built with the believers' money and then illegally taken from them. It must be completely restored and returned in the condition it was in when taken."

"Don't forget—Belyaev carried out a poll and the majority were against giving the church to the believers."

"Yes, I myself spoke in favour of a concert-exhibition hall. But that was last year—and at the time it was impossible to think what it really meant to give it back. But this, in fact, is the right thing to do."

"If we hold a city referendum, the majority will be against giving the church back to the believers."

"I'm not so sure. This question cannot be solved by voting. Even though the believers are a minority, their rights must be secured."

"I'm the only representative of the believers who put in the request to register the commune. If the Praise to the Mother of God Church were given to us, the Moscow Patriarchate would help finance restoration, as promised."

"The fate of the Ratmino Church is especially important for us nonbelievers, too. The decision eventually taken should be one that teachers our children justice, tolerance and respect for the interests of others."

I don't want to force a decision, but it is clear to me that it is high time to decide. Large spots of mildew have already appeared on the freshly whitewashed walls of the church, because, inside, it is damp, cold and devastated.

I must repeat that I was more interested in Deputy to the City Soviet Alexander Belyaev's position. In his activities—state activities—he tried to be guided by the ideas of justice, and morality. This is important and, one more thing, he escaped the primitively arithmetic understanding of democracy, according to which a representative of power must be on the side of the majority—against the minority.

Some people may say that he did little, what's one church? It's not even clear what will become of it? Right. But, in this case, it's not only the results that are valuable, but the motives, too. They are unusual for us, but I'm sure there's some future in them.

And another thing. When I asked Alexander's acquaintances why, in their opinion, he was nominated and elected deputy, I usually got the short answer: "He's simply a decent person."

Literature Publishing Policy Questioned
18000172 Moscow OGONEK in Russian
No 43, 22-29 Oct 88 pp 6-8

[Article by Vladimir Vigilyanskiy: "The Civil War in Literature, Or How To Help the Reader of Tolstoy"]

[Text] The autocratic-bureaucratic method of management has distorted many things in our lives, including our literary life. Now, when the journals and newspapers are trading accusations of working against each other and of unwillingness to reconcile, it would be worthwhile to consider the birth and development of that segment of literature which has been beyond criticism, and to think about who advanced this Soviet literary front on various floors and corridors. Many of our disputes today are symptoms of old diseases. Today, in the era of glasnost, we have been given the opportunity to call many things by their right names, and to examine areas which for decades were obscured by a dense smokescreen of paegeyrics. We have received many letters from readers dissatisfied with the literary situation which grew up during the years of stagnation.. One can hardly agree with S. Yu. Bondarev when he calls this situation a "civil war" and names those who have had the gall to infringe upon the established table of ranks. Now is the time for calmly getting to the truth of matters and this applies to this area of life, as well as others. We are not the first to speak of this matter. Publishing policies, for example, have been hotly discussed in IZVESTIYA and KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE, DRUZHBA NARODOV and MOSKOVSKAYA LITERATURA, and other publications. Of course, we must calmly look at the facts, and avoid comparing one group of artists with another ideologically or creatively; we wish only to present the true picture of how paper, which has been in such short supply, was allocated and reallocated among them. Moreover, without doubting the worth of many of the books named in this article, we cannot help but be struck by the editorial obsession(which, until very recently was considered to go without saying) for publishing some works and neglecting others that are no less, and sometimes even more, worthy (with all the arbitrariness implicit in such comparisons—but after all this problem arose precisely as a result of comparisons.)

Having become familiar with the work of V. Vigilyanskiy, who has been studying issues of mass culture and publication for many years, we have decided to offer the results of his analysis to your attention. As we discuss the costs of the administrative management of reader demand, let us consider together how the shortage of paper and the shortage of trust developed.

Everyone remembers Yu. Bondarev's pronouncement to the effect that a "civil war" is now going on in literature, some of the enemy has gotten almost as far as the Volga, and the battle of Stalingrad is about to begin. Several other literary men snatched up this metaphor with delight and not long ago in an interview in the journal

NASH SOVREMENNİK, Anatoliy Ivanov further developed this theme: "It is not merely one or another group of authorities that is under attack, but the positions they are defending.."

According to A. Ivanov, the contemporary literary situation looks like this: on one side of the barricade are the forces who with their works are defending "social morality" and our socialist way of life; while on the other side are those who, in the name of a "new" and "different" truth, are attempting to topple that morality and that way of life. In the first group he includes G. Markov, P. Proskurin, M. Alekseyev, G. Kononov, L. Leonov, L. Kokoulin, V. Astafyev, V. Belov, V. Rasputin, and, of course, himself. The writers in whose works the "element of destruction are raging" and "social morality" is "being shaken" include N. Gumilev, O. Mandelshtam, V. Nabokov, B. Pasternak, A. Rybakov, A. Bek, D. Granin, V. Dudintsev, and A. Pristavkin.

A. Ivanov speaks with annoyance of the universal reader interest in this group of authors, whom he has scornfully dubbed "returnees."

Another thing which is worthy of commentary is the writer's naive lack of trust in the power of the socialist way of life, which, he seems to believe, can be easily toppled in a collision with... a truth; and his almost unconcealed jealousy of the success his colleagues have been having with the readers. We could also cite other pronouncements by Ivanov, for example, his attempt to discredit the rehabilitation of important figures of the past by claiming that they had violated criminal laws, or his discussion of the sources of "sabotage" in our society. But I will not do this—enough was said about such "manifestos" in the 5 April issue of PRAVDA.

It is important for me only to note that all this talk about the "civil war" is suffused with a feeling of panic before an approaching storm.

And the point is not even that the perception of our state as a totalitarian regime that does not permit democratic transformations in its development has been disproved. After all, if the orders come from "above" these perceptions too can be renounced (certain of these writers chose to criticize Stalin in the 60s, praise him in the 70s, and in our day again renounce him). The point is that certain people are losing their power, high positions, influence, rewards, prizes, orders, and finally, royalties,

On the pages of KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE (NO. 23), a worker in the Central Distributing Library, which supplies 850 Moscow libraries, talks about the books that readers really want. While the libraries requested 2200 copies of "Children of the Arbat" by A. Rybakov, there were 110 requests for A. Ivanov's "Eternal Call," 1000 each for "New Assignment" by A. Bek and "White Clothes" by V. Dudintsev and 180 for "Salt of the Earth" by G. Markov; 1100 for "Bonfire Light" by Yu.

Trifonov, and 300 for "Bitter Herbs" by P. Proskurin; 820 for "The Chosen" by B. Okudzhava, and 68 for L. Kokoulin; 880 for B. Mozhayev and 120 for V. Povol'yayev.

No, some of our literary figures are unhappy about these "destructive" processes, as they term them. And the higher on the administrative ladder such a writer stood in the past two decades, the louder are his expressions of dissatisfaction with the current literary situation and the more frequently (following dutiful words on the necessity for perestroika and glasnost) do the insidious, self-revealing little words of "but" and "however" escape his lips.

It is possible to cope somehow with the word "perestroika", it has so many facets and so many levels. And it can be stretched to include anything anyone wants. But what can you do with "glasnost"? Almost any effort to discredit or suppress it with references to "maintenance of law and order" simply show how much you fear it.

For example, imagine that a curious eccentric peers into the card file of the Library imeni V. I. Lenin and takes it into his head to compare how many books were published by, let us say, M. Alekseyev and A. Bitov, or A. Ivanov and B. Mozhayev, or I. Stadnyuk and B. Okudzhava, or A. Chakovskiy and F. Iskander, or A. Kalinin and V. Belov, or Yu. Bondarev and V. Makanin, or G. Gulia and V. Dudintsev. We can say with confidence that he would be struck by the monstrous discrepancy between the size of the printings and number of editions. While for one group of authors, the number of editions in Russian fluctuates between 75 and 115, then in the other group this range is 12 to 35. The difference of 50 books between Bitov and Stadnyuk and of 75 books with printings of millions of copies between Belov and Bondarev can easily be explained: the first group contains writers who were in power, and the others did not have this power.

Or say this eccentric wanted to check A. Ivanov's assertion that V. Kochetov is now remembered only to "beat a dead horse one more time," and that "no one is even talking about reprinting his books."

What would he see? He would see that Ivanov once again has misled him: from 1980 to 1988 V. Kochetov published 22 books (2547 thousand copies), including a three-volume work (1982), a six-volume collection (1987), and 10 editions of the novel "Zhurbiny" (1390 thousands); that during this period two monographs were published on his works, and quite recently a book of reminiscences about him. Or say this eccentric decided to check for himself the fact asserted by Ivanov, that Gumilev, Mandelshtam, Nabokov, and Pasternak are being published here in editions of millions of copies. It is true that much is being said about them these days. Perhaps, millions of copies is the truth? But here too he will be disillusioned: while we have published 22 editions of Kochetov and 25 (nine of them in two volumes and one in four volumes) of Ivanov himself (about 10

million copies); one small edition of Gumilev (Ogonek Library, 150 thousand), one of Mandelshtam (65 thousand), and seven of B. Pasternak (740 thousand) and not a single separate edition of V. Nabokov have been published in our country.

On the other hand, during a single 5 year period, from 1981 to 1985, as sociologist S. Shvedov tells us on the pages of VOPROSY LITERATURY, Yu. Bondarev published 50 times (5868 thousand copies); G. Markov 32 times (4129 thousand); P. Proskurin 21 times (2615 thousand); S. Sartakov 15 times (829 thousand); and A. Chakovskiy 40 times (3902 thousand).

Unfortunately, all these meticulous statistics do not reveal the highly critical nuances that go a long way to explain the true reasons for this discussion of the "civil war" and the mechanisms underlying literary politics during the past few decades. In and of themselves, there is nothing wrong with millions of copies and numerous new editions.

However, this is only true when the reader himself, with his ruble, determines what and how much he will read. It is a pity that in the last few decades, the reader was virtually deprived of any voice in what should have been his own individual decision, while the officials of the Goskomizdat (State Publishing Committee) and the leadership of the Writers' Union decided for him what and how much would be published (essentially by, creating an artificial shortage of the best books by modern authors and writers of the past). And in this context, the problem of allocating the size and number of editions among authors took on the aspect of a well-engineered strategy.

In order to gain a general understanding of the history of contemporary literature, one need only glance at the allocation of editions among prose writers in the popular series "Roman-gazeta." As in a drop of water, the publishing policy of recent years is reflected here. OGO-NEK wrote about this last year.

I cite these figures: A. Chakovskiy - 21 publications, V. Kozhevnikov - 14, S. Sartakov - 13, S. Babayevskiy - 13, P. Proskurin - 12, V. Kochetov - 10, G. Markov - 9, Yu. Bondarev - 9, M. Alekseyev - 9, A. Ivanov - 9, I. Stadnyuk - 8, M. Bubennov - 8.

And for purposes of comparison: V. Belov - 4, V. Tendryakov - 3, G. Baklanov - 2, Yu. Hagibin - 2, V. Soloukhin - 2, Ye. Nosov - 2, A. Rybakov - 2, G. Troyepolskiy - 1, S. Antonov - 1, Yu. Trifonov - 1. Only posthumously, did they publish a single edition of the works of such writers as V. Shukshin, V. Semin, Yu. Kazakov, and K. Vorobyev. "Roman gazeta" did not publish anything by M. Bulgakov, I. Babel, M. Zoshchenko, A. Platonov, V. Kaverin, A. Yashin, B. Mozhayev, F. Iskander, V. Likhonosov, V. Konetskiy, V. Makanin, B. Okudzhava, A. and B. Strugatskiy, V. Kondratyev, A. Bitov, Yu. Davydov, T. Pulatov, O.

Volkov, A. Zlobin, I. Grechkova, B. Vasilyev, Ch. Amiredzhibi, Ch. Guseynov, A. Kim, G. Matevosyan.. Virtually all our best prose was neglected.

And yet during the last two decades they published, sometimes several times, the novels and stories of A. Blinov, I. Boyko, Yu. Borodkin, M. Gorbunov, M. Domogatskikh, N. Nikonov, S. Pestunov, A. Pobozhiy, M. Sokolov, A. Strygin, V. Serikov, A. Filev, P. Khalov, S. Tviguna, A. Sheludyakov..

Ostensibly because of the continuing paper shortage, Goskomizdat created a special department to coordinate the issuing of books by various publishing houses in order to avoid "parallelism and duplication of editions." As time passed, it became clear that this concern was directed exclusively at "rank and file" writers. And strict watch was kept to make sure that no one among them published different books with different publishing houses in a single year. As for the writers included in the special caste of "untouchables," on the contrary, everything possible was done to accord them "most favored nation treatment."

Judge for yourselves: the novel "Hot Snow" by Yu. Bondarev was published twice a year in 1970, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1984, 1988; three times per year in 1982, 1983, and 1985; and five times in 1986 (for a total of 4 million copies). The novel "Eternal Call" by A. Ivanov was issued twice in 1971, 1972, and 1987; three times in 1974; four times in 1986 (for 21 editions of volume 1 and 15 of volume 2).

My curious eccentric might find the situation pertaining to two books published by Molodaya Gvardiya in 1978 quite unique. Both were submitted for typesetting on the same day, only one was signed to press in January and the other in February. These two books have the identical name - "Hot Snow," and even the same author, one Yu. Bondarev. The type and the format are the same. Only the covers differ somewhat. The one included in the "Victory Library" series is of further interest by virtue of the fact that the surname of one of the members of the editorial board of the series is the same as that on the cover of the book. This is truly a unique case. Typically this author, like other heads of publishing endeavors, so as not to call undue attention to his name in the capital, likes to be published in other cities. Bondarev, for example, in addition to the central publishing houses, was published, sometimes several times each, in Stavropol, Volgograd, Kazan, Kaliningrad, Novosibirsk, Tashkent, Yoshkar-Ole, Kishinev, Petrozavodsk, Minsk, Elist, Barnaul, Leningrad, Baku, Voronezh, Krasnodar, Kharkov, and Tallin.

Possessing a monopoly on the publishing and sale of books, Goskomizdat, with the aid of those whom it nurtured (and who in turn supported it during the past several decades), could with complete freedom, and without being subject to monitoring or punishment, manipulate the policy with regard to books, publishing

some and not publishing others, engineering a shortage, constantly raising the prices of books, etc. The primary victim of all this was the reader. The debt owed to him by the book publishers grew from year to year, until there came a time when virtually any book that anyone wanted was unavailable.

Moreover, our reader was actually glad to accept the book coupon system introduced in 1974. I am referring to the "experiment" involving the issuing of coupons for books in high demand in exchange for providing the state with 20 kilograms of used paper.

This unique situation, without parallel in Soviet or world economics, became an everyday occurrence for us. The slavlike dependence of the readers on Goskomizdat was further enhanced by the fact that after providing this colossal assistance, the individuals who for months had rummaged through the garbage heaps gathering newspapers to get their 20 kilograms of used paper were not even given free choice of the book they would get, not even from the list specially constructed by Goskomizdat. It goes without saying that this list was discussed only behind closed doors and that no voice demanding that the readers be allowed to participate in the discussion was heeded. It is precisely this circumstance which allowed Goskomizdat to use the paper contributed by citizens to issue books that were either not in high demand or editions which had to be printed yearly for educational purposes (works by A. Fadeyev, N. Ostrovskiy, A.S. Pushkin, S. Yesenin, A.P. Chekhov, H. Balzac, T. Dreiser, and others). The paper which thus became available was used to publish a small group of writers.

Over a period of only a little more than two decades, the polygraphic economic agency (which was created for precisely this purpose in 1963) was transformed into a literary ministry and determined the literary climate. Having acquired over the years virtually complete power over readers and writers, it established a clear set of guidelines according to which it sorted writers into classes: some were "selected works," others - three volumes, still others—five volumes; a minimal number of copies were printed of one author, an edition of hundreds of thousands of another, and millions of copies of a third.

Today, Goskomizdat by autocratic decision abolished the publishing of collected works. And indeed what was the point of them? After all, all those in favor had already been published in full measure, and those who had not received even a two volume edition (see the list of those not published in "Roman-gazeta") were again out in the cold.

Goskomizdat denied the publishing houses virtually all their rights, interfering in their professional issues, saddling them with the literature the commission selected and eliminating names from publishing plans the commission considered unsuitable. Not very long ago this literary ministry compiled secret "for official use only" lists containing the names of writers who were not to be published at all. With a carefully thought out publishing

policy, it compiled its own literary history, from which it eliminated dozens of writers; while others, if they were published at all, were issued so infrequently and in such small editions that they never reached their readers. This led to the creation of "samizdat," a phenomenon which casts shame on our state. These lists contained precisely the works which are now being lavishly published by our journals.

On the other hand they nurtured a whole class of authors, who were not subject to even the slightest authority.

One of the former officials of Goskomizdat—Yu. Idashkin—in the paper KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE (1987, No. 8) listed, in terms of their positions, these writer-civil servants who occupied a favored position compared to other authors. In the first rank were secretaries of the Writers' Unions of the USSR and republics; next, editors-in-chief of the journals and the directors of publishing house; after them came the heads of local writers' organizations and deputy editors-in-chief. It was precisely these individuals who were exempted from criticism in the press, precisely these individuals whom Goskomizdat granted unlimited opportunities to have their own, this time officially sanctioned, "samizdat."

What is there to be said about the position of an ordinary "author"? In order to publish a short manuscript of poetry or prose, he had to wait for a minimum of 3 and a maximum of 10 years. The size of the edition would be meager, the royalties he received computed at the very lowest rate. Until very recently, his manuscript would first be examined by two or three reviewers; then, if it was recommended for publication, the editorial committee wrote its opinion on it; then the editor gave his conclusion in writing; after which the head of the division read it. Frequently this publishing chain of command was completed by the chief editor or one of his deputies. And yet even this was not the end. The manuscript being prepared for printing was sent to the Glavlit (Chief Administration for Literary Affairs.) And on the road there it might be returned in response to a recall by Goskomizdat.

The system of obstacles on the road between manuscript and book inevitably created a complex system of prohibitions. At all stages the most unlikely pretexts could be invoked to justify a refusal to publish a manuscript. In the final analysis, this system of prohibitions also created conditions in which any manuscript at all could be turned away.

Life itself created the "nutrient medium" conducive to the making of deals worthy of the mafia: you be my reviewer for this publishing house and I'll be yours for that one; you put in a good word so that they include me in their publishing plan, and I will get them to put you on the list (for preferential housing, official trips abroad, membership on boards, commission, etc.). You give me a bigger edition, and I will publish you in my journal.

A propos of this I am reminded of the bitter confession of a certain poet. He complained in print that while he was an editor of SOVREMENNİK, it was easy to get his books published by other publishing houses; he had many friends who took him out to restaurants and gave him books with touching inscriptions; and he was sent on interesting trips. However, subsequently, when he became an independent agent, suddenly all his friends disappeared; no one invited him anywhere; and he could not get his books published.

Are you getting the flavor of the system? That's right, it is the same as "command-bureaucratic" system, as it is now termed. The Goskomizdat took it upon itself to perform the service of distributing the books scheduled for printing. It automatically put "stars" on certain entries in the thematic plan, signifying the commission's recommendation for urban and rural libraries (and we have 350 thousand of them). Because the library distributing centers (completely contrary to common sense since the money for library books is provided by the Ministry of Culture) was also under the control of this same Goskomizdat, the problem of books gathering dust on the shelves of books stores was abolished.

In order to provide a clear idea of the scope of the activities of the powers that be, let us, along with my eccentric hero, look into the library card catalogue entry for some author and follow the recent history of his publications. My selection fell on Hero of Socialist Labor, winner of virtually all awards, secretary of the USSR Writers' Union, editor-in-chief of the journal MOSKVA, the writer Mikhail Alekseyev.

He is one of our publication leaders, with 109 editions in Russian (according to data as of 1 January 1988). In the same class, we find Yu. Bondarev (107) and G. Markov (113). Or for the sake of comparison consider V. Rasputin (59), B. Okudzhava (19) or V. Makanin (14).

From 1951 to 1987, he published two one-volume "Selected Works," two two-volume sets, and a three-volume one; a "Collected Works" in six volumes and, finally, an eight-volume set which will begin to come out in 1987. Of all our prose writers now alive, only L. Leonov and V. Kaverin have been honored with a collection of more than six volumes. Now, there is a third member of this group. And this follows the publication of a six-volume set at the end of the 70s.

Essentially, the number of books to M. Alekseyev's credit are attributable to multiple editions of the same work. Thus, among his novels and novellas, "Heirs" was published five times, "Scrappers" six times, "Soldiers" 15 times, "Bread Is a Noun" 15 times, "Nonweeping Willow" 16 times, "Karyukha" 18 times, and "Cherry Slough" 20 times. Not infrequently these works were published several times in the same year by different publishing houses. He had particularly good "harvests" in 1973 and 1981. In 1981, for example, "Nonweeping Willow" was issued twice, "Bread Is a Noun, three times,

"Cherry Slough" three times, "Karyukha" four times, and the novel "Solidiers" was reissued. To complete the picture, we must add that all these works were published in the series that provides the largest editions, "Roman-Gazeta" (1952, 1957, 1962, 1964, 1967, 1971, 1975, 1982).

The size of the editions of M. Alekseyev's books is striking. While the publishing house Molodaya Gvardiya never published his book in editions of more than 150 thousand copies, and Sovetskiy Pisatel in editions larger than 200 thousand copies; Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Izvestiya and Sovremennik publishing houses lavishly bestowed on the library and book store shelves editions of 265 thousand and even 700 thousand copies.

The figure of 115 thousand copies for an edition seemed mysterious to me. But people who ought to know explained the secret of this unround number. It has to do with strict observance of the edicts of Knigatorg (Book Selling Agency) and with royalties. The amount an author earns from 115 thousand copies is identical to that for 200 thousand copies, (i.e., the amount stipulated for two "mass" editions). But by publishing a book in an edition of 115 thousand, the publishing house, even if it loses money, realizes a substantial savings in paper.

In general people, and especially writers, in this country do not like to discuss the issue of royalties in public. Nevertheless, recently, this issue is being raised more and more frequently at writers meetings, congresses, and in print. Writers, contrary to common belief, are among the worst paid of all the creative professions. It has recently been computed that the average monthly royalties of a member of the Writers Union is 160 rubles.

There turn out to be several reasons for this situation: outmoded rates, intense competition among those who want to publish books, too few publishing houses and literary journals, and the enormous cost of publishing. Each of these reasons deserves individual consideration.

I am disturbed by the following circumstances related to this issue.

In order to get around the law stipulating lower remuneration for reprinting, and for "selected" and "collected" works, a fee equal to that of the first edition was established. M. Alekseyev, for example, was paid for each inclusion of "Cherry Slough" in five "selected" and three "collected" works as if it had been a new work.

But no matter how much they are desired, "selected" and "collected" works cannot be published every year—this would be too obvious to rank and file writers, who get a "selected" work published, in the best case, once in their lives on a major birthday (50, 60 or 70). For this reason Goskomizdat thought up one more "exception"

involving the so-called "libraries" and book series. While two decades ago there were not all that many of these, in the 70s and 80s their number increased by a factor of 10.

Here is a list of some "libraries" and series in which M. Alekseyev's works were included, sometimes two or three times: libraries of the journals SOVETSKIY VOIN, OGONEK, DRUZHBA NARODOV, "The Soldier and Sailor's Library," "Library of Works Awarded the USSR State Prizes," "The Russian Novel," "Of the Times and Of Ourselves," "The Soviet Military Novel," "Feat," "Rural Library of the Non-Chernozem Zone," "Volga Plains," "Fortitude," "Adolescence," "Classics and Contemporaries." The last named, the most prestigious "library," prints mainly classics. Of the writers living now, only six individuals have had their works published here: M. Alekseyev, L. Leonov, S. Mikhalkov, S. Sartakov, and twice each Yu. Bondarev and G. Markov.

M. Alekseyev is not the leader in number of appearances in such "libraries." Yu. Bondarev, for example, in addition to almost all the series listed above, was also included in others: seven times in "School Library," twice in "Victory Library," and in addition, in "The Political Novel," "Heroism of Stalingrad," "Military Library for School Children," "Military-Patriotic Library," "Military Glory," "Patriot," "Library of the Soviet Novel," "Valor," and "The Writer - Youth - Life."

If you were to put the entire sum of royalties accumulating in this manner in one of the pans of a balance scale, then to make the scale register 160 rubles, you would have to put the royalties of several thousand authors in the other pan. This is what lies behind the average figure.

I do not think that M. Alekseyev himself went to great efforts to get these publications and editions. Having gotten into a certain "range," he could dispense with the effort of trying to "place" his works. The appropriate department did all the work for him. Moreover, there are exceptions, V. Rasputin, for example, when he heard talk about how there was not enough paper for editions of Solovyev and Karamzin, offered Goskomizdat the paper allocated for a reissuing of one of his own books. The poet B. Slutskiy, when one of his books of poetry was selected for publication in Hungary, asked the director of the publishing house who among their poets of the twentieth century had already been published. Hearing that several Hungarian poets who were his contemporaries had not yet been published there, he refused to sign the contract until they too were printed.

In this context, I, and I hope many others, was glad to read the recent statement by M. Alekseyev:

"I have been grieved to note that certain writers to whom I am tied by many years of creative and human friendship have begun to exaggerate their accomplishments. I

keep wanting to say: we must react to the way we are treated as modestly as possible. We must avoid developing a "Napoleon" complex, which is a very dangerous thing. And you yourselves at times begin not to notice that certain critics have overvalued your work, for various reasons of their own... I very much like V. Astafyeva's idea of constantly asking oneself: do I have the right to "steal" the reader away from Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy with my writing? In my opinion this is the most sober view to have of one's self and one's works."

The references to the critics is no accident. In truth the panegyric responses to M. Alekseyev's work number in the hundreds. Indeed, the last negative review was published in NOVYY MIR not long before M. Alekseyev signed that sadly famous letter condemning the line of the journal under A. Tvardovskiy; i.e., 20 years ago. After this instance, there was nothing but eulogies. Over the past 10 years, for example: six monographs on his work have been written and published. In one of them, M. Alekseyev's native village is likened to Yasnaya Polyana and Shakhmatov. It is a consolation that the writer understands that to be "beyond criticism" is to be buried alive, since here in Russia, we speak no ill only of the dead.

M. Alekseyev's last remark is also notable—the time has long been ripe for a sober view of oneself and of literature. In truth, one must consider who and how much, to use his terminology, one has "stolen" from, if not L.N. Tolstoy, then from hundreds of writers—from authors of antiquity to Shushkin, for whose books one must pay ten times the official price on the black market.

Let us give ourselves over to literary daydreams. I think that the prestige and significance of Yu. Bondarev and G. Markov would not decline if 5 of the 38 editions of the novel "Hot Snow" and 5 of the 33 editions of the novel "Strogov" were eliminated and the paper used to issue the long-awaited five-volume collections of A. Platonov and M. Zoshchenko. Or perhaps the paper could be used for a five volume edition of B. Pasternak, or four-volume collections of O. Mandelshtam, A. Akhmatova, or N. Klyuyev, or a three-volume edition of I. Babel, which, by the way, were published in Russian in the West as early as the 60s and 70s.

Moreover, today Yu. Bondarev's thinking is similar in spirit. His call for publication of a five-volume collected works of M. Bulgakov in 1990 is worthy of a great deal of support. Only it is hard to understand why the writer asks for five and not 10 volumes; after all, a ten-volume collection is being published in the United States and there has been an eight-volume version in Yugoslavia for some time. Can it be that again there is no paper, or has M. Bulgakov grown equal in rank to other possessors of five-volume collections, such as S. Dangulov, S. Sartakov, A. Ivanov, or G. Markov, but has remained a little short of those with six volumes of collected works, such as A. Sofronov, N. Gribachev, V. Kochetov, I. Shamyakin, M. Ibragimov, Yu. Semenov, A. Koptayeva, A. Chakovskiy, and Yu. Bondarev

There is a measure of truth in discussions of the "civil war" in literature by Yu. Bondarev, A. Ivanov and others. The development of glasnost and democracy inevitably touches on the economic interests of these literary men. Their freedom from restraint, their million dollar incomes, their privileges and unlimited power are being threatened. One does not give up such things without a fight.

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

Films on Bukharin, Filipp Mironov Described
18000171a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 5 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by T. Cheremina and M. Kydryavtseva: They Are Once Again With Us under the rubric: "Art and Document"]

[Text] Is it any surprise that today documentary cinematography has turned to subjects, which for many years were considered closed? Many things were consigned to oblivion—the personalities which constitute the pride of the nation and the real truth about our revolution. Today the time of relearning, trying again to understand and comprehend the sometimes brutal truth has finally come. The names, which for long decades were uttered in whispers, are returning and in occupying their place in the hearts of the people and restoring the link between the past and present, they are being spoken out loud.

Yekaterina Andrikanis, the film director of documentary films at the Central Studio, who is working on a film about N.I. Bukharin, stated:

There are very few documents remaining about Nikolay Ivanovich, and this is understandable: for one thing people risked their lives just for saving these materials, even for a photograph or manuscript. But some things have miraculously been preserved and they are at the disposal of our film crew. Generally speaking, an encounter with unique film material awaits the viewer. Only one thing troubles me now. In January, I began to select still photography relating to this period and personality. Only the negatives existed and no one had used them prior to us. It was a colossal task to sort, develop, and systematize a chronicle. We had accomplished all of this and suddenly, the Krasnogorsk archives literally began to squander our work. It is not enough that this material is being offered to other film crews within the country, but it is even being sent abroad to foreign film companies. Moreover, all of this is being sent abroad for its own merit: there, as they say, everything will be carefully sorted out, like in the archives. Our pride is our pride and the priority for using unique archives should belong to Soviet producers of documentary films. After all, it is no secret that the periods for producing pictures in our country, to put it mildly, are longer. It is a pity to have such a lack of self-respect.

In addition to the archives materials, we are using interviews of those, who knew Bukharin, in the film. Anna Mikhaylovna Larina and Yuriy Larin—the wife and son of

Nikolay Ivanovich are assisting us in this task. Generally speaking, there will be many heroes, among them the sons of the old Bolsheviks Pyatnitskiy and Postyshev and other prominent Soviet statesmen of the past.

Incidentally, even the geography of the filming is extensive—Moscow, Krakow, Weimar, Paris—places, which in one way or another were linked with the name of our hero.

If Bukharin was well-known to many people, nevertheless, yet another studio work will tell the story of the man, whose name not only disappeared from memory for a long time, but was completely forgotten and stricken from the annals of history. The film director Aleksandr Ivankin is shooting the film "Revolution Square" according to Lev Roshal's script, in which the main hero is the Commander-in-Chief of the Second Cavalry, Filipp Mironov. We only recently learned the details of this tragedy from the newspaper publications NEDELYA and SOVETSKAYA ROS-SIYA. Prior to this, only military historians knew about the existence of the Second Cavalry. The director-producer A. Ivankin stated:

Our work is still just beginning, but even now it is clear that the film will not only tell the story of Filipp Mironov and the Second Cavalry, which played a decisive role in the rout of Wrangel's army in the Crimea. The action in the film is limited to two years of the civil war—1919-20—the most complex historical period, in which the ideas, which were subsequently and single-mindedly developed by Stalin, were conceived. Now the reason for our tragedies and failures is sought only in this person. But, you see, there was also Trotsky, by whose personal order our hero was to have been executed by a firing squad on two separate occasions. I would like to relate the complexity and ambiguity of the period. Mironov is a tragic figure, not only because his life was abruptly ended in Butyrskaya Prison in 1921, but also because in being an energetic builder of the new world, he was unable to reconcile himself to unwarranted cruelty. The civil war chronicle has already been used on numerous occasions, but the subject is so serious and important that even familiar material in the film will be viewed with great interest.

Thus, the producers of documentary films are working to fill in the gaps in the gallery of the brilliant personalities of our history. T. Cheremina,
M. Kudryavtseva.

Likhachev Proposes Restructuring of Authority Over Cultural Preservation

18000171b Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 17 Nov 88 p 4

[Article by D. Likhachev, Chairman of the Soviet Cultural Foundation; Yu. Platonov, First Secretary of the Governing Body of the USSR Architects' Union; A. Vasnetsov, Chairman of the Governing Body of the USSR Artists' Union: Monuments Need Their Own Caretaker under the rubric "Letters to the Editor"]

[Text] Among the most important problems facing the country in the current crucial period of its development

is the particular concern evoked by the problems of preserving our historical and cultural heritage.

The positive efforts which are being undertaken in this area are obviously not in keeping with the scale of the negative process which is occurring. The issue of preserving historical and cultural monuments is among those, in which the change in the public consciousness has been displayed most vividly. Of course, the shift from indifference, and at times an active unwillingness to realize the special and exceptional importance of spiritual memories did not take shape only today, it did not happen all at once, but it is exactly now that the latent and hidden work of the soul has appeared in all of its naked acuteness. Especially since the deliberate annihilation of monuments, their physical destruction because of a lack of elementary upkeep or as a consequence of impermissible use, and the degradation and loss, as a result of modern city-planning and economic activities, of historical cities' and villages' distinctive character, which has taken shape over the centuries, are symbols, which have not yet receded into the past, of the obvious trouble in this sphere, which has become a nation-wide anguish.

Among the reasons for this situation, one cannot disregard the feebleness of the purely declarative legislation, the volitional decisions of local authorities, the preponderance of bureaucratic interests and the incompatibility of both the organizational-economic mechanism of city planning, as it exists today, and of the departmental policies of its activities, which usually have no use for the priorities of monuments, with the problems of preserving our heritage.

There remains, as before, a fundamental disparity relative to the scope of the problem in the means and levers of influence, which are at the command of the agencies for protecting and restoring the monuments. Suffice it to say that every year we lose not less than one percent of the extremely limited number of monuments which are under state protection. Simple calculations have shown that just to maintain the monuments which are already under state protection, it would require a tenfold (1) increase in the capacity of the restoration organizations, i.e. increasing their current budgets from 180 million rubles a year to two billion rubles a year—in the immediate future. And lists of newly discovered monuments have been awaiting confirmation for more than one decade already...

The need to establish a special branch of the national economy, which would be able to solve all the problems of the practical restoration and regeneration, is long overdue. It is necessary that the agencies for protecting the monuments be independent from both departments and the local political systems. The organization of a united systemic center is required.

Moreover, it is perfectly obvious that the powerless ministries of culture, which have disgraced themselves in many aspects of this sphere, and, for which the issues of

the protection, restoration, and use of the monuments are far from being their sole concerns, are not able to solve the problem, which they are currently faced with. The obviousness of this is so great that all 100 representatives, who spoke at the All-Union conference on the problems of protecting, restoring, and using historical and cultural monuments, which was held in Moscow during May of this year under the aegis of the Bureau of social issues of the USSR Council of Ministers, were unanimous in this opinion.

During the discussion, in which the majority of the country's leading specialists participated, quite definite proposals concerning the cardinal reorganization of the entire matter of protecting, restoring, and using the monuments: to create a single non-departmental "vertical" structure of state inspectorates for the protection, restoration, and use of monuments and historical areas, which would be directly subordinate to the USSR Council of Ministers and would be fully empowered with the necessary rights and competences; and, to completely transfer the planning and performance of the restoration projects to the local authorities in the republics and allowing them to decide the question concerning the organizational forms for ensuring the restoration and regeneration.

During the discussion, it was noted that the organizational subordination of all the restoration subcommittees to the Main Directorates for the restoration of monuments and for the restoration of historical areas, which are receiving the appropriate level of planned financial and material support, in the Councils of Ministers in the union republics and in the Moscow and Leningrad ispolkoms, is most responsive to the scope and complexity of the problems.

It is necessary that the state inspectorates have the ability to control and safeguard issues concerning the preservation of historical-cultural heritage, which are being affected by the activities of ministries and departments, especially when decisions are being made regarding the construction of major national economic facilities, which entail changes in the ecological and cultural situation in entire regions of the country.

The proposed structure must consist of a state inspectorate for the protection, restoration, and use of monuments and historical areas, which is part of the USSR Council of Ministers and an All-Union Scientific Research and Experimental Technological Design Institute of Cultural Monuments with union-wide centers of scientific-technical information and documentation, as well as centers for retraining and increasing the qualifications of the restoration personnel.

The proposals, which are being advanced, are radical, but the problem of preserving the historical-cultural heritage of our nation, a problem which is equal in scope and urgency to the protection of the environment, can no longer be solved by half measures.

And the position taken in this matter by the USSR Ministry of Culture, which ignored the united opinion of the specialists and the public, which was widely extolled at the All-Union conference in Moscow on 16-17 May of this year, and which, as before, insistently suggests keeping the entire matter of protecting and restoring the monuments, even the state inspectorate (I), within the structure of the ministry, itself, wishing to ignore the fact that the problem outgrew the existing organizational framework long ago, is all the more surprising and a cause for concern.

Today, the problem of preserving our heritage is recognized not so much as a professional problem or even a problem which is common to the whole culture, but as a political problem. It is precisely this understanding which impels us to bring to the attention of the party and state agencies and the press the urgency of the fundamental restructuring of the whole system, in order to guarantee the preservation of our heritage and its lively participation in the life of our society. D. Likhachev,
Chairman of the Soviet Cultural Foundation;

Yu. Platonov,
First Secretary of the Governing Body of the USSR Architects' Union;
A. Vasnetsov,
Chairman of the Governing Body of the USSR Artists' Union.

Belorussian Cultural Club Gets Official Status
18000161a Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 15 Oct 88 p 3

[Article by BELTA correspondent A. Ezerin in the column "Facts and Comments": "Polisse Not Formal?"]

[Text] There is one less informal association in the republic. Polisse, a social and cultural association in existence since 14 April 1988 on an amateur basis, has obtained recognition as a regional republic organization at the Belorussian department of the Soviet Cultural Fund. Following is a conversation between BELTA correspondent A. Ezerin and Mikola Shelyagovich, board chairman of Polisse.

[Shelyagovich] The main purpose of the association is preservation and development of culture on an ethnic and language basis. There is considerable potential for this activity. Thus, for example, several million people live in the Polesye ethnic area (Belorussia, Ukraine, Poland).

Although the Polesian culture is the youngest in the Slavic family, the roots of its traditions are old and strong. In 1563 Dmitriy Sapego, a magnate of the Grand Principedom of Lithuania, wrote the "Revision of the Korbinskiy Economy" in a variant of Old Russian. Adam Mitskevich was of the opinion that it was the Polesian language that was used to set down the statutes of the Grand Principedom of Lithuania. A Polesian alphabet book published in 1907 has come down to us.

We enjoy the literary heritage of philology Professor Mikolay Yanchuk and democratic revolutionary Frants Savich in the form of verses, poems, and plays.

[Ezerin] What are the immediate tasks of your association?

[Shelyagovich] To begin with, we intend to set up a Polessian scientific and cultural center in Pinsk and a museum of history and culture of ethnic Polesye in the town of Ivanovo, Brest Oblast. Further plans include establishing the first Polessian language literary and popular science publication and working on a dictionary, alphabet book, and grammar.

We also hope to continue our activity not only under the aegis of the Belorussian Cultural Fund, but also by possibly developing ties to our Ukrainian colleagues and the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Slavic and Balkan Studies, which is heavily engaged in the spiritual and material culture of Polesye. We will look for contacts with the Polish Academy of Sciences and the University of Warsaw, where natives of the Polish Polesye - Podlyasye - are working. Incidentally, the Belorussian language newspaper NIVA published in the Polish People's Republic has been printing Polessian literary works for more than 20 years. Nevertheless, most activity dealing with revival of this distinctive culture is taking place in Belorussia.

[Ezerin] Your program requires substantial material support. Who will finance the association's activity?

[Shelyagovich] Polisse functions on a self-financing basis. However, to develop our full capability, we require starting capital. For this reason, we are pinning our hopes on donations from private citizens, collectives, and organizations. Their contributions would promote revival of Polessian culture. Funds may be deposited into Belorussian Cultural Fund account 702301 at the Belzhilotsbank; they must be designated "For Use by the Polisse Social and Cultural Association." We hope that Polessians themselves will be the first to respond.

BSSR CP CC Approves Bilingual Education Plans for the Republic
18000161b Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 15 Oct 88 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Basic Measures for Further Development of Education in the Belorussian SSR (As Approved by the Belorussian CP CC on 27 September 1988)"]

[Excerpt]

[Passage omitted]

III. Further Development of Belorussian Bilingualism and Strengthening of Patriotic and International Education

16. Analyze deeply and thoroughly in oblasts, cities, rayons, labor collectives, and schools the state of relations between peoples and of international and patriotic education of the populace under the guidelines set by the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Assure purposeful and continuing application of the principle of Belorussian bilingualism, from children's pre-school institutions to higher educational institutions, with no privileges, restrictions, or compulsion permitted relative to the language of instruction. Exert efforts to insure that each inhabitant of the republic possesses a good knowledge of the Belorussian and Russian languages and exhibits fluency in speaking Belorussian and Russian. Develop and submit for review by the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and the BSSR Council of Ministers the long-term republic program "Native Language," which provides for a complex of measures related to organizational, material, personnel, and application aspects of expanding the area of use of the Belorussian language.

1988-1989

Obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms of the Belorussian Communist Party; Belsovprof; LKSMB CC; BSSR Ministry of Education; BSSR Academy of Sciences; creative unions; BSSR Goskomizdat; ispolkoms of local soviets of people's deputies; Ideological Department, Belorussian CP CC

17. Introduce the study of the Belorussian language into schools where Russian is the language of instruction, starting with the second grade; support the teaching process with the necessary educational and instruction materials and technical aids.

1988-1992

BSSR Ministry of Education

Install the Belorussian language for teaching the majority of subjects listed in the training plan for departments of the Belorussian language and literature of philological faculties. Increase the number of classroom hours devoted to the Belorussian language in all faculties of teaching institutes and teaching departments of universities. By 1992, staff all schools with teachers highly qualified in subject matter. Expand training by means of graduate study to prepare teachers specializing in Belorussian language and literature.

Open in the 1988-1989 school year in the State University imeni V.I. Lenin an evening division offering the specialty "Belorussian Language and Literature."

Satisfy the needs of Belorussian language teachers for literature on teaching methods. Enlarge publication of the book series "School Library"; publish the school regional atlas "Belorussian SSR" and textbooks to be used by teachers preparing to teach Belorussian literature.

Analyze the practice of reading courses in Belorussian language and literature, history of the BSSR and USSR, and selection of graduate students for departments in universities and pedagogical VUZes; take measures to promote this work.

Review the instruction program for history of the USSR for the purpose of providing more time to study the history of the BSSR; prepare and publish a new textbook on history of the BSSR.

1988-1992

BSSR Ministry of Education; BSSR Academy of Sciences; BSSR Goskomizdat

Systematically hear in party committees reports read by educational leaders relative to progress made in teaching the Belorussian language and literature.

Permanent.

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; Belorussian CP obkoms, gorkoms, raykoms; BSSR Ministry of Education

18. Expand the network of pre-school institutions in which Belorussian is used as the language of instruction; introduce into kindergartens where Russian is used as the language of instruction material familiarizing the children with Belorussian folklore, classical literature, music, and fine arts.

Starting in 1989.

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; Belorussian CP obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms; ispolkoms of local soviets of people's deputies; BSSR Ministry of Education; BSSR Union of Artists; BSSR Union of Composers; BSSR Union of Writers.

19. Encourage presentations in the press, on television, and radio by leading representatives of the BSSR Ministry of Education, BSSR Ministry of Culture, BSSR Goskomizdat, on problems related to development of Belorussian-Russian bilingualism, progress made in increasing the role of the Belorussian language in the spiritual life of the population, and on publishing of books in the Belorussian language.

Organize for republic television lessons in the Belorussian language; for Belorussian radio, the monthly program "The Belorussian Language."

Starting in 1989, make provision for annual celebration of republic, municipal, and rayon holidays related to the native language and Slavic writings.

1988 and permanent.

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; BELTA; BSSR Gosteleradio; BSSR Union of Journalists; BSSR Ministry of Education; BSSR Union of Writers; Belorussian Republic Branch, Soviet Cultural Foundation.

20. Develop a special-edition series of books and pamphlets entitled "Our Glorious Fellow Countrymen," featuring famous people of the republic, to include the social and political, scientific, and cultural heritage.

Starting in 1989, organize in the Mastatskaya Literatura publishing office the publishing of the "By Way of Time" historical and literary anthology; in the Yunatstva publishing office, an annual collection of works of art devoted to the history of Belorussia. Assign a high priority to supplying these publications to libraries of teaching and educational institutions.

1988-1990.

BSSR Goskomizdat; BSSR Academy of Sciences; creative unions.

Set up "Druzhba Narodov" book clubs in all republic oblast centers. Improve the popularization and dissemination of Belorussian literature among youth; activate this kind of work in organizations of the Voluntary Society of Book Enthusiasts. Provide regular press coverage on book and publication news. Hold annual exhibition of Belorussian language books with author participation. **1988 and permanent.**

BSSR Goskomizdat; BSSR Union of Writers; BSSR Mintorg; Belkoopsoyuz; Ideological Department, BSSR Communist Party CC.

21. Study the possibility of publishing the monthly popular science and historical journal NASLEDIYE, and submit suggestions to the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party.

1988.

BSSR Academy of Sciences; BSSR Goskomizdat; BSSR Union of Writers; Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC.

22. Make wider use of the better works by Belorussian authors in drawing up the repertoires for theaters, concert organizations, motion picture theaters, professional and amateur creative collectives.

In 1988-1989, study the experience acquired by the BSSR Union of Cinematography Workers, BSSR Ministry of Culture, Belarusfilm Studio, and BSSR Union of Writers relative to engaging Belorussian writers to create scenarios for artistic and cartoon films.

Permanent.

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; Belsovprof; BSSR Ministry of Culture; BSSR Union of Writers; BSSR Union of Composers; BSSR Union of Cinematography Workers; BSSR Union of Theater Workers.

23. To promote strengthening and creative development of Leninist norms and principles of national policy; encourage youth to evolve solid internationalist convictions and patriotic feelings; effect timely exposure of the ideological nature of anti-Sovietism, bourgeois and petty bourgeois nationalism; and counter subversive imperialistic propaganda, the following measures are to be taken:

- submit for consideration in the next scheduled session of the Presidium of the BSSR Supreme Soviet the recommendation of creating a permanent committee of the BSSR Supreme Soviet to deal with national affairs and relations between peoples;
- in 1988, form in party committees special propaganda groups, drawing on scientists, teachers, members of creative unions, journalists, and other categories of the ideological aktiv. Organize regular presentations by them in youth lecture halls, labor collectives, and locations accessible to the populace, dealing with pressing cultural problems of relations between peoples and international and patriotic education;

Permanent.

Belorussian Communist Party CC Buro; Belorussian CP obkoms, gorkoms, raykoms;

- set up at boards of republic, oblast, and the Minsk municipal organization of the Znaniye society, committees charged with disseminating information on CPSU national policy;

1988

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; Belorussian CP obkoms, gorkoms, raykoms; board of BSSR Znaniye society;

- study, with reader input, the possibility of publishing a Belorussian language version of SELSKAYA GAZETA and the oblast newspapers GRODNENSKAYA PRAVDA and ZARYA. Submit recommendations to this effect to the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party;

1988

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; Belorussian CP obkoms;

- intensify clarification work with individuals in educational collectives, creative unions, and in scientific,

editorial, and publishing institutions, working with persons who have an incorrect interpretation of aspects of development of relations between peoples, in this regard drawing more heavily on public opinion;

Permanent

Party committees and organizations;

- in the press, on television and radio, continue to clarify problems associated with little-known aspects of Belorussian history, the more important problems of development of the Belorussian language and national culture, and expose various bourgeois falsifiers of CPSU national policy;
- develop, in the Institute of Party History at the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party, the Minsk Higher Party School, and the Social Sciences Department of the BSSR Academy of Sciences, subject matter and encourage presentations by scholars and specialists in the republic press, on television and radio, dealing with the formation of the Belorussian state system and the formation and development of Belorussian socialist culture.

Prepare and publish with necessary comments materials relative to the 400-year old Statute of the Grand Principdom of Lithuania; collapse of anti-people, bourgeois-nationalistic parties and organizations; the reactionary nature of works written by bourgeois nationalism ideologists; modern falsifiers of the history and culture of Belorussia.

1988-1990

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; Institute of Party History at the Belorussian CP CC; BSSR Academy of Sciences; BSSR Gosteleradio;

- organize for dissemination in printed publications and mass information media the analysis of clarification of pressing problems of effecting Belorussian Leninist national policy, development of culture and language, and patriotic and international education of workers, schoolchildren and university students. Hold regular discussions of these problems in sessions of the BSSR Goskomizdat collegia, BSSR Ministry of Education, BSSR Gosteleradio, BELTA, board of the BSSR Znaniye society, editorial offices of republic and oblast newspapers and journals;

Permanent

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC;

- organize a republic seminar entitled "People. Culture. Perestroika."

1989

BSSR Academy of Sciences; BSSR Ministry of Education; BSSR Ministry of Culture; Belorussian Republic Branch, Soviet Cultural Foundation; creative unions;

—develop topics of scientific works and sociological research dealing with pressing problems of the historical and cultural development of Belorussia, relations between peoples, international and patriotic education of youth and workers; encourage participation of social scientists in the development of definite recommendations relative to these problems for party, soviet, and economic organs, and for ideological personnel and the aktiv.

Organize within the Institute of Art Studies, Ethnography and Folklore of the BSSR Academy of Sciences a department devoted to these problems of national affairs and relations between peoples.

Organize at the BSSR Academy of Sciences an archaeological committee charged with the identification and press coverage of historical documents and materials of national cultural interest.

1988-1990

BSSR Academy of Sciences; Institute of Party History at the Belorussian CP CC; BSSR Ministry of Education; BSSR Ministry of Justice; Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC.

24. Render timely ideological and organizational influence on amateur youth associations; guide their efforts toward resolution of pressing problems of an economic, social, and cultural nature. Improve effectiveness of work in international and patriotic education of youth. In this connection:

—monitor progress made in republic oblasts, cities, and rayons in fulfilling the requirements specified in decrees issued by the Central Committee of the CPSU for the Kazakh Republic party organization; verify measures outlined in the republic conference of leaders of amateur associations having historic, cultural, and regional studies orientation; discuss results of this activity in party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms;

1988

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; Belorussian Komsomol CC; Belsovprof; ministries and departments of the BSSR;

—develop the long-term republic program "Spadchyna," making provision for carrying out a broad complex of operations related to revival, preservation, and popularization of the historical and cultural heritage of the Belorussian people; organize extensive discussions on the program in labor and educational collectives, the

press, on television and radio; encourage active participation by amateur youth organizations, clubs and the entire community in the realization of this program;

1988-1989

BSSR Ministry of Culture; BSSR Academy of Sciences; oblispolkoms and Minsk gorispolkom; Belorussian Republic Branch, Soviet Cultural Foundation; Belorussian Voluntary Society for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments; republic creative unions; Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; Belorussian Komsomol CC;

—encourage schoolchildren and university students to join in the historical and regional studies activities Native City, Native Settlement, and Native Village, guiding the efforts toward studying the history of the native area and the glorious revolutionary, military, and labor traditions of the Belorussian people; improving the quality of construction of populated places; and restoring historical and cultural monuments.

Organize in Minsk and republic oblast centers restoration and scientific production teams composed of student architects, builders, historians, artists, sculptors, and decorative arts specialists, tasking them with the development and rendering of definite projects in the restoration and rebuilding of decorative historical and cultural monuments for social and political centers, interiors of cultural institutions, and residential micro-rayons, and with other activities.

1988-1990

Belorussian Komsomol CC; BSSR Ministry of Education; BSSR Ministry of Culture;

—expand, in general schools, vocational and technical schools, VUZes, and tekhnikums, the network of political and discussion clubs and circles involved with democratization of public life, national history and culture, international friendship, and other activities of interest to youth;

Starting in 1988

Belorussian Komsomol CC; BSSR Ministry Education;

—establish for youth a people's university teaching the history and culture of Belorussia;

1988

Belsovprof; Belorussian Komsomol CC; Belorussian Republic Branch, Soviet Cultural Foundation; BSSR Znaniye society;

—organize a republic workshop entitled "Improvement of the Forms and Methods of Patriotic and International Education of University Students and School-

children in the Light of the Requirements Set by the 27th CPSU Congress";

1989

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; BSSR Ministry of Education;

—generalize the experience gained by Minsk party organizations in enlisting the participation of leading personnel in ideological and political education of school-children and university students.

1988

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC.

25. Encourage, in party, trade union, Komsomol and scientific workers, the ideological aktiv, economic managers, and teaching personnel, a deep understanding of the nature of the new processes and events currently under way in the area of national and cultural development of society; development of skills in leading discussions and political polemics; exercising the ability to expose alien views and hostile propaganda schemes in a convincing and well-reasoned manner. This is to be accomplished by:

—organizing short-term conference-seminars for party, trade union, and Komsomol workers and for the ideological aktiv, on the basis of the Minsk Higher Party School and Houses of Political Education of Belorussian Communist Party obkoms, with the aim of strengthening international and patriotic education and improving the level of workers' relations with peoples;

1988

Party organization and personnel sections; Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; Belorussian CP obkoms;

—organizing the republic seminar for lecturers entitled "Pressing National Policy Problems of the CPSU under Present Conditions";

1988

Ideological Department, Belorussian Communist Party CC; board of BSSR Znaniye society.

UkSSR Cultural Fund Chief on Support of Ukrainian Culture

18000222 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 88 p 4

[Excerpt from interview by M. Odinets with the Ukrainian poet Boris Oleyunik under the rubric: "PRAVDA's Fridays": "Time Connections"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Excerpt] Speaking at the 19th All-Union Party conference, the well-known Ukrainian poet Boris Oleyunik urged to strengthen the ties between generations and to protect the great, timeless values created by our ancestors. He is the chairman of the Ukrainian Culture fund and performs his duty with enviable energy.

[Odinets] Boris Ilyich, first of all, I have a general question, namely, what is the situation in the republic with the historical and cultural monuments, and is everything being done to protect them in order to use them for the purpose of promoting patriotism and love for the Fatherland?

[Oleyunik] Recognizing all the good things that were done in order to save the sacred national objects, I must say, however, that even today, a certain contempt toward the monuments of the past and the national cultural treasures still exists in our country. Of course, it is rather our misfortune than fault. To a great degree, it is caused by the fact that for many years, a nihilistic attitude toward the past of culture as being something backward, was being brought up in the people, and, quite often, only those things that were created during the years, when one or another particular leader was in power, were considered to be outstanding. The thesis of "convergence" has also played its sad role. Some people interpreted it literally to be in favor of some supersubstance moving aside the native sacred objects on the "what is left" principle, thus depriving them of protection and, in essence, assisting in the destruction of irreplaceable values. The most astonishing is that the disinterest and the abstract approach to history and culture were presented as almost the manifestation of internationalism, while the intelligentsia's caring for the national spirit, color, language, and cultural monuments was considered to be a narrow-minded patriotism, which during the sad memory ears of stagnation quite often was called nationalism.

Think of the huge, ominous noise raised because of the poem "Love the Ukraine" by Vladimir Sosyura, of all kind of accusations directed at this fine poet, and those against Konstantin Dankevich's libretto of the opera "Bogdan Khmelnytskyi". Today, these cases look monstrous, but during that time the most talented people known to the whole country, the real Party members, were forced under the pressure by bureaucrats to repent their never committed mistakes and nonexistent nationalistic extremes. In addition, distorting the reality their "fellow-countrymen" were defaming them in the local press, were "unmasking" them and accusing in all mortal

sins. Such groundless accusations were scaring away the honest people and were making ambiguous the situation of those, who cared for the national culture. Under these conditions many of them either left the republic or became conformists, developed an "adaptation gene", and sometimes even betrayed the most elementary principles of human relations.

At the present time, all those who value the Ukrainian culture's interests and its further fate, have a task to clean up its life-giving springs and treasures from the superficial drifts, in order to restore them in their original beauty. The vanguard of the creative intelligentsia, which are, unfortunately, still dispersed, are trying to do everything possible to achieve this goal. It happens that sometimes they are unsuccessful due to excessive vigor. And the Philistines, for the mentioned above reasons, are rejoicing at such misfortunes.

For example, let us take the language problem. The language, one of the most important determinants of any nation, in our republic, let us be frank, has found it self in a dead end situation. As a rule, the real, not imaginary, nationalists explain the existing situation by the "pressure from Moscow". But what has Moscow to do with it, if some parents frenziedly resist the native language believing that their children will reach the tops of their careers only by means of the Russian language.

Of course, this process has to a degree affected the whole our multiethnic society, but there is a very national nihilistic specifics inherent to the Ukraine only. Our brilliant Dovzhenko determined its roots in the most profound and correct way: "The only country in the world, where the history of this country was not taught in universities and where the history was considered to be a prohibited, hostile, and counterrevolutionary subject, is the Ukraine. There is no other such country in the world. Where is there another such place for deserters to appear and multiply if not here, where the weak-spirited and untrustworthy people would grow if not here. It is not deserters' fault, but misfortune. We should judge them, but ask for forgiveness and cry for the bad upbringing, for spiritual maiming during the great time..."

A Philistine is always watching the "higher-ups" imitating with the speed of light their behavior and system of gestures including articulation. And when the upper floors more often than not are not using their native language, the Philistines immediately react to this fact as to a fashion favoring a career advancement and even as to "directives from the Center".

It is not a secret that at one of the anniversary meetings in Kiev the only countryman, who made a speech in Ukrainian, was... from overseas.

That is, a situation has emerged similar to the pre-Pushkin period, when the elite, which entirely spoke French, considered the Russian language as a distinctive feature of a rude commoner.

Today, the Party is doing many things to remove stress from certain painful spots connected with ethnic problems. An impression is emerging that this time the higher authorities know how to go further along the Lenin's road, but people at the lower levels still are not ready for that. In addition, our fellow-writers are also bringing a lot of confusion in this activities.

For example, the names of writers, who were repressed and unjustly removed from our literature, are being restored. However, during the assessment of their activity and the characterization of the post-October and pre-war period the names, which are the pride of our culture, namely, those of Sholokhov, Tychina, Golovko, Dovzhenko, and other, are proved in a shadow. It is wrong, during perestroika we need to learn proper management rather than to artificially reassess values.

[Odinets] And what about the architectural monuments...

[Oleynik] History left us priceless treasures. The spirit of the past is reflected in them. They are connected with the life of our ancestors and their struggle with foreign enslavers. The Mikhailovskiy golden-dome cathedral saw the invasion of the Batyy Khan's hordes. It remembered the heroic resistance of the Kiev residents to the wild hordes. It survived fatal blows for approximately 700 years and was destroyed before the war... by its own "foul great-grandsons of the great and glorious great-grandfathers". The church Pirogoshchi na Podole mentioned in the "Word on Igor's Men", military cathedral built in 17th century, and many other sacred monuments experienced the same fate.

When in the early 60's it was decided to destroy the Refectory, an ancient monument near the slope to the Dnieper at Pechersk, a group of the well-known Ukrainian public figures such as Bazhan, Tychina, Rylskiy, Gonchar, and others, opposed the project. N. Podgornyy, who was then the 1st secretary of the UkCP Central Committee, publicly ridiculed them for this noble act.

[Odinets] What should be done in order to prevent similar actions, which make everybody feel ashamed except those, who already either left the office, or are dead, and to preserve the connection between times, and generations, which is feeding our patriotism and pride for the history.

[Oleynik] The fact that the Kiev Rus' is the cradle of three brotherly peoples puts on us a special, triple responsibility for preservation of historical values representing the common sacred places, the common root of the peoples-brothers. For example, the ruins of the Kiev-Pecherskaya Lavra built in the 11th century are towering above the grounds of the State Kiev-Pecherskiy historic-cultural preserve. Several years ago, a decision was made to restore it, but, unfortunately, this work has not been started yet. Specialists are arguing

whither to drive in piles thus subjecting the adjacent buildings to the dangers of deformation, or to rebuild it on the original ancient foundation. There is also a third opinion, that is, to preserve the ruins until the time, when a reliable method to restore this outstanding building is found.

I think that today, when there is a Government's decision to restore the cathedral, time has come to restore the prolonged debates of the specialists, which cannot work out a common point of view. Why would not we use the experience of restoring similar structures available to our foreign friends.

[Odinets] On Saturdays and Sundays, one may read in the newspapers or hear on the radio about certain places, where groups of enthusiasts are getting together in order to help in the restoration of an old building, ancient chapel, or an old fortification wall...The work is dirty and consists of sorting out bricks and carrying them to another place. However, people are working with enthusiasm, because the love of antiquity is driving them...

[Oleynik] And also the age-old idea of collectivism, when a good, large work is made by the whole village community, by the masses. There is such a notion among the people, namely, "toloka" [barn raising], when the whole community builds a house for a fellow-villager. In the same manner they work on the restoration of historical monuments.

Kiev is a concentration of our history's sacred objects, however, other hundreds, thousands of monuments reminding of the remarkable events are dispersed all over the Ukraine. Places have remained, where famous people lived or come to visit. At the present time, a large work is being done to bring them in order and to preserve for next generations. The initiative in this noble work belongs to students. Several youth detachments were working during the last and this years in Kochanovka at the Chernigov Oblast, where Gogol, Shevchenko, Glinka, Repin, Gye, and others were visiting the Tarnovskiy's estate. Help is provided for restoration of the cathedral in the village Belaya Krinita in Bukovina (a branch of the central museum of ancient Russian culture and arts imeni Andrey Rublev is being organized there). The Soviet culture fund (thanks first of all, to its chairman of the board D. Likhachev) assigned 200,000 rubles for this purpose. We are participating in organizing the Nikolay Roerich's museum in the village Parkhomovka of the Kiev Oblast, where his mosaics are in the local Pokrovskaya church. With the direct fund's participation, organization of the famous Ukrainian composer L. Revutskiy's museum in the village Irzhavets of the Chernigov Oblast is being completed. We will take part in organizing the Balzac's museum in Verkhovne of the Zhitomir Oblast, where he lived and worked. We supported the initiative of school students in the township Kozatskiy to restore the prince Trubetskoy's estate, a 19th century architectural monument. In every way possible, we assist the activities of so-called non-formals

from the "Lion's brotherhood" in Lvov, who started to bring in order graves at the Lychakovskiy cemetery. Young Kiev residents began to bring in order the Baykovoy cemetery. This activities are in line with our program "Youth", which we consider to be the most important one. Because all the priceless objects will indeed be worth nothing, if we already today would not bring up conscious connoisseurs and defenders of the past among the young people.

There are also other programs, for example, "Return from abroad the cultural values of the Ukraine". The Fascists occupants and their accomplices took out only from our republic 130,000 paintings. We call upon everyone, who knows of their location, to advise us and to help in bringing these and other values back home. Our call is already bringing results. Thus, we received works of the famous Soviet painter V. Kasiyan from the Society of the United Ukrainian Canadians. Iren Radkevich from Australia sent works of the Ukrainian classical painter I. Trush.

The "Youth" program goes harmoniously with the program "Memory", according to which our associates are taking the most active part in protecting, in particular, the famous Kazatskaya Khortitsa in Zaporozhye against the construction of a road and a bridge over it, which endanger this unique preserve. The fund's interference, we hope, will help to protect the Tarasova Gora in Kaney, which is also being infringed upon by builders, from a misfortune. At the present time, efforts are being made to save the buildings of the Kievo-Mogilyanskaya academy on Podol, which carried science and education not only to the Slavic peoples, but also to all of Europe.

In addition to the everyday attention and care for the ancient culture monuments, the fund deals with the problems of preserving the sacred places of the recent past, namely, those of revolution, and the Civil and the Great Patriotic wars. In accordance with the mentioned program "Memory", we supported the initiative of the War Veterans society to create around Kiev a "Glory Belt", which would unite all the places connected with the heroic defense of the Ukrainian capital in 1941 and its liberation in 1943. The war veterans, heroes of the battles past, and young people, especially school children, are willingly assisting this noble cause. The money fund for creation of the courage ring was replenished after a charitable concert given at the Oktyabrskiy culture palace by the Red Banner song and dance ensemble of the Kiev military district. In the memory of the Kiev Dinamo soccer players, who in a dramatic "death game" beat the Fascist soccer team Kondor, we arranged a charitable game of today's Dinamo under the leadership of Valeriy Lobanovskiy. Part of the proceeds from this game went for the construction of the monument to the soldiers-internationalists in the newest Kiev Kharkovskiy rayon.

Sponsorship over the hospitals, where soldiers, who honestly performed their international duty in Afghanistan, are being treated for their wounds, became convincing evidence of the generations' unity. For example,

recently, the Ukrainian culture fund's activists gave a charitable concert at the Kiev district military hospital for the soldiers, who served in Afghanistan. We think that such actions must become a continuous thing and to be included in the task program of the fund's activities, as well as the sponsorship over the Chernobyl workers, who heroically work in the extreme stress zone. By the way, owing to the Ukrainian culture fund's initiative, an exciting meeting of the soldiers-internationalists with the heroes of Prip'yat was organized at the Culture palace of the shift township Zelenyy Mys, where our activists, the well-known artists of the republic, performed.

Characteristically, after each charitable concert organized by the fund, the flow of money contributions to our account No 000702603 increases. This was the case after the All-Union Shevchenko celebrations "In the family free and new" in the Kharkov Oblast, and, in particular, after concerts at the Kiev and Zaporozhye Philharmonic Societies, and the Kiev and Lvov opera-houses. We strictly carry out the wishes of our donors, who send their money for particular purposes, for example, for the construction of Taras Shevchenko monument in Lvov, Petr Ilyich Chaykovskiy in Leningrad, or fund of the Kiev-Mogilyanskiy preserve.

We were especially glad to receive large sums of money from the Donbass coal miners, association Ukrzapadugol in the Lvov Oblast, students of the Kiev State University, religious communities, and churches. This is the most authoritative evidence of the whole nation's interest in our programs, which include in addition to the already mentioned ones, such as "Folk Song, Folk Art", "Taras Grigoryevich Shevchenko", "Pushkin in the Hearts of Generations"... Auctions, after which a part of money received from selling fine and folk art objects is going to the Ukrainian culture fund accounts, are becoming increasingly popular.

[Odinets] And what about other than money things?

[Oleynik] People present their collections, which they acquired for many years, namely, rare fine art and valuable books.

[Passage omitted]

We are trying to get in touch with foreign firms interested in our work. At the present time, we are investigating the ways to realize this idea.

Recently, we organized an exhibition of the oldest painter Oksana Pavlenko, who represent the monumental school of Boychukists, which until recent times were pronounced an anathema. We began to organize a museum of Ivan Gonchar, a painter and a tireless collector of folk art, and a devotee of the native culture, who greatly suffered from all kinds of "cultural janizary", as he calls them. This collection has thousands of priceless exhibits. It includes ancient icons, old portraits of the Ukrainian hetmans, embroidered towels,

rugs, carafes, garments, metal-clad chests, rare books, old Cossac weapons, Easter eggs and even...cannonballs. In short, not waiting for decisions to be made at the top, which, as the the practice shows, one may wait until the Doomsday, we announced a drive to raise money for construction of an extension to the Ivan Makarovich's house, where it would be possible to open a unique museum.

Everything beautiful and outstanding created by the people must be carefully preserved and augmented. The outstanding Ukrainian artist Feodosiy Gumenyuk had to suffer greatly and was practically pushed outside the Ukrainian borders by overly zealous defenders of ideological infallibility. We are proud that it was our fund which organized the first exhibition of the artist's works, though Gumenyuk's name is for a long-time known outside the borders of our multiethnic Fatherland.

Because we profess the principles of pluralism, we support the representatives of different one even polarly opposed art directions. For example, at the exhibition in Kiev dedicated to the 1000th anniversary of baptism of Rus' mostly young artists of very different schools were present. The artists themselves were entrusted with the selection of works for this exhibition, which to a great degree assured his success.

[Odinets] There are many cases, when people, who before stayed somewhat aside, join the activities of the culture fund's organizations...

[Oleynik] Of course. But we ourselves are trying to attract them to us. Thus, when we decided to organize the museum of Ivan Gonchar, we obtained the support of such non-formal group as "Spadshchina" ("Heritage"), which consists mainly from the young people of the Kiev University and the Academy of Sciences' institutes. Or, for example, the same "Lion's brotherhood", which we supported during the difficult time of its formation. Today, they attracted to their side even those, who in the beginning were trying to hamper our work. In order to implement the program "Youth and Culture", we are trying to strengthen the ties with the non-formal associations in Moscow and Leningrad, that is, with all those, who are interested in the Ukrainian culture's problems.

[Odinets] Here, obviously, you cannot do without the support of the Party organizations.

[Oleynik] Sure. With pleasure, I can mention the very constructive help from the Party Kiev gorkom. We are indebted also to the member of our fund's presidium, the secretary of the Party Podolskiy raykom, Ivan Nikolayevich Saliy. He is the real enthusiast of our good deeds. Due to his initiative, buildings in this ancient Slavic rayon of Kiev, which have a great historical value, were repaired and restored. Ivan Nikolayevich is persistently pressing for turning Podol into a historical preserve, where everything would show its ancient origins. We

invited our colleagues from the Georgian culture fund to a house located on one of the old streets and transferred to us by the Podol's authorities, in order to solemnly open there a memorial room in honor of their famous countryman Lado Ketskhoveri, who lived here long ago. This became the beginning of an original friendship's corner. This will be the first input in the Center of peoples' friendship, formation of which was already announced long time ago from the highest podia.

[Odinets] Judging from appearances, your organization is involved also in production activities...

[Oleynik] Yes, of course. We are planning to organize a series of shops, which will restore objects of fine arts, old books, furniture, pottery, and other objects being transferred to us as gifts. We intend to involve cooperatives in these activities. There is no other way, because all our personnel of creative workers consists of 16 persons. We are counting on the involvement of the largest number of people. Therefore, we need premises. We are searching, asking, and pressing for their transfer to the fund, but the gorispolkom, for the time being, cannot make a decision. By the way, the board of the culture fund is squeezed into a small building with four other organizations. The gorispolkom is planning to place an additional fifth neighbor in the same building.

[Odinets] The fund has many problems and difficulties...

[Oleynik] During the period of formation, they were especially many. Today, their number decreased, but we still have enough of them. A total of up to 50 paid creative people are working in the republican fund's organizations. Mainly, they are true servants of the sacred pursuit of

culture. Of course, there are some, who do not belong, but it does not upset us, and we are building "strong points", recruiting people, and mobilizing active people.

We have a difficult time organizing production activities. We have already several times submitted our proposals to the government of the republic. Finally, on the fourth attempt, a decision was made. We raised the issue of publishing a joint with the Society for preservation of monuments journal based on their bulletin. It seems, that everything is resolved, but there is no paper. Generally speaking, it is difficult to implement the ideas, for each of them we must go in a real combat. At the present time, we are fighting for the old building of the Kievo-Mogilyanskaya academy. Because in this case the interests of the military are involved, we decided to address the Minister of Defense comrade D. Yazov. Since he is a highly intellectual man, who is interested, by the way, in poetry, I am sure that he will not refuse. There are tombs of our great ancestors, and the "love to paternal graves" must win. We are concerned for how to protect Chigirin, the sacred for the Ukrainians place tied with the name of Bogdan Khmel-nitskiy, where for many years a nuclear power plant construction site was planned and the construction was already started. Now, as they inform us from Cherkassy, they supposedly plan to build a plant in the newly built structures. And here with my deepest respect I will name Oles Gonchar, who was the first to strike the bells of alarm, bringing the attention to the danger threatening the het-man's capital, ancient Chigirin.

In the conclusion, I want to say that the main direction of our fund's activity is formulated in the words that were said at the 19th All-Union Party conference. This direction is in that we must "further develop the common to the whole people patriotic movement in support of the line to perestroika".

State, Law Institute Professor on Formation of Rule-of-Law State

18000167 Moscow OGONEK in Russian
No 43, 22-29 Oct 88, pp 14-16, 29-30

[Interview with Aleksandr Maksimovich Yakovlev, doctor of juridical sciences and professor at the State and Law Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by Alla Alova, OGONEK correspondent, date, place, and occasion not specified]

[Text][Alova] First of all, to mention sacred cows and stereotypes. For decades now the idea of the rule-of-law state has been labeled "produced by bourgeois democracy". But this idea is not simply ascribed to bourgeois democracies; it really is characteristic of a higher level, socialist democracy.

[Yakovlev] Well yes, it "contradicts the values of socialism," "in reality leads to restoration," is "an attempt to bring things in under the appearance of humanism." That is how I understand your question, a "journalistic question." You are not asking, but simply suggesting that I dispute the position of the defenders of the former "developed socialism."

In fact the main question today is the question of a new structure of values. This is the most important center of contradictions in our consciousness.

"Revolution" literally means turning over, nothing more. And it can be understood in that limited way: turn everything upside down and start over. But even this cannot be done. How many times have we seen or even participated in a simple rejection of the old in an effort to establish something new (which already, by definition, is assumed to be better than the old) but then we find that while the immediate past is being rejected something which preceded that past and is even worse is being affirmed. It is no longer a secret for anyone now that while rejecting bourgeois values and cursing bourgeois "decadent liberalism" and all kinds of inventions like the presumption of innocence, we have ended up in the embrace of a Medieval worldview and Medieval Inquisition structures in the sphere of criminal justice while feudal military structures have characterized both the economic system and our relationship with the people. Any revolution which proclaims a complete denial of the past later faces the danger of involuntarily, spontaneously falling prisoner to the even older and less progressive past.

Unfortunately, when at a certain stage in history we declared class criteria the supreme and, essentially, only important criteria, we swept away the foundation of general human values. And then, without a foundation, we began to erect an enormous edifice.

But in a different—desirable for us—meaning of revolution it is the engine not of any development, but of progressive development, a transition to a higher level of civilization.

The turn toward the idea of the rule-of-law state is exactly this, an understanding that socialism—if it is genuine democratic socialism—must be a building that is not built on sand, not suspended in the air without a foundation, but a superstructure on top of the progressive elements of the development of the human race as a whole, including progressive elements in the development of bourgeois democracy. Please notice: bourgeois democracy can be attacked from two sides. It can be attacked from the standpoint of more progressive socialist ideology, but it also can be attacked from a totalitarian standpoint! And this has happened more than once.

But the attack from the totalitarian standpoint is distinguished precisely by the fact that it is "radical," destroys everything, and leaves nothing of the general human foundations of civilization untouched.

The idea of the rule-of-law state today is a fundamental revolution in our ideas about social development, about revolution. Yes, revolution is the abolition of what went before, but abolition in order to restore the economic and political structure of society on a higher, more perfect, and more ethical level.

Now as for the "social origin" of the idea of the rule-of-law state, bourgeois democracy could not give birth to it if for no other reason than there was no bourgeoisie in Ancient Athens. Democracy itself as a political structure is an invention, which was put into practice, by Ancient Athens.

[Alova] I am glad that vigilant ideologists can relax. It does not seem that Ancient Greece has ever been accused of having a pernicious influence on us. But to some degree the contemporary developed capitalist states are nonetheless children of the Hellenic system of government. And we, beginning with the 1930's, have more and more fearlessly denied our kinship with Ancient Athens.

[Yakovlev] There are two fundamentally different methods by which people interact in society. In societies of the first type some people are subordinate to others, to those who have more power, in other words the authorities. This is the command, army, autocratic system. The second type is where those who have a great deal of power and those who have less power or none at all are all subordinate on equal principles to the norm, to the law. Thus the rule-of-law state does not simply mobilize the law as a weapon of power, but is itself bound by this law. Power bound by the law, not armed by the law—that is what the rule-of-law state is. Now an elementary example of the second, rule-of-law type of interaction is the relationships among free commodity producers. They are the ones who brought society out of feudalism based on the "law of the fist" as Marx put it, on force and non-economic coercion. Of course, with time the hierarchy of force in bourgeois society was replaced by a hierarchy of money. But the domination and power of big money is also a reality from which you cannot escape anywhere. Take elections to the U.S. Congress. Yes, they

are free elections. But who finances the election campaign? Big money. Who buys television time so that a particular candidate will become popular? Big money.

[Alova] Aleksandr Maksimovich, excuse me but this is beginning to sound a little like elementary economic-political education. We have all received an "orientation" in school already.

[Yakovlev] That's just it! For decades we have been "oriented" to the ugly points of their democracy. And for decades, when talking to us about the West, they have "focused" attention on economic inequality only. And political observers stood to their death on the streets of Paris, New York, and London so that—God forbid—we would not see the other part, which also actually exists in the Western countries, which lives alongside, or more accurately in opposition to the power of money.

These are solid, dependably operating democratic institutions which restrain authoritarianism in the political sphere. It is equality before the law, which by no means is always ground under by economic inequality. It is the press, finally, which sooner or later is capable of exposing even a scandal in high places, of making public the arbitrary actions of even the top people and groups.

These superstructural legal structures are very strong there. They cannot be underestimated, and they must be respected. Otherwise instead of a democratic society there is a totalitarian society. There are many examples in history.

[Alova] But what about the mafia, which like a moth has eaten through "their" whole democracy, bought off the police and the judges?

[Yakovlev] There is a mafia. No one disputes that. But it is not universal and it is not omnipotent. Take the United States. The mafia there is mainly engaged in the narcotics trade and uses rackets to shake down small businessmen; for the most part it stops there. But in our country not long ago a mafia, so to speak, took over Uzbekistan; in any case it paralyzed agriculture and spread into the law enforcement, party, and artistic spheres. Your magazine has written about domestically produced rackets. So how can we accuse the West, if our own hands are not clean! The mafia is very powerful in Sicily, but it was already there in the Middle Ages, and in Northern Italy, in the industrial regions, the mafia is not that strong at all. There is a mafia in Marseilles, but in Paris it is seen mainly in the movies. There are regions where the mafia exists historically and not as a direct result of bourgeois democracy.

I do not at all want to picture bourgeois democracy as an ideal, and I am not saying we should overlook its shady aspects. I am simply saying that we should stop underestimating it. There are things to be learned from it.

[Alova] In your opinion, what are the main obstacles to turning the Soviet Union into a rule-of-law state?

[Yakovlev] I see two such obstacles. In the first place Soviet people do not have a sense of economic dignity. And in the second place, real power in the economy does not belong to those who should have it.

Did you expect something else from a legal scholar? A discussion that would not involve economics? But I will even call on physics to help me: the law of communicating vessels operates rigorously in relations between economics and the law.

Many people become annoyed and say: why are you always emphasizing economics? So what if we will not have abundance—for a while. Everything does not come at once! You can't do two things at once. First we will take care of the triumph of the law, and put abundant food and commodities in the background. We will solve the problem by stages. At the same time we will avoid the preoccupation with material things. Why should we emphasize the material; it is demeaning to people.

At first glance this is an attractive sort of juxtaposition, but to separate the material well-being of society from its civic maturity is fatal. No, this will not come about by stages!

After all, we are not talking about a situation where everyone has a lot of everything, where everyone rakes in as much as possible for himself. We are talking about a situation where there is abundance around, available to every person. Because an abundance of accessible goods, the possibility of getting any good or service at any moment, without any additional conditions or extra efforts, legally, paid for by labor, in other words bought—this possibility gives rise to an exceptionally important social psychological phenomenon: a sense of economic dignity. Which is the foundation of human dignity in general!

I will certainly not have to buy it all, certainly will not have to "rake it in," but the awareness that with my honestly earned money I can buy everything that I want, the awareness that in my country I will not under any conditions have to demean myself and beg, the awareness that I have full economic rights, gives rise to a sense of confidence, calm, and dignity. On the other hand, I can rake in enormous wealth, but I still will not have a sense of either economic dignity or dignity in general if it is all piled up, gotten through influence, from special stores, brought in "through the back door" with nervous glances around.

But for now I am forced to work hard to get things, to use influence, bow and scrape, and demean myself; for now I tremble when I think that I have to take my car to the garage. For now I cannot buy a car with my own money, money I have earned; I have to ask that one be allocated for me (which means that I am singled out among

others), prove that I am worthy, that I do not drink and am morally stable in general, that I do public work and have been employed at this enterprise for 15 years now, that the vehicle is necessary to me for work purposes. So I am not intending to satisfy my own private sybaritic wants so much, but mainly to serve the state better, and I should be allowed to purchase a Zhiguli not because I am a person and a citizen, but because I am a production leader.

For now even to get things for which we pay really enormous sums, for example a cooperative apartment, we have to appeal to the ispolkom again and again, smile ingratiatingly—as long as things are that way we will not have that economic dignity, economic independence, and freedom. And if a person does not have that feeling, it is very difficult to expect that he will behave in obedience to, and most importantly, with respect for the law. When a person is constantly standing (no, pacing back and forth is better) before the choice—get something really necessary or observe the law. But to demand irreproachably correct behavior from those who control scarce goods, for example from people working in trade, is simply ridiculous, and even cruel in a certain sense.

In Ancient Greece those who were economically independent had rights. They were in fact the free citizens, the subjects of the law. And then the slaves were objects of the law, that is, not people who managed themselves, but rather people who were managed.

Is the enterprise, cooperative, or person working on a contract today economically independent? No. Why not? Because the producer today—the plant, kolkhoz, agriculture cooperative, or person working on contract—does not have the principal right: to dispose of the products of his labor and buy (not beg!) necessary materials and equipment.

All you hear today is people saying, you are on a lease contract, then go for it, you are free now! That is nonsense! The lessor does not have freedom. Does he buy fertilizer and equipment? No, the sovkhoz gives it to him or they do not give it to him. And the product which the contracting lessor produces—does he sell it? No, this product is taken from him at a predetermined price. We do not need any illusions. He is not an independent commodity producer at all. It is time to understand at last that only when the elementary economic right to dispose of that which you have produced, to sell it, not turn it over, and to buy things, not receive them—only when this right is inalienable, inseparable from the commodity producer, only then will he have real economic freedom and become a full-fledged subject of the law, or put more simply, the master of his life without any ironic or censoring quotation marks.

We are always throwing up our hands up in despair, saying: the bureaucracy is omnipotent! There are so many official instructions! The ministries are suffocating us! The departments are dictating! Every now and then

the word goes out that the departments must be reduced, the bureaucrats reined in, or instructions stopped. These are empty concerns! Because the departments are in command and make law in full accordance with their actual status, the status of commanders, masters. After all, it is the departments who hold real economic power. They are the ones who take the commodity producer's product and distribute it. It is the departments, not those who produce it. And if this is true, they are the ones who make the laws and issue the instructions by which we all live. They tyrannize the producers. And they are correct to do it! After all, they are the masters.

That is how it will be until real power in the economy passes from the distributors to the producers, from the administrators to the working people. That is when we will have an economic base which is the only thing on which the rule-of-law state can be founded. After all, the department today is a monopolist in every respect, including legally! It has the strength, the power, so why does it need the law? The law as a means of coercing subordinates and dependents—yes, that it still needs. But the law as a measure of behavior for equal and independent subjects? But who is equal to it? Only another department. Then they are all subordinate to their master, the Council of Ministers, which is where the pyramid ends. This pyramid does not need the law either; it is a surplus element there which disorganizes the work, a "mechanism of retardation." Now if economic power is taken away from the departments, if the requisition in industry and agriculture is replaced by a production tax, and relations of administrative distribution of material wealth are replaced by trade relationships between commodity producers, the pyramid will crumble and the law will begin to reign. It will take over the throne on which the bureaucrat is now seated. And we ourselves are the ones who are keeping him there, and keeping him quite securely.

It is amazing. I go into a domestic service shop and the nail is pounded into my shoe by a state employee! Now isn't that absurd? Why should a shoe repairman be in the state service? Why do we need a Ministry of Domestic Services? Are people themselves really unable to repair each other's shoes? You put in the nail for me, and I give you money—that is all. We do not need anyone else! But no, we have an enormous system. An unbelievable, unimaginable expansion of the state in society has occurred in our country.

What does this have to do with the question of the rule-of-law state? It is directly relevant. If there is no Ministry of Domestic Services, the shoe repairman and I are equal partners with an interest in one another. Then this is a legal structure and we are guided by supply, demand, and the law. Watch out: if he shortchanges me or does poor work, I will take him to court and collect. Does he need that? But what do we have? The shoe repairman and I are unequal partners. I am a supplicant, and he is a state employee, shielded from me by powerful departmental armor. He does not care if I am satisfied

with him; I am not his boss. What is important to him is whether the ministry is satisfied with him. And to complain about the shoe repairman, I do not go to court, I go up the "chain of command," to his commander, that is to the ministry. I ask that they order him to be punished! It is hardly likely that this foreign commander will like to receive my shoe together with my complaint, just like the shoe repairman, like all of the other producers who do not work for me and do not receive money from me. In such a system of relationships where there is not direct commodity exchange, there is in fact no place for the law either.

[Alova] If real power, all the levers of economic management are held by the ministries, I do not understand how we can actually carry out the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" The ministries have ignored the demands of the Soviets and they will continue to do so.

[Yakovlev] Of course. It is a platitude that the question of power is decided in the economic sphere. Therefore, for power to truly belong to the Soviets we need, first, a reform of the soviet system, and secondly, I repeat, power in the economy must be transferred from the ministries to the producers. And the producers, which mean the people, will exercise power in the soviets through their representatives. So these two things are essentially a single way to the rule-of-law state. After all, the foundation of the rule-of-law state is precisely representative democracy, that is, power exercised by representatives of the people.

If the soviets truly represent the people, that is if democratic elections to the soviets are guaranteed, if the soviets elect officials and all without exception can be replaced, if the soviets monitor and demand accountings from all executives (from the chairman of the ispolkom to the chairman of the Council of Ministers), if the law is not a decision of the Ministry of Health, the wish of the Ministry of Trade, or the command of the Ministry of Finance but rather that which has been adopted by the soviets—now that is a working model of the socialist rule-of-law state.

I consider it necessary to mention one more obstacle on the road to the reign of law. This is the passport system. Our Soviet passport is a completely unlawful thing. It has only one lawful function, identification of the individual. The photograph, year of birth, my signature, and the state seal certifying that I am I. There should not be any other "data" in the passport, such as the "propiska" [residence permit], a concept which is not translatable into any other language. But there it is, and I cannot find any lawful grounds for this institution. It is interesting to look at how, when, and for what purpose it was devised.

On 27 December 1932 a law was adopted which introduced a "uniform passport system with mandatory residence authorization for the entire USSR." Anyone without a passport was subject to a fine and "removal by order of the militia organs." All this was instituted for

the purpose of "better records of the population of cities, worker communities, and new construction areas and to free these populated points from people not involved in production or work in institutions and schools and not engaged in socially useful labor (with the exception of invalids and pensioners), and also for the purpose of purging these populated points from kulak, criminal, and other anti-social elements who are in hiding."

Did you notice the wording? "To free" [literally "razgruzka"—to unload] is a word which for centuries was applied to inanimate objects. "Purge" is a sanitary term applied to the people. I will not even mention the enormous potential opened up by the pronoun "other." And this took place in the winter of 1932, when people, driven by famine, were pouring into the cities! Well of course, some will say, that is understandable because it was in Stalin's time.

On 28 August 1974 the Statute on the Passport System in the USSR was ratified. It stated that all citizens must "receive residence permits" (from the militia!) and "sign out" upon moving and so on. So what had changed in 42 years? There were some changes. The 1974 statute, which is still in effect, no longer mentions kulak, criminal, and other anti-social elements, even though they were the ones who provided the "grounds" for introducing the passport system. There is no mention of "unloading" and "purging." On the other hand, there is something new. Violators of the passport system today are not supposed to be "removed by order of the militia organs" (really there is no place to remove them to; the passport system operates in the countryside also, and everywhere). Today "citizens guilty of malicious violations of the passport system are held to criminal accountability," and one possible penalty is loss of freedom. Now what kind of "progress" is that in comparison with 1932?

I think that it was not accidental that the Statute appeared in 1974. That was the time when the complete, 180 degree turn away from the Khrushchev thaw toward bureaucratic omnipotence was completed.

We all have been familiar for a long time with the social deformities to which the institution of "residence permits" is genetically predisposed: fictitious marriages, bribes, organized recruiting, "limitichki" [persons with temporary permits], the vicious circle where without work you cannot get a residence permit and without a residence permit they will not hire you for work, and tramps are driven from town to town—this is not a few thousand people but hundred of thousands who are simply thrown out like trash beyond the bounds of legal state existence. For what? Because they do not have the residence permit. But how is it possible, one wants to ask, who gave us such powers, to make the rights of citizens derivative from residence permits? This directly and openly contradicts the USSR Constitution.

It contradicts the right to labor. Because it restricts the constitutional "right to select an occupation or type of

employment and work" not according to the "calling, abilities, professional training, and education" as Article 40 of the USSR Constitution states, but rather by possession of a residence permit.

It contradicts the right to education. No matter how carefully you read Article 45 of the Constitution, this fundamental right is simply not limited by the residence permit, not in between the lines and not in the underlying meaning. But in the announcements soliciting applications from persons who want to study at tekhnikums and VUZes we commonly find a small note: "Applications are accepted from citizens who have permanent residence permits."

It contradicts the right to leisure time. If I do not have a residence permit I cannot spend my leisure time where I want or as long as I want.

Now look, I am opening the USSR Constitution, to Article 34. It is written with absolute clarity that citizens "are equal before the law regardless of...place of residence." Are they equal or not? And what is our Fundamental Law? Indeed, the Statute on the Passport System is our Fundamental law—it long ago subjugated the Constitution.

And, in addition to the Statute on the Passport System, a more specific decree was also adopted in 1974 entitled "Certain Rules for Granting Residence Permits to Citizens." This is such a conglomeration of absolutely illegal exceptions and amendments to residence permit procedures that it simply nullifies the chances for many people (and incidentally, citizens—there you see, citizens are literally incidental!) to live and work anywhere. For example, it is not permitted to receive a residence permit for an apartment if the apartment has fewer meters per person than allowed under health norms. You understand, it is possible to be born and live with six people in a one-room apartment. In that case, the health norms do not disturb anyone that much. But you cannot receive a residence permit and that is that, whether you are a brother or a son. And there are millions of such absurdities!

I have heard that they are intending to abolish many of these restrictions and broaden the right to residence permits. Of course, that is very good. But I am very afraid that such smoothing over of the extremities will postpone a fundamental solution of the question of the institution of the residence permit. It should be wiped out totally and completely. Can it be in a rule-of-law state that in my own country I have to ask for permission to live where I want? And who do I have to ask—the militia!

[Alova] But many people express a serious argument that if the residence permit system were abolished everyone would dash for Moscow and Leningrad.

[Yakovlev] I am convinced that it is naive to think that we are regulating the population of the cities by the residence permit system. That is a fiction—people are

coming and they will come all the same. There will be fictitious marriages and we will not destroy the actual "limit" by any prohibition from above. Each day several million "representatives from the local areas" travel to Moscow and buy everything there is in the food stores. That is also overpopulation.

Now imagine for a minute that the residence permit system were abolished. What do you think? Are all Soviet people crazy? Would they drop their jobs and apartments and travel to Moscow to live in the railroad terminals? No, of course not, the only ones who would come would be those that could find work and housing here, in other words, those whose specializations are vitally necessary here. And indigenous Muscovites who for years have been unable to find work in their specialization here (because we have had a surplus of personnel in many professions here for a long time) or those who are simply sick of living in an enormous city—do you think they would not leave Moscow; in fact they would simply leave, some temporarily and some forever. They are not leaving now because they are afraid of losing their Moscow residence permit; if something happens they cannot return. In fact this Moscow residence permit ties us to Moscow for life! Even if we are doomed to being unable to find ourselves, apply ourselves here.

Probably we would not have to worry particularly about overpopulation of certain cities if the command-administrative system of economic management were abolished—there would be a kind of self-regulation of the process of settlement and migration. But how, I would like to know, do we intend to move from management of the economy by command to self-development if the institution of the residence permit is preserved?

After all, for self-development, the society, this highly complex organism, needs natural flows, a natural circulation of social forces from city to city, from region to region, from the city to the countryside and from the countryside to the city. These are ideas overflowing, work force, human energy. They overflow where the need of the organism is greatest. But artificial residence-permit obstacles simply close off the vessels, there is no natural circulation, and blood clots form.

For self-development we need people to be guided by real economic interest, real need, and the residence permit system stands in direct conflict with this real economic interest.

If the plants, kolkhozes, and institutes finally switch to real, not fictitious cost accounting, which means they start living by real interests, they will not need organized recruitment, but experienced personnel, talented and hard-working people who are capable of the highest labor productivity. But all around us we have the residence permit barrier.

[Alova] Since we are talking about the passport, we should not overlook the "nationality" column. In Europe, for example, our country and Czechoslovakia are the only ones that have it.

[Yakovlev] And they are correct not to have it! I do not consider myself any more Russian because my passport states that I am Russian. I consider myself Russian because that is my language, my culture, my behavioral pattern. I feel myself responsible, beginning from the time of Ivan Kalita; I hate the "oprichniki" [administrative elite] because they are my "oprichniki." Do you understand? Nationality is a very real and important category. But its reality lies in the endeavor to identify yourself and reproduce this culture in your activity.

So nationality has cultural and historical significance but nationality does not have any administrative significance! It should not have.

I am categorically against keeping the "nationality" column in the passport. I am categorically against "Point 5" on applications, beginning with the personal record that you fill out when going to work and ending with the library card; in other words, I am against making this cultural-ethnic category a state matter. The category of the ethnic group belongs to society, not to the state. We know what kind of state elevated nationality to rank of a state characteristic. The national socialist state.

Inclusion of the nationality category among state characteristics is fundamentally antidemocratic and leads to various kinds of deformations and deformities in inter-ethnic relations.

But that still is not all. We have not yet mentioned the most important and possibly most frightening thing about the passport-application system.

Why did the Stalinist state need the passport with a residence permit and showing nationality? Why when taking a job was it necessary to fill out those unbelievable applications with maybe 100 questions?

The more I know about you, the more I control you. Just try to be obstinate in something: I can pull a string, and I have lots of them, you yourself put them in my hands. I know about your relatives abroad and about all your former occupations. Means of hypercontrol, state blackmail, a weapon for psychological attack. And the government used it under Stalin and under Brezhnev. They used it to fight heresy, so that everyone would have the same correct thoughts, so that no one would suddenly want to learn more about the Stalinist camps and about our wonderful, heroic history, so that everyone would smile broadly, brightly, without any irony or hidden meaning. So that all people would be well-controlled puppets.

We were taught for a long time (and very successfully) that without a passport we were not citizens and could not even be customers, hotel guests, vacationers, or patients—we were nothing at all.

But am I really a Soviet citizen because I have a passport? It is just the other way around. I have a passport because I am a Soviet citizen. And the proof of this is not the passport at all, it is the fact that I was born and live here.

Understand, until 1932 a Soviet citizen was a Soviet citizen simply because he was born here, but since 1932 he has been a Soviet citizen only because the government permitted this and issued him a passport.

A change took place from the original right of citizenship to the state-sanctioned right to be a citizen.

But this change did not take place on paper only, in the garbled, deformed words of the Statute on the Passport System; the change took place in life, in our consciousness. We Soviet people lost some kind of very important feeling. The feeling that even without this bundle of papers, these "permits," this red book, this labor booklet, the communal payment record, and without everything, that when we are simply "naked," not confirmed in any way, we are nonetheless free people and full-fledged citizens.

And without a rebirth of this feeling you cannot build the rule-of-law state.

[Alova] Isn't that why for all these years Soviet people were so often and so easily deprived of citizenship. If it is not a primary right, but a kind of gift from the state, a badge that is passed on for good, obedient behavior. If you do something wrong we will withdraw our blessing. The Lord gives and Lord takes away.

[Yakovlev] You're right. In the United States only naturalized citizens can be deprived of citizenship. Those are people who are not born there, but come to the United States and are given citizenship by the state. But if you were born in the United States the authorities can never, under any circumstances, deprive you of citizenship because your citizenship is a birthright, it is inalienable from the person, it is "from God."

Another question is the need for a democratic procedure to take away citizenship. It is not a decision adopted behind closed doors, without intelligible arguments, even if it comes "from above"; it is done by an open, public court hearing.

This would show whether the person had in fact done something incompatible with Soviet citizenship, something deeply anti-Soviet, or whether a "group of comrades" simply thought so.

Incidentally, the concept of anti-Soviet activity should be significantly narrowed soon. As we know, preparation of the new criminal code is coming to an end. According to the almost unanimous opinion of scholars and practitioners from different institutes and departments, the new Criminal Code should not have Article 190 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, which establishes punishment for dissemination of fabrications that discredit the Soviet state and social order in oral or other form. This refers to actions whose purpose is not to undermine or weaken Soviet power. Under the article just 2-3 years ago people became dissidents for criticizing local authorities, for dissatisfaction with past and present ways, for keeping books by "anti-Soviet" authors such as Roy Medvedev, or simply for telling a joke "in the wrong place," in the company of strict "guardians of values."

[Alova] You and I already said a year ago, in the August issue of OGONEK in the discussion entitled "Past Time," that this article directly conflicts with freedom of speech, the right to criticism, and should be abolished.

[Yakovlev] But we said there that Article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code which establishes penalties for "agitation and propaganda conducted for the purpose of undermining or weakening Soviet power" is entirely justified. But now a year has passed, an eternity it seems because we have moved so far along the pathy of democratization, and the draft of the new Criminal Code proposes narrowing the operating range of Article 70 too. Simply agitation and propaganda is too broad a concept; this alone cannot yet be considered a crime. The only thing that can be considered a crime is a call for forcible overthrow of constitutional power or instigating such an overthrow of power. Otherwise you could still be put in jail for criticism, for an opinion that does not match the opinion of the authorities, as Daniel and Sinyavsky were convicted under Article 70.

Our bitter past has taught us that the most terrible weapon the state can direct against itself is to forbid criticism and to permit only consoling fairy tales pouring from all podiums and newspaper columns, a feeling of profound satisfaction with everything, no matter what. We are not afraid of criticism today, we criticize ourselves like no one else and that is exactly what will help us build genuine democratic socialism.

[Alova] Concerning criticism. It is clear that a condition for existence for the rule-of-law state is monitoring by society of state activity at all levels. In turn, one of the main factors in such monitoring is a free press. There has been a great deal of talk among us about the sold-out Western press, but what can our press in the years of stagnation be called? And even today, everybody knows that the telephone is more important than the teletype in the editorial office. All that matters is that the ring is "loud" enough: from the party raykom to a rayon newspaper, and from the obkom to an oblast newspaper.

If the newspaper is, for example, the organ of an ispolkom, the ispolkom has the telephone right at hand. It seems that subordination and democracy conflict with each other here.

[Yakovlev] At the 19th party conference the editor-in-chief of PRAVDA presented what I thought was fertile idea: the press could play the role of socialist opposition. The mechanism for carrying out this idea was also suggested at the conference: change newspapers from organs of party committees into organs of party organizations and have editorial boards elected by all the communists of the party organization. In this case the editorial board gets real independence and the possibility of evaluating activity objectively, among other the activity of the executive organ. The proposal was not adopted, but I hope that the issue has not been closed forever.

We have to pay tribute to the boldness of the journalists who are fighting their way inch by inch, hill by hill, and conquering ever-newer frontiers of freedom and glasnost while all the time risking a reprimand or discharge if they go beyond what is permitted today. And all the time there are some who want to pull the press down, to bring the new step toward freedom back to where it was yesterday. Everybody is writing about Galich and Viktor Nekrasov today, but a year ago an editor who was brave enough to publish such an article could have lost his job. And at the same time journalists are constantly being called on to kill the internal censors inside them.

I think that the new Law on the Press which is under preparation should finally make the work of the journalist safer and take away this "front-line pressure." The Law on the Press should guarantee the independence of the press and the independence of journalistic investigation.

[Alova] In other words it should guarantee an expansion of the journalist's freedom of action.

[Yakovlev] No, not an expansion but a consolidation. That is different. I am against giving journalists greater freedom than others have. Freedom for all must be expanded. For example, information should not be accessible only to journalists and a small circle of officials, "to those whom it is proper" as the present-day bureaucrat thinks. But as for consolidating journalistic freedom—protecting it against persecution and other obstructions, envisioning specific accountability for obstructing the search for truth and obtaining of necessary documents—that must be in the Law on the Press.

[Alova] Now a specific question, a topical one, so to speak. How do you Aleksandr Maksimovich, feel about the recently adopted USSR Ukase on procedures for organizing and conducting meetings, rallies, street marches, and demonstrations in the USSR?

[Yakovlev] I think that the Ukase should have been based not on the permit principle, but on the principle of registration: if there is nothing against the law in the application for the demonstration, the Ispolkom must register it, setting the time and place. Concerning the place, of course demonstrations must be conducted in the center of the city or in other populous places: what would be the point of a demonstration in the deserted outskirts? The registration principle would promote the development of democracy and people's activism and would cut off the possibility of arbitrary action by local authorities. And a second norm which I think is essential for demonstrations is the possibility of appealing the ispolkom's decision to a court. That is not possible today. The Law on Court Appeals of Officials' Actions does not envision appealing collegial decisions. But this is fundamentally anti-democratic; the further development of democracy will bang into this wall again and again, and is already doing so. After all, what distinguishes the rule-of-law state? The responsibility of citizens to the state, and most importantly, the responsibility of the state and officials to the citizen. The mechanism of this responsibility is court appeal of any acts by state power. That is the main lever of democracy. If we do not use it we will not move forward.

When the Ukase on procedures for conducting rallies and demonstrations was being prepared legal specialists, among them scholars from the Institute of State and Law of the Academy Sciences, presented their proposals. But they were not taken into account. Therefore we hope that at the session of the Supreme Soviet, which is to ratify the Ukase, there will be debate on whether it meets the challenges of the rule-of-law state. I will say honestly that it was a very heartening precedent when the deputies of the Supreme Soviet refused to ratify the reprisal against cooperative members—the Ukase on Taxation of Cooperatives. They simply shoved the Ukase out of the way! That was socialist democracy at work. And you know, nothing like that has happened in our country since the 1920's!

Here is what is very important in this: no matter how good our laws may be, the further democracy develops the more wisdom and political tact will be required of the governmental and militia organs who carry out the laws and from all of us. Democracy is always packed with "unusual" situations and unforeseen excesses. Imagine a spontaneous rally or a spontaneous march of people who have been aroused by good and lawful slogans and are not disrupting traffic. Yes, they have gathered without permission. So should they be dispersed? That would be stupid!

[Alova] In my opinion precision and certainty in such matters is still better than instability. As for depending on whether the chief of the militia precinct has or does not have political tact! That has already happened, it has already depended on that.

[Yakovlev] You see, we all want certainty, and I will admit that I do too. To have a correct, democratic, and precise formula known in advance for every situation, to make

impossible cases like the one in the airplane that was seized by the Ovechkin family which resulted in supposedly random fire while performing the rescue operation. But that is just the problem (and the pleasure?), that unlike an authoritarian regime democracy is not a building that is already built, turned over, and all ready to go, so that there is no need to think or be concerned about anything. Democracy is a process. There will not be certainty! There will be a constant balancing on the brink between "yes" and "no," between complete freedom and complete order. If there is nothing but deafening order, that is a cemetery; if there is nothing but undivided freedom—that is Makhnoism. We all have to learn the difficult art of optimal decisions, weighing things, and the ability to find and observe moderation.

[Alova] You said that the proposals of the scholars were not taken into account in adopting the Ukase on procedures for conducting rallies and demonstrations. Does that fit the principles of the rule-of-law state?

[Yakovlev] There is no country where scholars have legislative power. And with all my respect for scholarship, I do not think at all that they should be given this power. But the point is something else. The scholars presented their recommendations with supporting arguments, then the legislative enactment came out which did not take these recommendations into account and that was that. The arguments presented by the scholars were not answered publicly by anyone. That is the procedure we must object to. There must be open public discussion so that the broad society is able to judge who is right, these scholars or those who consider their recommendations on such a vitally important issue for democratic development to be unsound. Furthermore, I would like to know the authors of drafts of particular Ukases and laws. At the present time these drafts in our country are like folk songs or anonymous letters.

It was expected that the November session of the USSR Supreme Soviet would adopt a very important law, the Law on Judicial Proceedings of the USSR. The draft of this Law is now being worked out in various institutes and departments, and various suggestions are being made. Our institute is also working on it. We are trying to include in our draft of the law those ideas which we believe fit the ideal of the rule-of-law state. I would like the main proposals on this law to be publicly discussed before this session occurs, so that the arguments will be made public if they are rejected.

[Alova] There have been hundreds of exploratory articles on the need for judicial reform, and more broadly legal reform, in recent years. But the disputing parties do not seem to have come to agreement.

[Yakovlev] Many disputed issues remain. For example, there is the constitutional court. For a long time now no one has objected to the need to establish one. A decision has now been adopted to set up a Committee for Constitutional Supervision.

[Alova] A committee, not a court? Or doesn't the name matter?

[Yakovlev] Personally I would have called it a court all the same, because there is procedure behind the name. I think that this committee will succeed only if the primary features of a court hearing are reproduced in its procedures. But if the committee starts working like a ministry, like the existing administrative organs, it will be another group gathering behind closed doors and deciding things "in a business-like way" and "without unnecessary words." That will be, if you'll excuse me, just another useless addition to the existing administrative system. And then—let's not cling to illusions—we will have to forget about real constitutional supervision.

[Alova] Is it only laws, ukases, instructions, and other legal enactments that are subject to testing for constitutionality? Can a specific action (for example, construction of a nuclear power plant like Chernobyl) be found unconstitutional?

[Yakovlev] Of course, if it is proven that it violates the rights of citizens, written in the Basic Law, to preservation of health and the environment. The point is that in general any action such as construction of a nuclear power plant is preceded by a decision, to build, to tear down, and so on. And the decision is a legal act.

[Alova] In your opinion, should the organ of constitutional supervision have the right to set aside enactments of the supreme governmental organ?

[Yakovlev] That is a very complex matter. In the United States the constitutional court has the right to set aside any law. But Poland, for example, has a somewhat different system. There the constitutional tribunal also can evaluate any enactment, including ones being adopted by the Sejm, for constitutionality, but they cannot set them aside by their own power. They simply "return" the enactment they find unconstitutional to the Sejm for reconsideration, and if two-thirds of the Sejm reaffirm the constitutionality of the particular enactment, it remains in force. If they do not, it is set aside.

I will not try to say which is better, the U.S. or Polish system. If we knew our future committee would operate just like a court, then I think that I would be more inclined to the American version, but if it becomes just another "office"? Then you would not want to give it any power, would you?

Everything cannot be thought over and decided in advance. Things have to be decided as you go along. But it is good that we have taken up this path!

For example, great debates are taking place about the problems of the investigation. I am convinced that investigators must be made independent of the procuracy (at the present the investigation is conducted by the procuracy itself and the investigators are directly subordinate

to the procurator, so how can the procurator objectively watch over observance of legality in the investigation he himself is conducting?). In order to build a rule-of-law state it is extremely important to allow participation of the defense attorney in the stage of preliminary investigation. And I think that it would be useful to borrow the institution which exists in East Germany, court control over the preliminary investigation, in order to eliminate the possibility of arbitrary action during it. In East Germany any citizen whom the procurator has ordered to be arrested can appeal the arrest to court, so that the court can check whether the arrest is well-founded. The court hears the arguments of both the investigator and the defense attorney, and it either affirms or sets aside the arrest. It would probably be good to introduce a figure such as the investigation judge, who would monitor the entire course of the investigation and at the end would be able to determine whether there are sufficient grounds to bring the person to trial. In this way he would prevent cases which are not adequately proven or are completely fabricated from being brought to court.

[Alova] What you are talking about now is attempts to eliminate the defenseless position of a person faced with the possibility of unsubstantiated investigation, unsubstantiated arrest, and the possibility of misspeaking under pressure. But in our life we also see another phenomenon, the person who is too much protected. This is where there are real, solid grounds for beginning a criminal case and bringing the case to court—there are grounds, but it is not possible. They cannot arrest the person for weeks, months, or even years. Because this person is protected by the powerful armor of deputy or party immunity. Of course, in formal terms we do not have party immunity, but in reality it is very difficult to bring a highly-ranked party employee to criminal accountability. Do we need this over-protection today, if we truly want to fight against corruption, against the mafia on all levels without exception? Many of our readers raise this question in their letters to us.

[Yakovlev] First I will discuss deputy immunity. This is a mandatory, essential condition to democracy in any society! We must nourish and preserve deputy immunity by every means!

The frustration of an investigator who is handling a specific criminal case, has found a major criminal, and cannot arrest him for a year is entirely understandable. But you and I, and the society should be concerned not only about catching the criminal, but also about defending democracy! And the interests of democracy demand that it is better for a criminal to hide behind the wall of deputy immunity than to lose a truly independent organ of people's power which monitors everything. The idea of the rule-of-law state means that people's representatives, which means the soviets, will monitor all organs without exception, doesn't it? Now let us imagine that there is no deputy immunity. And suppose such an unprotected deputy is monitoring the procuracy, for example, discovers unlawful actions, tries to fight the

mafia, and boldly comes out at session of the soviet with criticism of the militia and the procurators. That is not realistic! In revenge he will be arrested the very next day on some fabricated suspicion! And then there will be no one to defend him, the deputy; the mafia paralyzes the power of the soviets.

So deputies really have to be insured against unlawful criminal prosecution.

But if the investigator cannot simply, with the procurator's approval, arrest a member of the Party Central Committee and has to wait for the approval of the Central Committee, this procedure, which of course is not stipulated by any law, is a direct violation of the Constitution and a violation of the principle of equality of all before the law. Long ago Lenin spoke out against the "party protecting its own scoundrels."

[Alova] The central element in the mechanism of the rule-of-law state is independent judiciary power. But how can we make it independent? How can we protect judges from the influence of local powers, departments, raykoms, and obkoms? How can we pull the plug on the so-called "right of telephone," which developed during the years of stagnation?

[Yakovlev] Every reform has its key, its main element. We introduce it and suddenly the whole picture changes qualitatively, suddenly everything rises to a completely different level. If we do not introduce it everything will change for the better, but there will be no qualitative leap. It is like the appearance of sound in movies. Even without the soundtrack movies could have developed further and become better, but only to a certain point.

The "key" in the judicial reform is the introduction of trial by people's representatives ("trial by jury"). Without this we will not make the court an independent organ.

I am using the term "trial by jury" conditionally. After all, they were given the name "jurors" [literally, persons under oath] because they swore on the Bible. But why couldn't people's assessors take an oath, for example, on the USSR Constitution?

So it is precisely this "trial by a jury," or a body of people's assessors consisting of, say, six persons, who after the court session, having heard the arguments of the procurator, defense attorney, and witnesses, go off to a separate room and there separately and independently from the professional judge, decide the main issue—whether the defendant is guilty or not—relying on their experience of life and sense of justice. And then together with the judge—this is exactly where professional knowledge is required—the question of the measure of punishment is decided.

[Alova] But the opinion has been expressed today in the newspapers and journals that the need for the "trial by jury" will disappear if we simply increase the number of

people's assessors, and also if we choose as people's assessors not just anybody, but people who have truly earned it, who are not indifferent, people with an activist posture, who will be able to argue with the judge and defend their own opinion if necessary.

[Yakovlev] Very little would change! Think about it, why are people's assessors today usually silent? Why do they automatically agree with the judge, without any unnecessary questions, so that the public has very accurately nicknamed them "kivaly" [yes-men]? Is it just because there are only two of them, not six, and because unworthy and indifferent people are selected? You know, you do not have to be a high-powered psychologist to understand that no matter how many people's assessors there are and even if they are three times as worthy and active, if they sit alongside the judge, in the end he will simply overwhelm them with his authority, the weight of his professional knowledge, all those points, paragraphs, exceptions, and unfamiliar terminology. The assessors duck at this point, and they will continue to, and they will be "kivaly"! That is natural and predictable for human psychology.

[Alova] But people's assessors—and this is being proposed now—can have elementary legal knowledge, after all.

[Yakovlev] That's right, elementary! They will never have knowledge or experience comparable with the judge! He will still be able to demolish them with legal sophistry. Today, when people's assessors in rare cases do not agree with the judge, he will sometimes make a "power" move such as saying: "You do not agree? Then write the verdict yourself! Here is your paper. What, you don't know how?" Of course, to be able to write a verdict the people's assessors would have to go to school for a long time. But if they become a "court of jurors" and decide just one question, guilty or not guilty, they do not need profound legal knowledge. The experience of "jury trials" in the most diverse countries, including Russia where a "jury trial" found Vera Zasulich not guilty, shows that this is exactly where experience of life, people's wisdom, and a sense of justice and honesty are needed.

[Alova] But what if the "jury" makes a mistake all the same?

[Yakovlev] A guilty verdict can be set aside on the appeal level, and the procuracy has the possibility of transferring the case for a new hearing. But an acquittal by the jurors cannot be set aside under any conditions, even if it is mistaken.

[Alova] So it comes out that the criminal remains free?

[Yakovlev] Yes but that is how it comes out. But where does our greater interest lie today? A situation where "10 innocent persons are convicted, just so that just one guilty person will not escape punishment"? We already know what this "equation" means, and we suspect how

many millions are hidden behind that number "10." I think that after many years of experience with judicial "errors" of exactly this type we have an interest in the opposite. Even let some guilty persons be acquitted, if only the innocent are not convicted. That is the kind of arithmetic we need today.

I think that the "trial by jury" should adopt its decision or vote, but only unanimously, not by majority. Where they cannot reach unanimity they will not give any verdict, and a new body of jurors will be formed. It is much harder to reach unanimity than to get a majority, and so this greatly reduces the likelihood of convicting an innocent person.

The trouble is that your question "And what if the jury makes a mistake?" is symptomatic. When you talk about judges, for some reason people seldom ask, "And what if the judge makes a mistake?" And the fact that many jurists today think that if we increase the number of people's assessors enough then the "trial by jury" will be not needed, is also symptomatic.

Many people are used to the idea that wisdom is distributed by the court according to status, to position, and the higher a person's rank is the wiser he will be. But certainly not the other way around. The one who is in charge knows how things should be. "Simple people" hold no authority for us. After decades of fictitious people's power do we believe in representative democracy, in the power of representatives of the people?

Just think about this. We are shocked that ordinary citizens, not lawyers and not judges, will decide the question of whether the particular defendant is guilty or not, but we have a permanently operating Supreme Soviet consisting of 400 people's representatives and they will decide questions much larger than whether Sidorov is guilty of killing someone else's cow or not. They will decide enormous and fundamentally important questions of our life, problems of the defense budget, the food problem; they will adopt laws that will determine the destiny of our country! But then, these are those same ordinary people. We are now preparing to give them real and full power. So why are we afraid to give the same kind of people power to decide a particular criminal or civil case? Where is the logic here?

It seems to me that the arguments against the "trial by jury" are essentially directed against giving power to real deputies, to the people's choices.

Moreover, the existence of the "jury trial" will change the entire picture of the investigation and of the court! The investigator will know that all his actions and his entire system of evidence will not simply be "rubber stamped" by the procurator and then by the judge, as unfortunately happens frequently today, but that it will all be discussed and analyzed by independent "jurors." And the procurator will no longer be able to dictate to the judge; he will have to work hard so that his evidence

and all of the arguments for the charge are very convincing. The defense attorney will be able to appeal to the hearts and minds of the "jurors," call on their sense of justice, their humanness.

There will be someone to fight in front of! There will be someone to prove things to, to convince.

[Alova] But after all, the judicial reform is directed precisely to making the judge independent. If we are successful in this, then I do not understand why the opinion of the jurors is better and more objective than the opinion of the judge, who is also independent, but is a professional?

[Yakovlev] Complete independence of the judge is possible only in dreams. It is the ideal. We can only move closer to it, but we will never achieve it. The judge is part of a definite practical and professional structure, and the possibility of influencing him cannot be entirely eliminated. But the "jurors" gather new each time, for each particular case. Therefore, they are a thousand kilometers further away from the possibility of being influenced than any judge.

Indeed, it is the "jury trial" that can make the judge independent. So that the if secretary of the obkom telephones the judge, the judge can answer: I'm sorry, I cannot do anything. It is the jurors that decide. That is that.

And isn't this why certain bureaucrats who are used to thinking of the court as simply one more department where everything is decided on command from above oppose introducing the "trial by jury"?

Of course, jurors are always just people. They can be indifferent, they can be moved by passions, and they are prisoners of social, group, and national prejudices. In general we are constantly encountering the fact the democracy does not make our life ideal at all. It even creates additional difficulties, carries all kinds of costs, and sometimes dramas.

Really, democracy is the worst form of government, if you do not consider all of the rest. If you do not consider the Rashidov system, the Brezhnev system, Stalinism, and fascism. So far the human race has not thought up anything better than democracy.

We have already had order. We have already had a wise man who said that he knew better than anyone else how things had to be done, and that he was leading the people to a brilliant future while closing the eyes of the others. He led us through seas of blood. And he closed not only the people's eyes, but also their mouths. We already know where that road could take us, if we were orderly and obedient.

Trial by Jury Urged for Serious Crimes
18000234 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 88 p 2

[Article by I. Petrukhin, doctor of juridical sciences, head scientific associate at the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute, under the rubric "We Discuss Drafts of USSR Laws": "The Jury—Jurist Considers It Essential in the Rule-of-Law State"]

[Text] The legal reform being carried out in our country still does not rest on an adequately thought-out theoretical conception. Unfortunately, some jurists are trying to reduce the reform to nothing but "patchwork." This is incorrect. We need fundamental democratic transformations of many of the institutions of Soviet court law. Take peoples assessors for just one example. The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference resolution entitled "On the Legal Reform" says that the role and responsibility of the assessors should increase, and to do that, among other things, "their number should be increased in trials of the most complex cases."

But how can public representation in the trial be organized? Should the peoples assessors and the judge be joined in a single body, or separated? Both models of jurisprudence have been known since time immemorial. They are the trial by lay judges and the trial by jury. The trial by lay judges arose in Medieval Germany, where the judge and 2-4 assessors were joined in a single body. The trial by jury, where 12 assessors decide the question of guilt and the judge decides on the measure of punishment, arose in England in the 13th-14th Centuries and later spread to the United States and the former English colonies. France borrowed the trial by jury from England, but later transformed it slightly: the 3 permanent judges and 9 jurors make up a single body. The legal reform in Russia introduced trial by jury on the English model.

V. I. Lenin wrote numerous times about the democratic nature of the jury trial and its advantages over trial by lay judges. These evaluations continue to be significant in our conditions too because, in V. I. Lenin's words, we must take everything valuable and progressive from the bourgeoisie. This applies directly to trial by jury. The scrapping of the old court during the revolutionary transformations in Russia did not signify a rejection of democratic forms of administering justice. In the first years of Soviet power courts with 6 and even 12 peoples assessors were formed. But the further development of events, and then the personality cult, led to a sharp reduction in public participation in legal proceedings. What talk can there be of jurors if the notorious 1 December 1934 law did not even permit the parties to participate in the court hearing and barred appeals of verdicts or even requests for pardon, and moreover the sentence was carried out immediately! And what about the special sessions, the "troikas," where there were not even judges?

Restructuring demands that we fully restore democratic forms of judicial proceedings. Justice for the people and by the people—that is our main challenge.

But what are the advantages of trial by jury? First of all, there is greater collegiality. Two assessors may be mistaken, fail to consider something, or act wrongly. But a meeting of 12 people will bring out all circumstances that are important for the case and ensure that a well-founded decision is reached. There is still too little genuine collegiality in our courts. Judges often do not even ask their opinions on issues that must be decided in the verdict. Sometimes the judge starts writing the verdict without a word and only when he reaches the sentence calls on the assessors. Peoples assessors complain that sometimes the judge openly pressures them to adopt a particular decision. This is precluded in the trial by jury.

The principle of people's power is most strongly expressed in the trial by jury. In it the state function of dispensing justice belongs to the people itself. In the police state the principle, might is right, triumphs. But in the rule-of-law state strength is on the side of right. In the trial by jury the people's will is sovereign. Therefore, acquittals by juries are put into effect immediately and are not subject to appeal. And a guilty verdict can only be appealed to the benefit of the convicted person.

The right of the people to judge means also that they are responsible for the decisions reached. When a verdict is modified or set aside by a higher court today people think that a mistake was made through the fault of the judge alone. Trial by jury removes responsibility from the judge for deciding the basic issue in a criminal case, the guilt of the defendant. This will make it possible to put an end to the obsession with percentages in evaluating the work of courts, which gives rise to a desire to correct as few judicial errors as possible.

Only a jury trial can be truly independent. It is still possible to influence a judge somehow with the "power of the telephone." But it is simply impossible to incite all the peoples assessors, if there are 12 of them, not 2, to return an unlawful verdict.

Unfortunately, the threat to court independence is still real. The resolution of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference states that "one of the guarantees of greater court independence should be the election of rayon, city, okrug, oblast, and kray courts by higher-ranking soviets of peoples deputies." Despite this the draft Law on Amendments and Supplements to the USSR Constitution envisions that election, subordination, and the right of recall of courts will be in the jurisdiction of soviets of peoples deputies of the same level. Leaving aside the question of disrespect for the decisions of the party conference, we will say straight out that introduction of such a legislative innovation would lead to greater dependence of courts on local authorities. An undesirable judge can be recalled easily at the next session of the soviet by the votes of those whom he has displeased. And

the 10-year term of election for a judge becomes simply unnecessary. That is why introduction of trial by jury would be so timely. After all, peoples assessors are not elected by state organs and they are not subordinate to them, but rather to the voters themselves.

Trial by jury gives an education in the law. It will instill social activism and a sense of responsibility in citizens. Peoples assessors today agree with the judge in everything, rely on his experience and knowledge, and hide behind him. They almost never use their right to a special opinion. But some judges actually like such obedient assessors. They do not get in the way. During the years of the cult and of stagnation the people lost the habits of thinking, arguing, and making decisions. Trial by jury will help overcome these negative phenomena.

The assessors are free from stereotypes and standards and can reach decisions that are a little ahead of the law. I am sure that a trial by jury would acquit the "shabashniki," the "non-mercenary" thieves who take valuable metals from plant dumps, and others whose actions have, in the very recent past and with the blessing of the highest court organs, been considered serious crimes. No one calls on the assessors to break the law. But to understand its essential points, developmental trends, and its conformity with newly developing social relations—this is their direct duty.

Trial by jury will raise the prestige of the defense bar, intensify the adversarial nature of the trial, and regenerate the courtroom eloquence (meaningful, not empty eloquence, of course) that has died out today. Our defense lawyers have "wilted" emotionally. They understand that no matter what you say, you will not change the judge's mind. After all, it is often true that the decision has in fact already been made and the judge is only pretending that the statements of the parties are important. Comments such as "Keep it brief," "Stick to the point," and "The court is aware of that" are not that rare from the presiding judge. It is a different matter in a trial by jury.

There was a time when jury verdicts were greeted with applause. But the court today has become an official state activity, legal proceedings are no longer revered, and the people are not interested in them.

Of course, simply increasing the number of assessors will not do much. Where there is a difference of opinions the judge will still be able to use the threat: if you do not agree, write it yourself. But of course, the assessors cannot write a verdict by themselves. Whether they want to or not, they have to give up.

At the present time jury trials account for a comparatively small number of cases: 3 percent in England and 4 percent in the United States. But that is all that is needed. It is enough that any person accused of committing a serious crime (felony) who claims to be not guilty has the right to have his case heard in a jury trial. When

harranguing the "bourgeois" court our jurists usually "forget" to explain what a felony is. What it is is a crime whose penalty is incarceration for 1 year or more. We have much stricter sanctions. Therefore introduction of the jury trial even for cases of capital crimes or crimes punishable by incarceration for more than 10 years would be a great step forward. We should not throw out the legal significance of the defendant's confession either. A free and mentally healthy person who possesses a sense of dignity should not impose a jury trial if he admits his guilt and is only asking for a just sentence. But unlawful investigative methods may lead to false confessions. Therefore, the time to determine whether the accused person has confessed or wants to exercise the right to jury trial is after the case is turned over to the court, not before.

Opponents of the jury trial say it is clumsy, complex, and expensive. But they do not consider that we are talking about just a few cases of great social significance. To decide them correctly demands a greater expenditure of time, effort, and money. A study showed that of 700,000 peoples assessors who were elected, only two-thirds were called on to perform their public duty in the courts.

They also point out the impossibility of separating facts from their legal assessment. But no one is suggesting that the assessors be asked about the bare facts. They should, for example, present their opinion on larceny, not items missing; on murder, not homicide; on bribery, not transfer of money, and so on. When answering the question, guilty or not guilty, the assessors will, of course, fit the established facts in the case to the legal norm. The judge will help them avoid mistakes. In his jury instructions he should explain the meaning of the legal norms which will be necessary for a legal assessment of the particular case. The meeting of the jurors will be successful if the question of guilt is posed relative to each charge and each episode of the charge. Jurors should have the right to modify the legal assessment of an action in the direction favorable to the defendant.

Certain attributes of the jury trial make it a significant guarantee of individual rights. Above all these are the preemptive removal of a certain number of jurors, putting them under oath, the unanimity or substantial majority required by law for a conviction, and the bar on appealing an acquittal.

This summer I had the opportunity to attend a jury trial in district court in London. The defendant, a black man, was accused of raping a white girl.

It took no more than 2 minutes to fill the jury panel. The bailiff brought 15 potential jurors into the room. The defense attorney removed three of them on a preemptory basis. No reasons for removal were given. The persons removed, three elderly white males, left the courtroom immediately and the remaining 12 were moved to their seats designated and began performing their duties. However, they had only one duty—to listen!

The entire trial was guided by the efforts of the parties. The prosecutor questioned the defendant, the victim, and witnesses in detail, and after him the defense attorney asked them his own questions (cross-examination). Then the defense witnesses were questioned. The judge occasionally struck leading questions and even less frequently asked questions himself. The atmosphere in the courtroom was business-like. I did not form the impression that trial by jury was idle talk and a pointless waste of time, as our authors sometimes write. The defendant was acquitted, although the jurors' votes were split. The reason is that, under English law, a minimum of 10 votes are needed for a conviction. And if less than 10 of the jurors are for conviction, the defendant must be acquitted.

The police, naturally, are unhappy with acquittals; they hate the jury trial and at the same time fear it. They fear it because jurors keep a close watch on the legality and morality of the methods used in the investigation. A jury acquittal is the most effective means to instill order in the preliminary investigation. Jury trials in Russian in the 19th Century returned up to 40 percent acquittals, and in the 20th Century up to 25 percent. In England and the United States juries acquit 15-20 percent of the defendants. Extreme rightist forces attack the jury trial in rage, accusing it of liberalism and lack of desire to fight crime. But it has withstood them and not only has a glorious past but also a promising future.

People sometimes try to scare us by suggesting that under our conditions juries would be stricter and more unbending than the judges themselves. A groundless fear! Studies have been done in many countries (and in our country too) which show that the "judges of the people" are more humane and lenient than the "judges of the crown."

We should not simply borrow the trial by jury; we should make it even better. The jurors should be more active. For this they should be given the right to ask questions of defendants, victims, witnesses, and experts. Jurors return their verdict not from the written materials of the file, but only on the basis of what they have heard in the trial. But they do not remember everything they hear. The jurors should make necessary notes, and in the jury room should use a written record of the trial. Preparing the record by this time (and not 2-3 weeks later, as happens in our country) raises the level of all court work.

So the question of the defendant's guilt in the most important cases should be decided by an adequately representative body of peoples assessors who are separate from the judge. But the sentence should be given by the judge and the peoples assessors together.

The jury trial can also be used to decide the most important civil cases. Trial by jury is a great achievement of human culture, a cultural treasure that we certainly should not reject.

Poll Reveals Judges', Prosecutors' Views on Legal Reforms

18000208 Moscow SOVETSKAYA YUSTITSIYA in Russian No 19, Oct 88 pp 21-22

[Article by V. Kogan, Doctor of Legal Sciences, under heading "Our Discussions": "Legal Reform: Who is for What?"]

[Text] The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference resolution "On Legal Reform" states that in order to make justice more objective and enhance the role and responsibilities of public jurors it would be useful to increase their number in court hearings of the most complex cases. This recommendation could best be implemented by establishing a court of public representatives in which a collegium of public jurors would decide the question of a defendant's guilt independently of a professional judge and then, together with the professional judge, the question of the sentence. What do judges, prosecutors and investigators of the internal affairs agencies think of this?

A poll has revealed that the establishment of such a court for mandatory consideration of cases of crimes carrying the maximum penalty was favored by 28.3 percent of 212 polled judges, 22.1 percent out of 68 investigators, and 20.3 percent out of 64 prosecutors. The establishment of such a court invested with greater authority, including consideration, at a defendant's request, of other categories of cases involving serious crimes, was favored by another 42 percent of the judges, 33.8 percent of the investigators, and 39.1 percent of the prosecutors. On the other hand, 23.6 percent of the judges, 29.4 percent of the investigators, and 34.4 percent of the prosecutors felt that there was no need for such a court.

Thus, the polled jurists supported the idea of a court of public representatives, though the degree of that support varied. How should one interpret the fact that judges voiced the greatest support and prosecutors the least? It is probably necessary to reckon with the professional peculiarities of these two groups. A court of public representatives would enhance the independence of judges and thereby facilitate their work. But such a court would also increase the demands on proof and make the outcome of court proceedings considerably less predictable for prosecutors than now. It is hardly surprising that more prosecutors than judges opposed the idea of a court of public representatives. What is gratifying is that so many prosecutors favor it, for this means that their concerns for justice take precedence over parochial concerns.

The resolution "On Legal Reform" stresses the need to provide much greater guarantees for the implementation of such principles of Soviet legal procedure as competition, openness, unswerving implementation of the presumption of innocence, the impermissibility of either placing too much emphasis on the indictment or letting off those who have encroached against Soviet law. Implementation of these provisions will require a whole range

of measures. One of them is the proposed establishment of court supervision of the investigation process. An inquest judge would decide on questions such as the degree of restriction of movement [of a suspect], response to defense petitions, committing a defendant to trial, or quashing a case. The introduction of an inquest judge would most decisively facilitate the principle of competitiveness during the preliminary investigation. This proposal was supported by 75.5 percent of the judges, 44.1 percent of the investigators, and 29.7 percent of the prosecutors; opposition was voiced by, respectively, 13.2, 45.6, and 48.4 percent. Once again, we are faced with the question of how to interpret the differences in the responses of judges, investigators and prosecutors. The principle of competitiveness, for which it is proposed to introduce the position of inquest judge, is to a large degree promoted during court hearings. A judge sees competitiveness "at work," he is fully cognizant of the advantages of competitiveness, which makes it possible to review all aspects of a case, establish the truth, and make a fair decision. It is precisely because of their understanding of the role of competitiveness in the legal process that 41.6 percent of the judges rated "inequality of prosecution and defense before the court" as a shortcoming of our system of criminal law (similar responses were given by 11.8 percent of the investigators, and 6.3 percent of the prosecutors). For the same reason 62.3 percent of the judges indicated "indictment bias" as another shortcoming (as compared with 20.6 percent of the investigators and 40.6 percent of the prosecutors). That is why judges are so much more resolutely in favor of the idea of an inquest judge than investigators or prosecutors. As for the responses offered by prosecutors, a more thorough analysis is called for. As mentioned before, 40.6 percent rated "indictment bias" as a shortcoming. However, responding to a question on the difficulty of work, which includes such incompatible duties as supervision of the investigation, support of the state indictment, and assuring due process, 57.8 percent of the prosecutors chose a response to the effect that a principled prosecutor would always be able to remain objective and perform his duty. This view was shared by 19.1 percent of the investigators and 9.4 percent of the judges. An opposite variant of the question, according to which a prosecutor's objectivity should depend less on personal qualities than on organizational and legal statutes, was preferred by 86.3 percent of the judges, 77.9 percent of the investigators, and 35.9 percent of the prosecutors. Why is it that prosecutors are so reluctant to take a negative view of their conflicting situation, which creates so many difficulties for them? It should be borne in mind that responses to questions are influenced by people's self-judgments, and if necessary a self-defense reflex comes into play. If I as a prosecutor concede that my professional status necessarily contributes to bias and subsequently prejudice, such a recognition inevitably casts aspersion on me. But if I claim that a principled prosecutor will always be able to maintain his objectivity and perform his legal duty, I thereby set up a psychological defense which precludes any negative self-evaluation. After all, everyone thinks that he is that principled

person who never succumbs to the demands deriving from his official position. People should not be judged for wanting to respect themselves, but this desire must be taken into account when analyzing their responses. Such an analysis makes it possible to claim that the interests of justice are reflected less in the attitudes of prosecutors and investigators towards the introduction of inquest judges than in the attitudes of judges. The introduction of inquest judges is one of the guarantees of competitiveness and unswerving observation of the presumption of innocence.

Another important method of enhancing competitiveness and assuring unswerving observation of the principle of the presumption of innocence is greater involvement of defense attorneys in the preliminary investigation and court proceedings, also mentioned in the resolution "On Legal Reform." According to our poll, 63.7 percent of the judges agree that defense attorneys should be involved in the legal process from the time a suspect is apprehended, 33 percent favor involvement from the time of arraignment, and 2.4 percent oppose any such expansion of defense rights. Among investigators the responses were, respectively, 41.2, 47.1, and 10.3 percent; among prosecutors, 37.5, 56.3, and 4.7 percent. Views of judges, investigators and prosecutors are similar with respect to detention: 22.6 percent of the judges, 28.1 percent of the prosecutors, and 16.2 percent of the investigators opposed detention prior to indictment; 52.4 percent of the judges, 26.5 percent of the investigators, and 15.6 percent of the prosecutors favored detention of a suspect, but only during the preliminary investigation and at the discretion of the inquest judge; finally, 22.2 percent of the judges, 57.4 percent of the investigators, and 56.3 percent of the prosecutors favored existing procedures. In assessing these responses it is necessary to take into account that the problems discussed are professionally closer to the concerns of investigators and prosecutors than judges. They understandably view involvement of the defense in the early stages of a criminal case and restrictions on detention as making their work more difficult. There is no escaping from this consideration: it is necessary to reduce its negative impact, for example, by changing the system of performance evaluation (70.6 percent of the investigators, 60.9 percent of the prosecutors, and 58.5 percent of the judges consider the deficiencies of such evaluations to be a shortcoming of our system of criminal law). Furthermore, it should be noted that the responses of prosecutors reflect involvement in criminal prosecution to the detriment of the prosecutorial task of upholding the rights of citizens, including suspects and defendants, without which a legal state is impossible.

Although on the whole the responses of judges to the poll were more in line with the interests of justice than those of prosecutors and investigators, the fact that there is no unanimity among judges cannot be overlooked. This would suggest that responses are influenced not only by specific work experience. But by what?

The poll revealed that 60 out of 212 polled judges, or 28.3 percent, favored the institution of a court of public representatives for mandatory consideration of cases that could draw the maximum penalty; 50 judges, or 23.6 percent, opposed the idea of a court of public representatives. Let us compare the responses of resolute supporters of a court of public representatives with those of their opponents to other poll questions. Perhaps there is some dividing line?

Those favoring a court of public representatives were more prone than its opponents to consider that: the current criminal justice system requires radical reform (69.7 against 22 percent); charging prosecutors with supervision of the investigation, support of the state indictment, and monitoring legality inevitably creates difficulties and leads to errors in the investigation and in court (92 against 70 percent); the right to defense is inadequately enforced (30.3 against 12 percent). Among those favoring a court of public representatives there were more who accepted the establishment of an inquest judge (83.2 percent against 56 percent), favored an attorney's involvement in the legal process from the time of a suspect's apprehension (74.2 against 42 percent), opposed arrest during the preliminary investigation prior to indictment (53.9 against 39 percent), favored giving witnesses the right not to answer incriminating questions (67.4 against 36 percent).

Furthermore, those favoring a court of public representatives were more likely to favor reducing the death sentence in new criminal legislation (55 against 36 percent) or eliminating it altogether (14.6 against 6 percent). Finally, those who favored a court of public representatives generally sided with the view that the best way to enhance law and order was to encourage civic activity and public involvement in all people (88.8 against 68 percent).

What is typical in the responses of those opposing the idea of a court of public representatives? What answers predominated among them? They were more likely to consider that: our system of criminal justice is good enough and it only has to be rid of unconscientious and unqualified people (36 against 24.7 percent); the current procedure is too complex and includes unnecessary formalities (46 against 31.5 percent); a principled prosecutor can handle both indictment and supervision (22 against 5.6 percent); there is no need for inquest judges (26 against 6.7 percent). They were more likely to favor having attorneys involved in the process only after handing down the indictment (52 against 23.6 percent) and incarceration during the preliminary investigation before indictment and throughout the investigation (38 against 22.5 percent), and to oppose immunity for witnesses (46 against 24.7 percent). The majority of those opposing a court of public representatives favored retaining the death sentence in new criminal legislation at the current level (50 against 25.8 percent) and considered that to strengthen law and order it was more important to have greater control over people's behavior (26 against 10 percent).

Thus, the differences between the responses of those favoring and opposing a court of public representatives are hardly accidental. On the contrary, there is a direct relationship between the responses of each group. They display a logic of their own. It can be said that support of a court of public representatives reflects a democratic approach to the legal perceptions of professional jurists while opposition to such a court reflects an authoritarian view.

The democratic view holds that the law is stronger than administrative fiat, that fighting crime should not preclude the protection of individual rights, and that punishment must be humane. As opposed to this, the authoritarian view holds that administrative fiat is above the law, all means are justified in fighting crime, and punishment must always be severe.

The democratic view is most fully embodied in the competitive process, the authoritarian in the investigative. Neither of these processes exists in pure form. Nor do the aforementioned views exist in pure form: we are dealing with concepts which invariably simplify and demean reality. With this reservation it can be said that both views are always present in the legal consciousness of different social groups, in the legal conscience of jurists. The issue is which of them predominates, and among whom.

The administrative-command system of government in our society reflected the authoritarian view, required and nurtured it. Perestroika, on the contrary, reflects the democratic view, requires and nurtures it. One of the factors facilitating a radical legal reform is the democratic view which we have found in the legal consciousness of professional jurists: judges, prosecutors, and investigators

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Yuridicheskaya Literatura," zhurnal SOVETSKAYA YUSTITSIYA, 19889681

Kirghiz MVD Chief on Corruption, Internal Reforms

18000247 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 10 Nov 88 p 3

[Interview with Major General of Militia Viktor Vasilyevich Goncharov, Kirghiz SSR minister of internal affairs, by correspondent A. Galunichev; date and place not given]

[Text] [Galunichev] Viktor Vasilyevich, in an interview with you exactly a year ago we talked about the initial changes in the republic's internal affairs agencies. How far has restructuring advanced during this time? What is the operational situation in Kirghizia today?

[Goncharov] We have, of course, progressed further. In following the general laws of restructuring, our republic's internal affairs agencies are conducting a search for

fundamentally new work forms and methods to strengthen socialist legality and law and order. First of all, there is glasnost and reliance on public opinion.

The republic's press is more and more frequently publishing information on the status of the struggle against crime, briefings and "round table" discussions on television are being conducted, and "telephones of trust" have become a practice. Direct ties with the population are being expanded. Open letter days, the reception of citizens in housing areas and enterprises, meetings of the directors of our subunits with worker collectives, and reports by militia district inspectors to the population are being organized.

In a word, the militia's work has become more open to the press and to public monitoring. Indications of the strengthening of citizen trust in the militia are being perceived. The number of statements and reports from citizens about transgressions of the law have increased by 23 percent this year. In this respect, approximately 2,000 more criminal proceedings have been instituted. Of course, crime statistics have begun to "look" worse—an increase of 21 percent. However, it is not this that disturbs us. The number of certain heinous crimes is increasing. The majority of them are being committed because of drunkenness and domestic conflicts. Theft, especially apartment burglaries, the stealing of automobile spare parts and items from automobiles, the theft of transport equipment and cattle, and thefts from organizations and state institutions represent the lion's share of the increase. These crimes have a strong effect on the interests of the citizens. We regularly warn the population about them through the press.

[Galunichev] However, technical safeguards against theft exist

[Goncharov] At the present time, 2,215 apartments in the republic have alarms. This is not very much—only two percent of the number of apartments with telephones. However, this two percent has not provided us with a single case of theft. However, there have been 309 thefts this year alone because the technical strengthening of rural bases, depots and stores with departmental protection was underestimated.

In this connection, the question of establishing—possibly on a cooperative basis—a single cost accounting subunit that would assume technical support for protecting state and cooperative installations and the apartments of citizens, including the equipping of housing entrances with coded locks and intercom systems, the reinforcing of doors and windows, and the equipping of automobiles with modern antitheft devices.

Doctors say that an illness is easier to prevent than to cure. This is also true in the criminal area. It is not simple to bring crimes, especially theft, to light—reports about them often arrive late. We are at fault here also. In September, the Kirghiz SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs

Collegium examined the shortcomings in the professional work to bring crimes to light and planned and implemented a series of concrete measures.

[Galunichev] The 19th All-Union Party Conference resolution "On Legal Reforms" talks about improving the work of the militia, raising the standards and professional competency of internal affairs agency employees, their very strict observance of socialist legality, eliminating abuses, ...

[Goncharov] We have begun to realize these requirements. The qualitative composition of personnel has been improved somewhat by increasing the number of specialists with a higher and secondary legal education and by raising the quality of course training. A school of reserves has begun to operate. We hope that competitive selection for working in the militia will provide good results. The State Motor Vehicle Inspectorate has conducted an experiment like this. The BKhSS apparatus is also starting to staff itself on a competitive basis.

The Collegium session examined the question "On Raising the General, Political and Legal Standards of Personnel in Kirghiz SSR Internal Affairs Agencies and Subunits." Universal compulsory education has been introduced in all subunits for those who do not have legal training.

A statute, which we developed for public spokesmen monitoring the implementation of legislation in medical sobering-up stations, admission and distribution points, temporary isolation wards, etc., has been in effect in the republic since March. The deputies, workers, employees, kolkhoz members, students, and other citizens included in these groups have the capability to inspect without warning (except for nighttime). In our opinion, this is also one of the specific ways to expand democratic principles in internal affair agencies.

[Galunichev] Democratization also presupposes the inevitability of accountability for violations and for abuses that are especially dangerous in your specific area.

[Goncharov] A strict and highly principled appraisal is given to any deviation from legality. During this year, 101 employees of the republic's internal affairs agencies have been punished for various violations. Increased attention is being paid to the observance of legality during the review of reports and statements from citizens about transgressions of the law and the struggle against so-called percentomania where the satisfactoriness of reports troubles our employees more, grossly distorting the actual status of crimes.

We and the procurator's office are conducting a continuous inspection of internal affairs agencies. Approximately a thousand cases of procrastination (many of a year's and two-years' standing), unjustified refusal to

institute criminal proceedings and the direct concealment of certain crimes from the register have been established. The severest measures have been taken against the guilty parties. PRAVDA wrote about two of these cases, which occurred in 1987 in Frunze, in the article entitled "A Distorting Mirror." The pursuit of a high percentage in uncovering crimes lies at the basis of such distortions. In connection with this, I can report that the criteria for evaluating work in accordance with the percentage of crimes solved has been officially rescinded this year.

[Galunichev] We recently celebrated the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Criminal Investigation Department. It was noted that the Criminal Investigation Department was, as before, on the forward edge of operational work.

[Goncharov] The Criminal Investigation Department primarily insures the most important task of the militia today—the inevitability of punishment for a crime. Restructuring is occurring ever more noticeably in its activity. Significantly more attention is being paid to analyzing crimes. The social portraits of specific figures in the criminal world are being investigated. We are aiming at discovering the reasons and conditions that contribute to antisocial displays. Much is being done to compensate those who have been kidnapped. All of this requires high professional knowledge and a large intellectual strain. Today, you see, Criminal Investigation Department employees must more and more frequently wage a struggle against legally well-grounded and extremely resourceful criminals. In many cases, crimes are committed in groups. In pursuing mercenary goals, these people resort to everything.... They carefully prepare for the crime and do not forget disguises and a convincing alibi.

[Galunichev] Viktor Vasilyevich, what you are saying is evidently connected with phenomena that evoke every kind of false rumor. There are quite a few publications now on the Mafia, brigandage and corruption. Here, for example, it is thought that the "lion has jumped." Did these processes really bypass our southern republic?

[Goncharov] Manifestations of the corruption characteristic of stagnation did not bypass our republic, of course. Organized criminal groups have existed and continue to be discovered. It is sufficient to recall the sensational affair of the Tokmakskiy Meat Combine, the robbery of the polytechnic institute's cashier, and a number of others. Investigation of embezzlement by a large group in the tobacco industry and the Oshskiy Cotton Production Association is continuing. However, this is still not a Mafia with its structure and special traditions.

I want to report that more decisive steps have recently been taken against organized crime. A special section for combating it has been established in the Kirghiz SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. Considering the inter-regional nature of group crimes, contacts have been strengthened with the internal affairs agencies of the

Kazak, Uzbek, Tajik, and Turkmen SSRs and a mutual exchange of operational information has been organized. Operational detachments are covering the border rayons in order to suppress the transport of narcotic raw material and stolen cattle and motor transport. The "Poppy" and "Surveillance" inter-republic operations have been conducted. The details, I think, are unnecessary since this information is primarily valuable to criminal elements.

[Galunichev] Do you think that unexpected incidents similar to the orgy of the rockers in a Moscow grocery store, the disturbances by youth in Andropov and Alapayevsk, the outrages in Morshansk and Kazan, not to mention the Transcaucasus where the militia has encountered far from ordinary situations, will catch the republic's militia unawares?

[Goncharov] One cannot fail to consider the danger of group disturbances—the more so since we also have had such incidents, though not of these scales. The fights in the city of Frunze between our youth and foreign pupils are still fresh in memory. Party, Soviet and law enforcement agencies have drawn serious conclusions from these events and have adopted and are carrying out a series of measures. It is no accident that a decrease in juvenile crime was noted this year. I think that it is necessary to strengthen and expand this success.

We have at our disposal forces that are well trained to suppress disturbances. The special motorized subunits of the patrol and post services of the militia and internal forces form their basis.

However, it is necessary to teach democracy to everyone, including the militia. Relying on force cannot always lead to the desired results. That is why it is necessary to develop an ability to convince people that our requirements are correct. Unfortunately, however, militia personnel at times still lack this ability. We are seemingly undergoing a test and a baptism of democracy. There is still much to be learned during the course of events.

[Galunichev] Is it now possible to sum up some results of the half-year experiment in isolating the investigation apparatus in the depths of the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs?

[Goncharov] The experiment in separating investigation subunits from the subordination of internal affairs agencies at the local areas is being conducted for the purpose of establishing a single and independent investigative service within the Ministry of Internal Affairs system, which would be free from pressure from any side. This staff will investigate all categories of crimes, including those on which the procurator's investigators now work.

If one is to talk about the initial results of the experiment, they are not simple ones. To a certain degree, they are beginning to justify our expectations for raising the

quality of investigations. The absolute number of criminal cases, which are returned for additional investigation, has been reduced. Investigators have begun to approach more carefully and weightily the solution of such an important matter as election as a measure for suppressing an arrest. The investigation is gradually being freed from its accusatory bias.

However, it is necessary to state frankly that our investigators lag behind modern requirements in organizing the solving of crimes. They have not become the pioneers, leaders and coordinators of other services in the internal affairs agencies in arranging this work. The experiment has still not proven itself along this avenue.

[Galunichev] Last year, there were many arguments about the participation of lawyers in the preliminary investigation, and a discussion is already taking place about lawyers being on duty at militia rayon departments. What do you see as the future of these acts?

[Goncharov] The consistency principle of the investigation, accusation and defense undoubtedly leads to justice and fairness. The laws of the Kirghiz SSR provide a rather wide circle of cases which permit the participation of a defense counsel at an early stage of the investigation, i.e., from the moment of the accusation. This applies to crimes by juveniles, the dumb, the deaf, the blind, and other persons who because of their physical or psychological shortcomings cannot exercise their right to defend themselves.

Kirghizia is one of the few republics where legislation permits the participation of a lawyer in the review of cases concerning administrative transgressions of the law. We do not prevent lawyers from using all their work forms. If questions concerning the expansion of the participation of lawyers in other areas of a preliminary investigation in the internal affairs agencies are to be solved legislatively, we are prepared to create the best conditions for this.

[Galunichev] Two reports—"Vodka" in VECHERNYY FRUNZE and "How To Conquer Karpinka" in SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA—were published in September. Both newspapers sounded an alarm over the eruption around the wine and vodka speculation, violations in trade and the home-brewing boom. The question of introducing legal measures for this category of people has been raised. What is your opinion?

[Goncharov] The positive positions won in the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism are well known. Nevertheless, we cannot close our eyes to the negative—we do not have the right—including speculation in wine and vodka items and home-brew. This is one of the results of the excesses, of the voluntary methods and of prohibition in the struggle against drunkenness. Many, for example, have paid attention to the fact that it was worthwhile to increase the number of points selling spirits in Frunze to 61 in October; as lines shortened,

profiteering subsided. Of course, this is no solution to the question. The CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Progress in Fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee Decrees on Questions Concerning the Strengthening of the Struggle Against Drunkenness and Alcoholism" suggests a way to intensify and further attack the evil. Just as before, no small role is allotted to the militia. The mentioned publications correctly point out that the initiative of our agencies in the struggle against speculation and home-brewing is legislatively constrained. The decree recommends that the necessary changes be introduced in the anti-alcohol laws. There is no need to talk about the fact that it is necessary to arouse all of society in order to resolutely strengthen opposition to this vice. Passivity here is just as dangerous as extremes.

Mironenko on Komsomol, Youth Problems

18000220 Moscow OGONEK in Russian
No 44, Oct 88 pp 1, 2, 20-21

[Interview with V. I. Mironenko, first secretary of the All-Union Leninist Komsomol Central Committee, by Vladimir Shakhidzhanyan, place, date, and occasion not specified]

[Text][Shakhidzhanyan] Viktor Ivanovich, I would be interested to know how one becomes first secretary of the All-Union Leninist Komsomol Central Committee. Tell us about yourself.

[Mironenko] I have a very ordinary biography. My father was born in the Ukraine. My parents lived in the Far East. My father graduated from a veterinary institute, and mother was a meat and dairy industry engineer. They got married before the war. Then my father was sent to study in a military school. He became an aviation engineer. He left for the front. After the war my parents moved to the Ukraine. At that time people were being sent to the liberated regions for soviet and party work. At first father worked in the apparatus of the party obkom. Then he became chairman of the ispolkom in the rayon center. He was elected first secretary of the party raykom, but he only managed to work 2 or 3 months. He died young, at the age of 45.

I have an older brother who was born one month after the war began. Mother lives with him in Kiev. She is already past 70 and ill. Unfortunately, we seldom see each other. All we do is talk on the telephone.

When my father died I was 7 years old, and my brother had then finished the first year at the Kharkov Aviation Institute.

Then I went to school. I worked a year at a factory. Incidentally, I tried to get into the department of journalism at Moscow State University.

[Shakhidzhanyan] You didn't get in?

[Mironenko] Everything was quite complicated. After finishing secondary school I decided to go to flight school, but I did not pass the medical exam. I worked for a year at a plant and studied at the Moscow State University preparatory extension school. I came to Moscow and decided I would enter the department of journalism. But I was naive and provincial and had no idea what was required for admission. Of course, I had no publications, which are essential for the creative competition. So they did not accept my documents. But there was a very fine woman there who advised me: If you really want to become a journalist, you will get the education and be able to realize your dream. So by education I am a historian. I prepared myself for scholarly work. I taught history at Chernigov Pedagogical Institute and was even preparing to defend my dissertation. Then I became carried away with Komsomol work. I began in the position of secretary of the Komsomol committee at the pedagogical institute, and now as you see, I am in this office.

[Shakhidzhanyan] And what problems, in the view of the first secretary of the All-Union Leninist Komsomol, are the most important ones in the youth movement today?

[Mironenko] The first one is the social health of young people under conditions of restructuring and what we are finding here is that when you begin to work one problem lead to the next. We recently began setting up the Igrushka joint-stock company. Toy production is a profitable business, with five rubles of profit per ruble of capital investment. The social return is even more important. Toys are produced by enterprises of light industry and by local industry. But they do a poor job of it. So we decided that the Komsomol would put in 50 million rubles while the Childrens Fund would put in 20 million, and the Peace Fund and the Cultural Fund would take shares. In all more than 100 million rubles is being collected! We figure to take in 40 plants, if the collectives of these plants are agreeable, of course. But I think that we will persuade them. In the meantime we have received the approval of the USSR Council of Ministry, the AUCCTU, and other organizations.

[Shakhidzhanyan] Viktor Ivanovich, is the Komsomol needed today? Would it be better to replace it with, say, a committee for youth affairs? Let it work on economic activity, improving everyday life and working conditions for young people, and defending their rights in all state and public organizations. There are too many things in the Komsomol that are just formality. The association which I am talking about would take into account the various interests of young people, including the so-called informals. There would be political clubs and associations of rock music fans. Let the people join together and help one another.

A significant share of young people today are at best indifferent to the Komsomol.

When you were elected first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee—although it seems to me personally that it was more like you were appointed—on your appointment certain hopes were expressed: an intelligent, educated, young (you are 35 years old now!), energetic, and charming man, and very importantly, you have gone through all the stages of growth in the Komsomol, and so you know everything good and bad in the Komsomol. Judging by your education you have a historical approach to evaluating particular phenomena. Preparations for the 20th Congress of the All-Union Leninist Komsomol, and the congress itself. All these things generally raised hopes. There were many interesting suggestions and it appeared to many people that they would very soon be carried out. But then some kind of decline set in. Why was that? The youth movement is one brick in a larger structure; it cannot be taken out. At best it can be repainted so that it does not stand out. Your predecessors, each in his own way, made appeals, talked, gave encouragement, conducted assemblies and congresses, listened to measured criticism from below, paid attention to criticism from above, and swore loyalty to ideas; but they themselves sometimes were busier preserving balance and getting along with everyone.

[Mironenko] I have thought about these questions. Happily, the time is past when posing such questions would arouse not only surprise, but a virtual accusation of anti-Sovietism. I agree with what you said, that I am not succeeding in many things, that I cannot do them. Let me emphasize, I alone will not be able to them. And even the secretaries and members of the buro—there are 28 of us—will not succeed. We will not succeed until everyone gets to work on this. Well, if not everyone, at least most people. There are 26.8 million Komsomol members today, a few million less than 3-4 years ago. I do not see any tragedy in the decline in the size of the Komsomol. On the contrary, this means that the mechanisms of self-purification have begun to operate within our organization. It is normalizing its health. Judging by everything my point of view is very different from yours on many points. I am an optimist, and believe me, that is not because of my work duties. Whether I was appointed or elected—that is a question for those who voted for me at the plenum and at the congress. Before becoming first secretary I was a member of the buro of the Komsomol Central Committee. It is not for me to say why I was the chosen candidate. But I am for elections with more than one candidate, say three, six, or seven. We are moving that way. But let us get back to the main question: One organization or many?

If we look at the international youth movement, it has various forms. There are four youth leagues in Poland, while Cuba has a young communists league and a student federation.

The Law on Young People is now being prepared. Once again much depends on those who represent the interests of the young people joined in our league. I understand that a great deal depends on us, that sometimes we are

simply unable to make use of all the rights we have. What is our trouble? To some degree we are monopolists: there is one youth organization. And naturally, like any monopoly, we are not guaranteed against stagnation, conservatism, and the development of bureaucracy. If the danger is not noticed in time, a situation like the one that once occurred in the Komsomol can develop.

If we talk about views of the Komsomol and predictions for the youth movement I would not be so bold as to say whether there are more pessimists or optimists. Do you understand me?

[Shakhidzhanyan] I understand you perfectly and even catch the underlying idea that there are more pessimists.

[Mironenko] Not at all. I am not giving an underlying meaning. I say what I think, what I am sure of. Let us assume that the Komsomol is disbanded. You will agree that young people will still need their own organization. The question arises: What kind of new one should be formed? Should several be formed? Should a federation be formed? I am not ready to answer whether that would be better. Therefore, let's not get away from reality, but talk sense. Any party tries to establish its own youth organization in order to influence the younger generation through this organization. But this organization must be independent in choosing its own activists, in the use of capital, and in working out the forms and methods of carrying out particular directives. I agree that the youth movement in our country needs a radical restructuring. But the main question concerns the content of the work. Dependent on this we can conduct a discussion about its forms.

We transferred the right to admit and expel and generally all the basic rights to the primary organizations. They can now elect their leaders in absolute freedom, without any pressure from above. Thirty percent of the primary Komsomol organizations elected leaders from slates of several candidates. In some cases they were probably just going through the motions. But we are fighting against efforts to nominate according to application data and nomenklatura lists.

Financial independence. Most of the money must remain with those who earned it, not flow to the Komsomol Central Committee. The money received in the Central Committee from Komsomol dues goes to maintain the tourist centers, vacation lodges, for publishing activities, and to pay Komsomol employees who are released from their primary jobs.

There is a lot of talk about reducing the bureaucratic apparatus. It must be reduced, but how? Set a percentage and issue an order, to be able to report later that the reduction was made! That will not produce anything. Let the Komsomol raykoms themselves decide what kind of staff they need. If they decide that they have to support two or three organizers on the money they receive, let them do that. If they decide that the money must be

spent to build a gymnasium or help the children's home, again that is their concern. Of course, a ceiling must be established, for there will be people who want to spend all the money maintaining the apparatus.

Wouldn't be better to establish a federation instead of the Komsomol? But why not put the questions this way: a Komsomol and a federation. How many people should there be in the Komsomol? I do not know. I only know that we have many people who are members without good reason. But I categorically oppose any kind of purge. The people in the Komsomol did not become passive all by themselves, and self-purging mechanisms are now gradually being instituted where the primary organizations decide directly who will be in the Komsomol and who will not, who will be admitted and who will be rejected. I will admit when I became first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee I did not have a complete idea of the difficulties I would encounter.

We have given a great deal of thought to how to solve the problems of college students. They are society's intellectual potential, the most energetic and critically-minded group. In my opinion the All-Union Student Council is a very effective organ. We have to think about giving it the right to delegate its own representatives to the Komsomol Central Committee.

As for informal associations, it does not hurt anyone to be a Komsomol member and at the same time a member of some particular interest-group association. If, of course, it does not contradict the Komsomol Charter. If it does contradict it, then let the young person make a choice where he wants to be. But as far as I know, 99 percent of the informal associations do not contradict the Charter in any way.

In the time since the Komsomol Congress we have been engaged in quiet political work. If we draw a comparison with a ship that has become obsolete and rundown, it would be possible to take cans of paint, repaint the ship's hull, and write on the side in large letters: "Restructuring, Democratization, Glasnost," and then let the ship sail off while everyone shouts "Hurrah!" But we aware that the ship has an engine room, a wheelhouse, and a captain's bridge, and that is where everything must be remade. To repaint the ship is simply to apply an outward luster, to do cosmetic repair. And I say that we have begun serious work: we have a great deal of labor yet to do. As for whether we should make one or several youth organizations? Let's wait, and experience will tell us.

It seems to me that all the Komsomol committees must get down to understanding people, and people must rise to understanding the fundamental interests of youth. I am talking about breadth of perspective, to see not only oneself in the organization, but also the organization as a whole.

[Shakhidzhanyan] You said that when you came to the Komsomol Central Committee you did not know what you would run into. Was that a misstatement?

[Mironenko] No, it was not. Many things really did seem a little different.

I think that there should be subdivisions in Gosplan and in the Bureau of Social Development of the USSR Council of Ministers which would work specially to promote solutions to specifically youth problems by target planning and allocating the necessary funds and resources.

In my opinion it would not be a bad idea to finance the young people's social initiatives accordingly. In order to give operational help through the MZhK's or to those who are engaged in scientific-technical creative work, and to youth theaters, studios, and musical collectives. Whether this is a state youth fund, an innovation bank, or something else we will find out from experience. We are working actively in this direction.

[Shakhidzhanyan] Viktor Ivanovich, often when questions that concern young people are being decided at institutes, factories, and plants they are discussed by the administration, the party committee, and the trade union committee, but the Komsomol just does what it is ordered to do. Moreover, everyone today feels a lack of attention. Telephone hotlines have appeared: if you feel bad, call up, and someone will try to help you. But there is a Youth League where they are supposed to understand and help you. But while the church is ready to forgive your sins, from the league you will receive a reprimand. I am talking about trust, sincerity. But in the Komsomol it often seems that everyone, especially the activists, are after privileges for themselves.

[Mironenko] In large part that is true, although there are significantly more exceptions to this rule. I am against any privileges tied to membership in the Komsomol. Whether it has to do with admission to higher educational institutions, receiving an apartment, deciding the question of a bonus for good work, job placement for Komsomol activists, or trips abroad.

For example, I am even against character references, including Komsomol ones. In all my life I have never read a single character reference that gave a real picture of the person.

At the same time I want membership in the Komsomol to be something that always distinguishes a person. It means that he, this person, wants to be more honest and sincere, and is trying to be more demanding of himself. If you like, it is a kind of vow: the person wants to raise himself to certain moral standards.

[Shakhidzhanyan] Viktor Ivanovich, I heard that your son has reached Komsomol age but is not joining the Komsomol?

[Mironenko] It is all true. I have two children, the younger is 9 and the older is 14. He has not joined the Komsomol yet.

[Shakhidzhanyan] They say that your relations with him are difficult. His teachers at school have many complaints about him. And he says, I am the son of the first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee.

[Mironenko] My son has not been fortunate. I come home late at night, and I leave early in the morning. It is that way everyday. And there are business trips. It hardly makes any sense to discuss my family problems now. Please understand me correctly. My son has his own life. Of course I want him to grow up to be an honest, sincere, good-hearted, and noble person. I want it very much.

If the son of a worker, engineer, teacher, or doctor receives a bad grade or criticism for behavior, no one gives it any special attention. There are always hard-working children and difficult children in school. But if the son of some well-known actor, writer, or political figure violates discipline or fails certain subjects, everyone begins reproaching him and pointing their finger: you are the son of so-and-so but look at you. Things are not so simple here. Let's go on to another question.

[Shakhidzhanyan] Young people's problems in the army. There are frequent cases of loss of respect for people, demeaning their honor and dignity, and senior men "pulling rank."

[Mironenko] I served in the army for 1 year after the institute. And like every real civilian, I wanted to get back to my customary affairs as quick as possible. I will not deny that the discipline and specifics of military service were very hard for me. I remember how our master sergeant would say to us: "You do not like the Rules of Guard Duty? That is your right, but don't forget that they are written in blood!" I became fully aware of the truth of these words during meetings with soldiers and officers at the front line in Afghanistan.

It has been 11 years since I served in the army. I cannot say that it was a year taken out of my life, that it gave me nothing. I saw another facet, another aspect of life. In the army I received physical conditioning and learned to get along with people. And I think that in the army, just as in the Komsomol or any other group, a great deal depends on you yourself. But when you talk about offending human dignity and "pulling rank," those are things we have to fight vigorously against.

[Shakhidzhanyan] Viktor Ivanovich, the Komsomol has its own press, and there are youth editorial offices in television and radio. In general, it seems to me that the youth editorial board has begun working in a much more interesting way. The "Viewpoint" program by itself is worth a lot! It seems to me that Komsomol workers underestimate television and do not use it enough.

[Mironenko] I agree. It is true that I remember after one interview on the "Viewpoint" program we received angry letters which said that we all should be fired from our jobs, above all the secretaries of the Komsomol Central Committee Mironenko, Shvetsov, and Ordzhonikidze. And this was only because we had finally appeared on the screen. It was not easy for me, as first secretary, to go on television. When I speak on my own behalf, when I express my personal opinion, people take it as the position of the Komsomol Central Committee. But all our decisions are made as a group.

Of course we could make more active use of our capabilities at KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and other press organs.

[Shakhidzhanyan] How are Komsomol workers paid?

[Mironenko] The wages of a secretary in a Komsomol raykom are 220 rubles. Once a year, when the secretary goes on vacation, he is given an additional month's salary. A Komsomol raykom generally has one vehicle, and it is usually a wreck. A secretary of a republic Komsomol Central Committee receives an average of 330 rubles. There are cases where we want a good person to come to work for us, but he refuses. He will be a miner or mining engineer earning 600-700 rubles. If he leaves to go to Komsomol work, he will lose two-thirds of his salary.

[Shakhidzhanyan] What is your salary?

[Mironenko] I receive 650 rubles. Take my work week, total up the hours, and divide. The work day goes from 0700 in the morning to 2300 at night. Saturdays are completely filled. As a rule I try to spend Sunday with my family, but I do not always manage to.

[Shakhidzhanyan] Your wife does not see you at home?

[Mironenko] Sometimes she does.

[Shakhidzhanyan] And what is her occupation?

[Mironenko] Teacher of English at a secondary school.

[Shakhidzhanyan] And in your opinion, how should careerism in the Komsomol be fought?

[Mironenko] That is probably one of the most difficult questions. The careerist simply "marches along". But how can we stop him? If a person feels organizational skills and taste for public work, that is good. I think that with the introduction of real elections we will be able to rid ourselves partially of careerists. Democratism and glasnost can do a great deal here.

[Shakhidzhanyan] You have already been first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee for 2 years now. Where, in your opinion, have you been unsuccessful? When you are alone in your office, all by yourself, you

probably have some special feelings. As I understand it, you wrote your own program, what you would do, how you would operate, what the distinctive features of your style are, and how and for what you would fight? Do you have your own program?

[Mironenko] Yes. At that time we did not have the kind of elections we are holding today. But even then it was clear to me that this suggestion needed to be brought to the Plenum of the Komsomol Central Committee and defended there. I remember that when I found myself alone in my office, I sat down at my desk, took a notebook—even today I always keep one at hand—and began making some notes for myself. You put the question a little tactlessly when you asked what have I not been able to do. I have not been able to do much more than I have been able to do. What is the reason? Probably I was not persistent and energetic enough. Possibly I did not have a full picture of the size of the problems I would have to face.

Therefore, I am far from having done all that I intended. I have been able to do a great deal together with secretary of the Central Committee Iosif Ordzhonikidze. He is an amazingly energetic, hard-working man. The Igrushka joint-stock society, the scientific-technical creativity system, and the MZhK centers in Moscow and throughout the country—these are our achievements. Together with my comrades I have been able to change the mechanism of internal democracy and resolve a number of financial questions. It seems to me that I was able to find support in the apparatus and involve thoughtful, interesting, energetic people. It was interesting what happened with my report at the 20th Komsomol Congress. It was the first time we had brought the entire report to the plenum. I remember that many people said: You are crazy, no one will ever let this report by. There was an argument, but we managed, yes we did!

Where have I not managed? I have not been able to bring many fairly simple ideas which were discussed at the congress to the oblast and rayon levels. So far I have not been able to break down the picture that some of the people I work with have of the Komsomol. I have not been able to draw more attention to the question of party guidance of the Komsomol in the party Central Committee. Many difficulties are arising in the local areas. Intervention by the party obkom in the affairs of the youth newspaper has occurred in Amur Oblast, where a complicated conflict occurred. Greater trust of the Komsomol in fact, and not in words. Greater support and faith.

[Shakhidzhanyan] How often have you met with the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee?

[Mironenko] These meetings take place at various events and at sessions of the Party Politburo. Of course they are not frequent, but this is because the problems that arise

and demand support from party organs are decided at the level of secretaries and heads of departments of the CPSU Central Committee. We are constantly receiving that help.

We have had a thorough discussion of the most fundamental issues concerning young people with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The statement of these problems was supported by the delegates to the conference and reflected in its decision. In general I think that one should not call on the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee simply to prove that you are present. Style is changing. Management by order is out. Real independence, more discussion, more trust, more faith in experiments.

[Shakhidzhanyan] What newspapers do you read?

[Mironenko] IZVESTIYA, PRAVDA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, and SOBESEDNIK. And also everything that is interesting in other publications. My assistant selects and marks what I need to read. I read everything that relates to youth problems.

[Shakhidzhanyan] The theater, movies, television?

[Mironenko] I seldom go to the movies. On television I watch the program "Vremya", and try to see "Viewpoint". I have seen performances at Oleg Tabakov's Theater. I am delighted at chances to go to the Bolshoi Theater. I had an amazing time during the 27th party congress. We did no drinking, there were no big dinners in the evening, and for 7 or 8 days I was able to see a great deal in the theaters.

[Shakhidzhanyan] Are you an absolute teetotaler?

[Mironenko] It would not be honest to say absolute. I sometimes have a drink. But you know, it takes too much time. Not the process itself, but what is associated with it: guests, conversation. Why should I spend 4 hours on that? I do not feel any desire to drink in order to relax.

[Shakhidzhanyan] You are a state figure, and in a certain sense you do not belong to yourself. To what degree do you feel this?

[Mironenko] In the last 3 years I have simply felt freedom. I do not look over my shoulder and I say what I think.

[Shakhidzhanyan] And if someone states to you a point of view that differs sharply from your own, are you subject to being convinced, can your mind be changed?

[Mironenko] I will admit that at first it makes me angry. I sometimes blame myself for reacting too sharply and immediately trying to prove that I am right. Many times I have said to myself: Wait a minute, calm down, let a little

time pass; you have to think everything over, and then you can accept or reject it. I fight with myself. I have been in many situations where I changed my point of view under the influence of colleagues. But sometimes I stubbornly insist on my own point of view. If I have an opinion I will defend it, argue, and try to convince others. You must be able to get your way, to finish what you have begun.

Health Official Denies Widespread Psychiatric Abuses

18120043 Moscow NEW TIMES in English
No 43, Oct 88 pp 41-43

[Interview with Alexander Churkin, chief psychiatrist at the USSR Health Ministry of Health, by Lev Yelin, observer for NEW TIMES]

[Text] [Question] The view that psychiatry in the USSR is used to clamp down on dissidents is not exclusive to the Western press. Academician Sakharov has written on the subject, and some of our readers also believe it to be true. How would you comment on this?

[Answer] Recently television showed a documentary film, "The Secrets of the Third Basket," which includes an episode about three patients undergoing compulsory treatment in a special mental hospital in Kazan. In the West all three of them are described as "dissidents illegally held in a mental asylum," and their names figure on all the "lists" frequently sent to us. I don't think the film director's choice of facts was fortuitous. From a psychiatrist's point of view, the cases of these three patients can be used as graphic examples to demonstrate all aspects of the problem....

The following is the diagnosis given for the patients in question by laymen friends of mine, based on what they saw in the television programme. That the first patient, who aired his deranged ideas, suffered from a serious mental illness was self-evident to each of them. On the second, who was "fighting to build a new society" and staging explosions in public places, opinion was divided: those who thought him normal referred in their arguments to members of Narodnaya Volya (People's Freedom), the "red brigades" and other political organizations that resorted to terror to achieve their ends.... As for the third, who had begun his "political career" in a prison camp where he served a term for vicious hooliganism, my acquaintances unanimously pronounced him normal.... Well, I am extremely familiar with the lives and case histories of all three. I have no doubt whatsoever that they suffer from mental disturbances which qualified them as not answerable for their actions, and relieved them from criminal responsibility.

In my opinion, the until recently closed nature of our society in general and even more closed nature of psychiatric matters in particular proved a major cause of rumour and talk. The pall of secrecy over normal "dissidents" and mentally ill "dissidents," lack of extensive

fair information about them and society's ignorance of the symptoms and forms of development of mental illness all led to a situation in which some regarded all dissidents without exception as mentally ill, while others were convinced that, on the contrary, absolutely all of them were normal.... The information gap led to rumours, speculation and sometimes propaganda fabrications.

[Question] Have you personally ever dealt with this problem? If so, have you yourself ever encountered questionable practices?

[Answer] In recent years I have had to deal a lot with the question of mentally ill "dissidents." Almost 300 case histories have been thoroughly analyzed and I venture to say that I have come upon none where the psychiatrists had pronounced an obviously normal person mentally ill, not to mention an official "policy," as some in the West try to allege.... At the same time, I have to admit that I have sometimes stumbled on cases of so-called hyperdiagnosis, where the symptoms and severity of the mental disturbance were less pronounced than those diagnosed by the specialists.

[Question] As for example?

[Answer] For example, the case of Bashkir Nizametdin Akhmetov. This man committed repeated crimes, and while serving his term began to write verse, I would say of an anti-Soviet nature. Presently it was smuggled abroad. Before long Akhmetov was awarded a literary prize in the FRG. Akhmetov suffered from an obvious form of mental illness, and the psychiatrists who examined him pronounced him not answerable for his actions and sent him for compulsory treatment.... Now, however, the USSR Ministry of Health experts, on reviewing the case history, have arrived at the conclusion that the degree of mental disturbance was not so grave as to qualify him as unaccountable for his actions.... Anna Mikhailenko, a resident of the Odessa Region who is well known in the West (she had written and distributed anti-Soviet texts), was hospitalized in a special mental clinic. To my mind, this was an unjustifiably harsh measure, and judging from her condition, Mikhailenko could have been sent for compulsory treatment in an ordinary mental home....

[Question] Where is she now?

[Answer] At home. Upon completing the course of treatment, forensic medicine experts pronounced her sound.

[Question] You said that some 300 dissidents' case histories have been analyzed, but have so far referred to only two diagnostic efforts. What was the full number?

[Answer] Experts put the number at 18. But, mind you, these are retrospective assessments. By diagnostic error I mean cases of hyperdiagnosis such as Akhmetov's or a

wrong choice of treatment enforced by a ruling in court, as in the case of Mikhailenko. It is not my intention to vindicate any of my colleagues, but, believe me, the diagnosis of mental disorders is a very complex thing and mistakes occur as they do, incidentally, in other medical disciplines as well. Moreover, mindful of the fact that psychiatry tends to have a marked social aspect, regardless of the system of government, one cannot discount the factor of social consciousness also having an influence on the psychiatrist. For instance, how should one regard an attempt at self-immolation in Red Square? Which is it, behavior compelled by the paranoid raving of a madman, or an act of self-sacrifice? It is impossible to know for sure unless we painstakingly examine the life and specific personality features of the individual concerned, not forgetting that doctors also vary in their professional skill....

[Question] Do you know of cases where psychiatry is used anywhere in the world to suppress dissidents?

[Answer] I am not familiar with specific data.... Amnesty International, however, has made such charges against a whole number of socialist, developing and capitalist countries. I cannot say how well founded these are. For example, I have read in the foreign press of psychotropic drugs being used to achieve "behavior modification" in U.S. and British prisons. But is it true, I wonder?...

On the other hand, all civilized countries have laws exempting the mentally ill from penal servitude, which includes sentences for crimes against the state or government. Therefore there are clinics for mental patients who have committed offences in many countries, including the U.S., Britain, France, Canada....

[Question] What factors now determine the need to hospitalize a mental case? What has changed since the adoption early this year of the rules on conditions and procedures for providing psychiatric aid?

[Answer] The law now provides for the hospitalization in mental clinics of people who volunteer for treatment, patients delivered by means of the ambulance service because of mental conditions that constitute a danger to themselves and others, or those who have committed acts that are dangerous to society and are recognized by a court as not responsible for their actions and sent for compulsory treatment. The list of medical indications for urgent hospitalization has been drastically reduced, and social indications have been removed from the list altogether. In all cases of urgent hospitalization, the patients' relatives and the chief psychiatrist of the senior medical authority are notified, and the patient is examined within the first twenty-four hours by a group of psychiatrists to decide whether hospitalization is justified. In the event of prolonged treatment in a mental clinic, the question of whether the treatment could be terminated or continued is considered by the board of doctors at the clinic every month and by the chief psychiatrist's commission every six months. The new

regulations have led to a reduction in the number of hospitalizations, and today from 10 to 30 percent of beds in mental hospitals are empty.

[Question] Could you give your assessment of recent specific instances when unlawful hospitalizations have taken place and been reported in the Soviet press?

[Answer] The USSR Ministry of Health has thoroughly examined all these facts. Summing up, I can say that absolutely all hospitalized patients have proved to be suffering from mental disturbances beyond any doubt, though the same cannot be said, however, of the justifiability of hospitalization in some cases.... The current regulations strictly stipulate the indications for hospitalization without the patient's consent, i.e., when he poses danger to himself and those around him. However, in some cases, featured in the press, these indications were not present and hospitalization was carried out in violation of the instructions. Those at fault are severely punished, but I am worried, however, that some doctors are still making the decision to hospitalize too lightly, as they did until recently.... Therefore much has now to be done to change traditional approaches to dispensing psychiatric help.

The democratization of Soviet society has also had an impact on the approach to the compulsory treatment of the mentally ill guilty of committing anti-state and anti-Soviet acts. Now only those anti-Sovietists who are also guilty of encroachments on citizens' life and health are still kept in mental hospitals. The rest have been transferred to ordinary mental hospitals or allowed to go home. Some of them later emigrated to the West.

[Question] Again I would like you to give examples....

[Answer] Here is one case. Vassily Shipilov, born 1928. He faced trial several times for violating residence rules and for vagrancy. Then, in the late 1950s, he was charged with anti-Soviet propaganda. The court, however, called his sanity into question, and Shipilov was sent to the Professor Serbsky Central Scientific Research Institute of Forensic Psychiatry for examination. There a commission of medical experts certified him schizophrenic and recommended that the court send him for compulsory treatment. The patient was held in special mental asylums until the court revoked the compulsory treatment. In late 1987 Shipilov was transferred to the Krasnoyarsk mental hospital and later was put into a boarding home for the mentally deranged, as having neither a place to live, nor any relatives to depend on.

In 1987, different organizations in Britain began to show great interests in Shipilov. A clergyman chained himself to the railings in Trafalgar Square as a protest against "the illegal confinement of clergyman Shipilov." As for his interest in religion, Shipilov had developed it over the previous year or two. He had only had four years at

school and had never had any religious education. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher also raised the Shipilov question during her visit to the USSR.

In June 1988 Shipilov received an invitation from British human rights "champions," was dismissed from the home and left for London. I can well imagine his hosts' disappointment upon getting such a mental case on their hands.

[Question] What are the relations between the USSR Ministry of Health, on the one hand, and the Ministry of the Interior and the KGB on the other, with regard to the hospitalization of people who make anti-Soviet statements?

[Answer] The relations between psychiatrists and law-enforcement officers rest on the basis of legislative and normative acts and among other things, on Clause 4 of the above Regulations, which states that "the psychiatrist, when performing his duties related to giving medical aid to the mentally ill and preventing them from perpetrating socially hazardous acts, is independent in his decisions, and governed only by medical indications and the law." Therefore, when militia or KGB officers arrest a citizen for anti-Soviet behavior, and if they have any doubts about his mental condition, they turn for consultation to a psychiatrist who examines the patient, and only in cases where the above medical indications are manifest, does he make a decision on urgent hospitalization in a mental clinic. In doubtful cases, the doctor recommends carrying out a statutory forensic-medical examination.

However, we know of cases where psychiatrists have failed to come up to the mark in such situations. A case described in the newspaper Moscow News provides an example of this. A medical student tried to enter the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, but was apprehended by militiamen. The young psychiatrist called by them for consultation made the decision to hospitalize the detainee. Incidentally, no pressure, as it later transpired, was exerted on the doctor by the militia.... When the detainee was brought to a mental clinic, the more experienced doctors who examined him there could not find any grounds for urgent hospitalization, and he was immediately allowed to go home....

[Question] How many mental hospitals are there in the USSR? Can Western representatives visit them? Has this question ever been raised?

[Answer] There are now about 700 mental homes and psycho-neurological clinics with in-patient departments. Moreover, this year the Ministry of the Interior is giving us 11 special mental hospitals designed for the compulsory treatment of particularly dangerous mental cases. The other such homes will be dismantled. Ordinary mental hospitals have never been closed to visits from foreign specialists, and every year hundreds of our foreign colleagues visit them. We have offered and continue to offer psychiatrists from abroad the opportunity personally to examine the people they take an interest in.

When examining patients here in the Soviet Union, most psychiatrists agree that they are suffering from mental illnesses, but are not in a hurry to admit it at home.... Several years ago a delegation of Austrian psychiatrists headed by Professor Harrer visited the USSR. They examined some "dissidents"—mental cases. Professor Harrer published an article in which he acknowledged that all of them really were mentally ill. At home in Austria, the mass media and his colleagues boycotted him.

There is a tentative arrangement that in November a delegation of American psychiatrists will come to the USSR and be able to meet any patients and visit any mental hospitals of their choice, including special mental asylums.

We have no secrets from our foreign colleagues now that they are talking openly about our problems—the more so as problems in psychiatry exist the world over.

Lithuania's Cardinal, Party Officials on Church-State Relations

*18000188a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
13 Oct 88 pp 1, 3*

[Unattributed report: "A Meeting With the Cardinal"]

[Text] On 11 October in the building of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, Comrades R. Songayla, V. Astrauskas, V. Sakalauskas, and L. Shepetic met with the chairman of the Bishop's Conference of the Lithuanian Catholic Church, apostolic administrator of the Kayshyador diocese Cardinal V. Sladkyavichyus. P. Anilenis, an official representative from the LiSSR Council on Religious Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers, also participated in the meeting.

Beginning the discussion, V. Astrauskas noted that the community of Soviet Lithuania heartily approved of the appointment of V. Sladkyavichyus to the position of cardinal. "You work much, you meet with people, your word carries weight," said V. Astrauskas, addressing the cardinal. "Your announcements in the press and your thoughts on the importance of moral upbringing facilitate bringing the people closer together and instilling in them a sense of responsibility for the future of Lithuania. We have common points of contact. There can be more of them, and it is heartening that our positions on this question are drawing closer together. During the great organization of our society we must review many things from the experience of the past, and change them. First of all, we must eliminate everything which might cause mistrust and confrontation. This is achieved by means of democratization of life and maximal consideration for the varied demands of the people."

R. Songayla stressed that man and his welfare, including also spiritual, is today the center of attention. A high moral outlook mobilizes people to a common cause, which is particularly necessary today. In recent years much has been done in the republic to improve the economic situation. However, many questions which are important for the people still await resolution. It is important for the people to feel that perestroika is being implemented seriously and entails positive changes. Today, for example, if we speak of construction of an enterprise, we are no longer speaking just of building the industrial buildings, but of integrated construction—of housing, kindergartens, schools, and stores. The interests of the individual person are the main thing. We strive to see that such changes in thinking become confirmed everywhere. We must all try to see that the command style and coarseness disappear from our lives, that people have primary convictions and teach [each other] to live and work honestly.

R. Songayla recalled that many priests saved people from the terror of the Hitlerites. These were noble deeds. Lithuania has not forgotten them.

V. Sakalauskas said that the success of any endeavor, any plan, requires good intentions. For example, we can build the best purification structures. Yet a dishonest person does not need them. He will still pollute nature.

Recently, through the wishes of Lithuania's faithful, many questions of construction, repair and restoration have been resolved. Yet we are once again receiving signals, said V. Sakalauskas, that in the rayons sometimes even minor household questions turn into big problems. This is not right. This should not be! We must regard the needs of the church communities in a kindly manner and try to help them whenever possible. We in the Council of Ministers have positively resolved all questions which were brought before us. Bureaucrats can ruin many things in the relations between the authorities and the church. We are decisively combatting [these bureaucratic actions] and will continue to do so.

L. Shepetis focused attention on the fact that recently many ideological categories have taken on a new tone. Our generation must return them to an active spiritual usage, correct the errors committed when in the past much was dehumanized. Here we must honestly say to each other: for each of us individually, relying only on our own judgement, it is difficult and hardly fruitful to solve problems of moral upbringing. Moreover, there is no serious basis for such a schism. Here the interests of the secular authorities and church coincide in many ways. We must support each other. Those who are really worried about what the current generation lives on and how the future ones will live have said: the Lithuanian Catholic Church never called upon us not to work. Isn't that enough? After all, this is one of the cornerstones of formulating responsibility in man, a lucid individual.

Today in the republic, where innovative phenomena engendered by perestroika are being born, the need is particularly strong for mutual understanding and consolidation. I believe that the appropriate appeal by the church would be very beneficial, especially since we have numerous examples of [the church] treating our requests kindly.

Cardinal V. Sladkyavichyus gave a positive evaluation of the increased attention to spirituality which is being felt everywhere. "The concern for 'our daily bread' must necessarily be combined with life's moral requirements. Today the living people are speaking out everywhere. In order to create something good, it is necessary first of all to follow the path of nurturing, and not uprooting, said the cardinal. Yet there was a time when they strived only to uproot... There was a lack of unity, perhaps. We did not understand the need for it. Without wanting to do so, we felt ourselves to be enemies."

"We would like to see," continued the cardinal, that mistakes are corrected more clearly. Mistrust still exists. One of its sources is the fact that the independence of the bishops is limited. Yet it is not the laws which are to blame for this and which, as we know, will also be

improved, but the various outdated instructions. The Lithuanian bishopric is not inclined toward confrontation. I am speaking here in the name of all our bishops. Yet the mistrust which still exists gives us great pain."

This problem of the relations between state authority and the church which the cardinal brought up in the conversation was immediately discussed. It was acknowledged that the practice on the question of the independence of bishops which has prevailed up to the present time does not fully correspond to the demands of the present day. They agreed to again soon review the possibilities of how, without violating the existing laws, to make the resolution of certain procedural questions more flexible and viable.

Cardinal V. Sladkyavichyus spoke of the return of the church of St. Kazimir in Vilnius to the faithful. The response was that the question of transferring the Museum of Atheism and returning the church is being resolved.

There was an exchange of opinions on the question which the cardinal brought up regarding the interests of the faithful, so that the building of the present-day Art Gallery—the former Cathedral Church—be returned for spiritual needs. A discussion followed: the Art Gallery and the concerts held in it have become a very valuable part of the cultural life of the people. Won't the change in status impose a loss which no one wants on a significant portion of the people? Maybe we can combine both the cultural and the spiritual function? They came to the general conclusion that the question is complex and is subject to thorough analysis and consideration of all the variants. Therefore, quick decisions here are impossible, and events should not be artificially rushed.

During the conversation, the cardinal noted the fact that certain priests sometimes make public attacks directed against our society and the Soviet order. Such behavior on their part introduces suspicion toward each other, which we absolutely do not need. It also complicates life for the faithful, most of whom, it was stressed during the discussion, are undoubtedly true patriots. The cardinal said that every priest must give himself fully to his work as a pastor. For him, church matters must be the most important thing.

All the participants in the discussion agreed that this meeting was very necessary and beneficial. In the words of Cardinal V. Sladkyavichyus, it proceeded without any hostile views. The agreement was made not to store up emerging problems, to try to effectively clarify them, and to continue the fruitful tradition of meetings of the republic leaders with the hierarchs of the Catholic Church.

Brazauskas Speaks at Lithuanian Creative Unions Meetings

*18000188b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
29 Oct 88 pp 1, 3*

[Unattributed ELTA report: "For the Benefit of Man, the People, and the Homeland"]

[Text] Writers, artists, composers, cinematographers, leaders in theatre arts, architects, journalists, publishers and the heads of cultural institutions all gathered for the general open party meeting which was held on 27 October. They met to discuss the most important common problems, to share their concerns and disappointments, to come together and jointly undertake the great endeavor which is called Lithuanian culture.

"We must develop and foster culture," said art critic G. Vaytkunas. "We must give greater weight to the humanitarian disciplines and elevate the prestige of art. The development of culture is the upbringing of the individual. Everything we have that is bad is associated with a lack of culture. After all, our current ecological situation in the republic is also the result of anti-culture. We currently speak at length about cost accounting and we are learning to account for material values, yet culture and art are in an entirely different, exceptional situation. The value of art cannot be defined by material income. The state must support with funding the activity of the creative unions, which is of principle importance for the humanitarization of society. The publication of the academic writing of the literary classics, expressive art, theatre, and especially cinematic art must be financed from the state budget. The prestige of our culture depends to a significant degree on this aid, just as it depends on the creators and leaders, and on traditions. In giving an overview of the general state of culture, music critic D. Katkus stressed that many things must be changed, and the entire system of values reviewed. He, poet M. Martinaytis, and other speakers criticized the order of awarding honorable titles and prizes and the deep-rooted custom of evaluating individual artistic works not by their creativity, but by the social activity or position.

In their speeches composer Yu. Andreyevs and literary critic P. Brazhenas touched upon the questions of party management of culture and stressed that ideological questions in the Central Committee apparatus must be entrusted to highly cultured and broadly erudite individuals. Without the foundations of culture, ideology would be dead.

Recalling the constituent assembly of the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroika which rocked the entire republic, writer I. Avizhyus said that now is the very time to prove that we know how to think soberly and to work well. We have achieved rehabilitation of the exiled, he said, just as we are rehabilitating the diligence of our fathers and grandfathers. This is one of the cornerstones on which the future sovereign state must be built.

The meeting touched upon the events of 1939-1941 and 1944-1953, and stressed that the party must give a political evaluation to the scope of political, economic and cultural deformations of socialism and to the consequences of Stalinism and stagnation. The attention of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee was focused on the traces of stagnation in the work of the propaganda and agitation sections of the gorkoms and raykoms, and of the party Central Committee. Writers Yu. Glinskis and S. Shaltnyanis spoke of the negative occurrences in our rural areas and of the dishonesty of local leaders.

Many of the meeting participants stressed the fact that the culture of the Lithuanian people must be interpreted as being indivisible, including also the creativity of the emigre artists. Every creative union must decide which of the Lithuanian artists and cultural leaders living abroad should be considered its honorary or actual members. It is necessary to strive for independent and direct international ties, and to create a system of training and probationary work abroad for students, performers, the artists themselves, and the future creative youth. The representatives of the creative unions approved the principles of independent book publication proposed by the party organization of the "Vaga" publishing house.

Architect Zh. Simanavichyus and other meeting participants spoke with concern about the poor state of affairs in the preservation of our cultural heritage, and of the uncared for, disintegrating old parts of our cities. It is a shame that the list of cultural monuments includes only material values, while the entire treasure-house of our culture must be preserved. Sharp criticism was levelled at the republic's Ministry of Culture. Art critic G. Martinaytene noted that through the fault of a number of the ministry's workers, great harm has been done to the protection of monuments and museums. The masterpieces of national art are stored in depositories, and are inaccessible to the public. They are afraid that these might transmit religious sentiments. The meeting participants said that the creative unions must show greater concern for restoring the destroyed national monuments and aid in perpetuating the memory of Lithuania's outstanding citizens. In speaking of the questions of resurrecting national culture and its autonomy, music critic Yu. Antanavichyus, along with others, introduced a proposal to awaken the silent bells of all the Vilnius Catholic churches. After all, the bell is the symbol of resurrection...

"By education I am an engineer-economist," said Lithuanian CP Central Committee First Secretary A. Brazauskas. "My life took such a turn that I could express my interest in the achievements of our culture only in my spare time. Today, of course, it will be necessary—and I will do this with great enthusiasm—to meet more often, to socialize, to resolve very many of the specific questions which have been coming to a head for decades and which took the form of specific events this stormy summer in Lithuania."

"The intelligentsia—and this is nothing new—was that force which outlined the course of events in the epoch of perestroyka, and which felt the need to express its opinion. This, in my opinion, was done quite successfully. This opinion took on precise direction, clear conception, understanding, and, quite gratifyingly, received extensive support by all of our people. This, probably, is the most significant result of such remarkable activity."

"Our position in regard to 'Sayudis' is clear and synonymous: we intend to work hand in hand with it, to collectively solve the problems facing the party organizations and all the workers in the matter of perestroyka and rebirth. I would hope that you understand and support me: comments addressed at individual persons shock our society. Maybe we still do not know how to operate on the basis of a cultured and intelligent democracy. We must resolve the questions in their essence—a label will not change anything."

"I am grateful to all who spoke at this meeting regarding the convocation of an extraordinary congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party. On the way here I wondered, what is it that evokes the desire to convene a special party congress, what are the reasons? We have 145 Central Committee members. There are few representatives of the intelligentsia among them. We will think about how to correct this situation. We also need the definite influence of the Central Committee in implementing a correct policy for selecting party cadres in the rayons and cities."

"As for our plenum, which was held on 20 October, the newspapers recounted everything truthfully. Twenty-three Central Committee members spoke, and their speeches were not organized ahead of time. For the first time there was a secret ballot on the question of the first secretary. For the first time the status of the second secretary was also quite clearly specified. Comrade Mitkin has 4 months to go until retirement. Therefore, the decision was made to retire him in the very near future."

"An extensive reorganization of the cadres is currently taking place in the Central Committee. We have been forced to dismiss one-third of the workers. This was the decision of the Buro. We will discuss this thoroughly and try to retain the very best people. Perhaps we will replenish the cadres with new people, those who are in step with perestroyka. The sections must be headed up by such people whom we can trust and whom all of society will trust."

"It is heartening to see that you, the creative workers, speak of such, I would say, down-to-earth matters as economic cost accounting and the Constitution. These questions define the level of sovereignty of the Lithuanian republic. This is truly a complex problem, and we must formulate it in a highly skilled manner."

"Today the requirements for party workers have changed radically. A party worker must understand why

our line is the way it is, why we are making these specific decisions. He must explain this to people, be with the people, and not be afraid of the spotlight in the direct sense of the word. He must speak out on television and in the press."

"The world of art helps us to avoid pragmatism and rationalism. It teaches us attention and respect toward man. Therefore, I am sure that the essence of existence and the fate of the individual are more deeply reflected in your hearts, artists. In the near future, you will tell Lithuania and the whole world about our time, our struggle and our ideals. You will tell them in the words of aesthetically justified human truth. Each of us must fulfill that task which has been entrusted to us and which we are ready to implement for the good of man, of the people, and of our Homeland," stressed Comrade A. Brazauskas in conclusion.

The participants of the general open party meeting of Lithuanian creative unions, having comprehensively reviewed the proposal to convene an extraordinary Lithuanian CP Congress to clarify the status of the party and the election of leadership, with consideration for the change in the situation, and having heard the conclusions of Lithuanian CP Central Committee First Secretary A. Brazauskas, unanimously decided to abstain from the initiative to convene an extraordinary party congress in the near future.

The resolution also stated that in the course of implementing the sovereignty of the Lithuanian SSR, the legal status of the creative union must also be changed appropriately. The new LiSSR Constitution must guarantee their autonomy. Full approval was given to the publication of the principles of the LiSSR Constitution regarding status of the Lithuanian language, which was presented in the resolution of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium dated 6 October 1988. The decision was made to elevate the culture of the native language through joint efforts, to support the efforts of linguistic societies and language enthusiasts in the sphere of language ecology, and to actively support the ideas of the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroika on the restoration of independence and national character of the system of formation of Lithuania. The resolution also presented the demand to return to the song festivals their national character, to base their repertoire on folk songs and the best works of our classics and modern composers. It was suggested that the traditional republic song festival be celebrated in mid-July to commemorate the anniversary of the Battle of Grunwald.

Russian Culture Informal Association Formed In Lithuania

Founding Meeting

*18000196 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
3 Nov 88 p 3*

[Article by V. Mikhailov: "Russian Cultural Center"]

[Text] On 31 October a meeting was held in the quarters of the Russian Dramatic Theater in Vilnius in order to

organize the "Russian Cultural Center" informal association under the auspices of the Lithuanian Cultural Fund. Advocating expansion of the dialogue among national cultures, the new association sees its mission as facilitation of the rebirth, integration, and development of Russian culture in Lithuania. The center plans to direct its activities toward the development and implementation of concrete special-purpose programs in accordance with the needs of the Russian-speaking population of the republic.

The organizers hope for support and help from Soviet and party agencies, labor collectives, religious associations, the Lithuanian perestroika movement, and ethnic societies.

The idea of creating a Russian cultural center" was supported by the secretary of the party gorkom, G. Shalyanene; the chairman of the board of the Lithuanian Culture fund, Ch. Kudaba; the representative of the Russian Orthodox Church archbishop, V. Novinskiy; member of the Sejm Council of the Lithuanian perestroika movement, professor B. Kuzmitskas; and Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee agent, S. Balyutskiy.

Information about the "Russian Cultural Center" may be obtained by calling 62-71-33 between 18:00 and 21:00. Ideas and concrete proposals should be sent to the address: 232040, Vilnius-40, a/ya 1527.

Initiator Comments on Goals

*18000196 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
7 Nov 88 p 3*

[Interview with Ergali Gerom, one of the initiators of the new cultural association; time and place not specified; interviewer V. Yanov]

[Text] As we have already informed you (SOVETSKAYA LITVA 3 November), on 31 October the quarters of the Russian Dramatic Theater were the scene of a preliminary meeting to organize a "Russian Cultural Center" under the auspices of the Lithuanian Culture Fund. At their meeting of 3 November, the presidium of the Lithuanian Culture Fund board supported this idea and asked the Vilnius directorate of the USSR Zhilsotsbank (Housing and Social Bank) to open a current account for the new association.

Today we are publishing a conversation between our correspondent and one of the members of the working group for organizing the "Russian Cultural Center," Ergali Gerom.

[Question] In my opinion the we have needed to establish such an association in Lithuania for a long time. But what specifically motivated the working group to take active measures?

[Answer] We welcome the awakening of Lithuanian national consciousness, the rebirth and development of Lithuanian culture. However, against this background,

the powerful centuries-old layer of Russian culture on this land has become less noticeable, so to speak. But it is there, it exists. We believe that this is precisely the right time to say a word about Russian culture to accompany speeches about the Lithuanian rebirth. Of course, one word is not enough. We need deeds, actions, organizations—an organization that would scientifically study the needs of the Russian-speaking population; that would have not an advisory, but a full voice in all institutions regulating cultural activity, including the Ministry of Culture of the republic; and that could have a real influence on publishing and play-staging policies, on the educational system, etc.

I want to emphasize that the "Russian Cultural Center" is not the final name, but only the working name of the future association.

[Question] How long has the working group existed and what has it already accomplished?

[Answer] The working group for the organization of a Russian Cultural Center has been in existence for slightly more than three weeks. Its initiator was the section of young Russian writers within the Writers' Union of the LiSSR. Aside from literary men, the group includes actors in the Russian dramatic theater, journalists, students and teachers in the Vilnius University, economists, workers, and engineers. Although we do not claim to be completely representative of the Russian-speaking population and all its social, national and age groups, we nonetheless consider that we have the right to conduct preliminary work to establish the "Russian Cultural Center."

We have worked out a draft charter for the "Russian Cultural Center", in which we have set down the major directions its activities will take.

Representatives from the working group visited plants, schools, the university, and the office of the Vilensk eparchy of the Russian Orthodox Church.

[Question] Please tell us about the preliminary meeting which was held in the Russian Dramatic Theater.

[Answer] To tell the truth, we had not succeeded in getting all the bugs out of administrative procedures and for this reason the registration of participants was far from ideal, for which we once again apologize.

But on the whole, I think that the meeting was successful. I want to specially note two points.

Those who attended the meeting were most concerned about giving the Lithuanian language the status of the official state language. The working group believes that there should be one state language in the Lithuanian

SSR—Lithuanian. But this issue should be resolved democratically. There must be a clear and unambiguous guarantee that the rights of the Russian language cannot be encroached on.

Unfortunately, the development of a new legislative act is again being conducted in secret. For this reason, all we read in the press are information releases stating that the draft legislative act is already finished and that it has been decided to submit it to the government of the republic; however, the text of the act itself has not been published.

Returning to the meeting, let me note an additional important issue over which the participants were sharply polarized. Certain speakers expressed the opinion that now we need another organization for the Russian-speaking population—a political one. This thesis evoked passionate support in some members of the audience, and equally passionate protest in others. Our opinion on this matter is quite definite, and it was expressed at the meeting: although there must be pluralism of ideas and viewpoints in our political life; given the present situation, the establishment of a political organization for the Russian-speaking population may lead to a confrontation and exacerbate interethnic relationships. The road to harmonizing interethnic relationships lies not through confrontation, but through cultural dialogue and mutual understanding and respect. This is precisely why we are creating the "Russian Cultural Center" in Lithuania.

[Question] What do you think, did the working group that evening succeed in performing its main task—that of persuading the attendees of the need to establish a "Russian Cultural Center"?

[Answer] I think so. The evidence for this includes the many concrete proposals people made during the meeting, in the intermission, and after the meeting was over.

Every day since the meeting, our phone has not stopped ringing between the hours of 18:00 and 21:00. When they call 62-71-33, people ask questions, seek advice, and offer help. Our postal "idea bank," which can be reached at the address: 232040, Vilnius-40, a/ya 1527, is filling up. The proposals we have received have formed the basis for special programs which we are now working out in detail with the help of well-qualified experts.

The working group has set up a rather full schedule of meetings with labor collectives of enterprises and institutions, the representatives of which have proposed to establish auxiliary groups to aid the "Russian Cultural Center." We also decided to send several specialists to Snechkus to study on site the complex problems of the Russian-speaking population. We have established press and sociological groups, which have already started work. The "Russian Cultural Center" hopes to soon receive permission to publish its own organ.

Today, of course, we have far more unsolved problems than solved ones.

[Correspondent] We hope that with time this proportion will reverse itself.

Medvedev Visits Alfa, VEF Plants in Riga
18000224 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
13 Nov 88 pp 1-3

[LATINFORM report: "From the Spontaneity of Rallies to the Specificity of Deeds: V. A. Medvedev's Visit to the Latvian SSR"]

[Text] On 11 November V. A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who is in the republic, visited the Riga Alfa Production Association imini 60th Anniversary of the USSR. The microelectronic products manufactured there determine the course of scientific and technological progress. The microcircuits, which are tiny in size, are widely used in modern home radio and television sets, tape recorders, telephones and automated production management systems produced by the country's enterprises.

The forward line of scientific technology—yes, that probably really is how one can characterize that highly specific production facility, which demands precision machinery, medical purity and, most importantly, people's skilled hands. And one can probably agree with confidence with the words of A. A. Bulayev, the association's general director, who provided explanations during the course of the visit, that without the timely updating of electronics and its basic components, one can hardly think about producing up-to-date, competitive products.

A discussion of the problems that are holding up the progressive development of that major enterprise in the industry was continued with workers and specialists in the shop where large integrated circuits are assembled and in other production sectors, work in which is associated with higher requirements with regard to personnel skills, strict accountability for operations performed, and complex working conditions, and the CPSU Central Committee secretary asked how the problem of retaining specialists and providing them with social benefits and wages is solved in the association. Answering those questions, N. A. Ogorodnik, the deputy general director, cited a set of problems that still await solution. Complex technological operations demand high outlays of nervous and physical energy, meticulousness and conscientiousness. And although, generally speaking, 200 rubles a month—the average earnings for the association—is seemingly decent money, it does not, alas, compensate for mental and nervous outlays of that sort. With the appearance of the cooperative movement, some first-rate specialists preferred work in cooperatives and quit

the enterprise. And that process is continuing. This is the source of another problem—replenishing personnel. They often have to be moved in from other regions of the country.

"You need to seek other ways," noted V. A. Medvedev. "Do you have your own vocational-technical school?"

A. A. Bulayev: "We don't have our own; there's a base school. Two groups are currently studying at it. But that is not enough. We need, at the minimum, 10."

V. A. Medvedev: "And what about the nationalities of the students?"

A. A. Bulayev: "Approximately 50/50. Although fewer youngsters of Latvian nationality go to industrially-oriented vocational-technical schools. That's no news for all of us."

V. A. Medvedev: "And are the engineering personnel also coming from outside?"

A. A. Bulayev: "Unfortunately, yes. The Riga Polytechnical Institute does not train the sort of specialists we need. Granted, we have managed to establish some contacts with the institute's rector. We have worked out a program for the development of personnel training, but it's a long-term program. And we need specialists right now. The problem of labor resources remains extremely acute."

V. A. Medvedev: "And how many people are presently living in the dormitory?"

A. A. Bulayev: "400."

V. A. Medvedev: "That's a lot."

A. A. Bulayev: "I agree, it's a lot. But it's worked out that our social program has lagged behind. Today something like 1,200 people need apartments. Now we are building them ourselves. There are not enough places in kindergartens, either; there's a shortage of 300 places. We don't have our own preventive-care clinic, either. Now we are starting to develop all that. Next year we will be on cost accounting, and in order to implement our projected social program, it will be necessary to leave 50 percent of our profits at our disposal and not allocate 56 percent to the ministry; the normative rate needs to be changed. Then everything will be solved in a normal fashion."

V. A. Medvedev: "Let's not allow a pro forma approach here. If there is a sense of that, especially in relations with local soviet agencies, and it affects the city's social development, it must be resolved in a different way."

The discussion went on to deal with problems of introducing new equipment, providing a two-shift work schedule with the aim of creating normal working conditions for women with children and providing qualified

medical service. In a discussion with T. F. Litvinova, chief of Shop No. 4, and A. N. Belukhaya, secretary of the association's party committee, V. A. Medvedev raised the question of the role of the party organization and the shop's Communists in day-to-day work and the provision of ideological support for restructuring, and of internationality relations.

After that the CPSU Central Committee secretary looked over the association's food center and visited the cafe, cafeteria and prepared-food-service store, which operates on the basis of advance orders. L. G. Arkulinskaya, director of the food center, provided explanations.

After that V. A. Medvedev visited the VEF Production Association imeni V. I. Lenin. He inspected the production facility where the quasi-electronic Kvant automated telephone exchanges are produced and the sector where circuit boards are manufactured in a cooperative production arrangement with the Finnish Telenokia company. The general director I. R. Brazhis told the guest about the association's work.

In one of the association's halls a meeting took place between the CPSU Central Committee secretary and employee representatives of the VEF Association and a number of other large Riga enterprises. It was conducted by A. P. Klautsen, first secretary of the Riga Party Gorkom. To attempt to briefly characterize the course of the discussion and exchange of views that took place at the meeting: people expressed concern over the sociopolitical situation that is developing in the republic and the complication of internationality relations, and they discussed the problems of the migration of manpower, the development of a new economic model for regional cost accounting, and the organization of the movements of all the republic's social forces in the struggle for the renewal of socialism. Employees of the republic party apparatus heard candid statements directed at them regarding their lack of a clear-cut, profoundly worked-out stand on many of the issues born of restructuring. More than 20 speakers that evening approached the microphone to express their attitudes toward the processes taking place in the republic, give their appraisals of political reform in the country and the republic, and express painfully urgent matters. We offer readers fragments of the speeches based on an abbreviated transcript:

Klara Demba, quality controller at the Alfa Production Association:

I have lived in Riga for six years and have covered the entire republic in my travels. And I have always regarded the people of Latvia with profound respect. All of us residents of the republic and Riga feel concern and agitation over the fact that our pearl Yurmala is dying and that the supply of food to the republic's residents has been deteriorating year after year. Over the fact that lines are getting longer, lines which have strained people to the limit. And when restructuring began, we hoped that we

would begin work all together, in a united front. That we would sow, darn, plane and do everything possible in order to rectify the situation. And we placed great hopes on the People's Front.

The congress took place in the building of the House of Political Enlightenment. The first thing that struck one was that the bas-relief of Lenin was covered with a sheet. And the congress began with the words: "Ladies and gentlemen." I remember that someone from the audience asked a question in Russian to the presidium: why were there only three workers in the Duma? After all, the front is called the people's front. A woman answered: You mean you can't see where the working class has taken the country? I know that the Latvian Red Riflemen were made up of Latvia's proletarians and working-class detachments. How can we forget our own history?

Here is what I want to say. Our mass media are simply inflaming the situation. One gets the impression that the republic press, radio and television have gone completely out of party control. And matters have reached the point that the republic Journalists' Union has proposed closing the newspaper SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, the publication of the republic Communist Party. But that same Journalists' Union closes its eyes to and has failed to issue a judgment on a monstrous illustration in the magazine RODNIK. I telephoned the Latvian Komsomol Central Committee. I was told that a commission was looking into the matter. But when I telephoned the press sector of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, I was told: that is what democracy is: everyone depicts what he wants.

The Journalists' Union is a union of journalists. But where are our ideologists? What is going on is simply the squabbling of journalists. But I want to ask: what is your stand, comrade ideologists from the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee? Where are our ideologists looking, for example, when every evening people who are engaging in open brain-washing gather at the Liberty Monument? Our ideologists are not there.

But even that is not what is most frightening. Brain-washing begins in kindergarten: youngsters are called invaders and asked to pack their bags. Yet what terrible trouble can result from what we put into our children's hearts and minds.

Nonetheless, I want to end my speech on a major note. To speak about the 7 November demonstration. There was a sea of red banners and very many people. But even here our republic television proved true to itself. What did we see recorded on the screen in the evening? The People's Front was shown several times. But Alfa, a huge enterprise that is playing a decisive role in scientific and technological progress today, was not shown at all. Was that fair?

Nikolay Aleksandrov, metal worker at the Riga Railroad Car Plant and member of the party committee:

I side completely with the previous speaker. I have a question for our Central Committee. In the first place,

why was there no reaction from our ideologists and Central Committee after the resolution was adopted by the writers' plenum? In the second place, why didn't the Central Committee secretaries and the chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet who were present in the hall at the People's Front of Latvia constituent assembly issue any political judgment of what was taking place?

Yesterday a draft decree was passed on ending the mechanical growth of the population. And it stated unambiguously that a number of enterprises that operate using shipped-in raw materials should either change their specializations or close. Our railroad car plant produces electric trains. But here is something I want to call attention to: if the republic, taking into account the lower price of our trains in comparison to Western models, increases their production, that will bring prestige to the republic and the entire Soviet Union. After all, we can provide Latvia with more valuta allocations. People should think about that.

And furthermore, I express the view of many people. We want officials of the Central Committee apparatus and ideological workers to visit labor collectives more often. Look: comrade Vagris is our deputy. But we have seen him only once. I think that our leadership must have more frequent contact with people in order to keep informed about events in the republic.

Aleksandr Panchuk, director of a bureau in the VEF Production Association's labor and wages department:

We are preparing to shift to cost accounting, to the first model, starting 1 January. In studying the economic relations that have been developing in our republic under cost accounting, I reach the conclusion that very little will change here. All the shortcomings of planning are automatically being transferred to the normative rates that are being established for us.

The speaker went on to illustrate his idea with numerical computations. Under this model, enterprises retain a stake in volume indices. And in such a situation we will not withstand competition with the aforementioned cooperatives.

The speaker drew the conclusion that the first model of cost accounting differs little from the previous model of economic operations.

Vladimir Krasovski, representative of state acceptance and member of the party committee of the Alfa Production Association:

After living in Latvia for nearly 30 years, I have received the nickname "migrant," in an example set by certain hotheads from the creative unions. But let that remain

on their conscience. Latvia has become a second homeland for me; I have acquired roots here, and the graves of people dear to me are here. This republic's fortunes are my fortunes.

In reading some of the members of our creative intelligentsia, I am simply struck by their encyclopedic knowledge. To all intents and purposes, they are specialists in all branches, since they undertake to judge everything. I, for example, understand technology. And when I read the conception of development up until 2005 closely, I became seriously concerned. We possess a unique ability to repeat our mistakes. Right now a technological revolution is taking place in the world. Yet in the conception of development, the technological revolution is completely forgotten, and the notion of microelectronics is completely missing. We are lagging behind by six to eight years. And if a decision is not made to reconstruct our enterprise, we will not make up for this lag.

The conception of development correctly states that we should feed our people so that they do not stand in lines. But tell me, how will we be able to reequip our agriculture if we do not reequip our industry? Then where will we get the valuta in order to install a personal computer for every one of our cows?

Dmitriy Kulakov, lathe operator at the Alfa Production Association:

Russians, Latvians, Ukrainians, Belorussians, Jews and people of other nationalities work at our plant. And for all these years we have worked together closely and cohesively. But lately we have started to feel that something is wrong among us. Before the constituent assembly of the People's Front, in looking over its documents, we agreed with some things, disagreed with some things, argued and discussed. Everything, it seemed, was going well. But the congress that took place aroused people, and especially the working class. There were anti-Soviet and antisocialist speeches at the congress. Do our Soviet people need this? The working class states unequivocally: we do not need this. Literally on the next day people decided: we must create an International Front that would take a different route—the route of solidarity and the consolidation of forces.

We who have gathered in this hall are worried about the fate of our republic. How will things go after this? I have been asked to convey the message that we are sick of rallies and sick of picketing. We need deeds. Honest, good deeds. The sort that the 27th CPSU Congress and 19th All-Union Party Conference wrote into their decisions.

Today workers are saying that we absolutely do not like the situation that has developed in the press. Squabbling is going on between the Russian and the Latvian press. And can this be what we need today? It works only to the detriment of restructuring. On local television we see very many representatives of the People's Front, but

very few of our republic's leaders. We do not see them in the shops, either, where we might voice our complaints to them. I think that would work only to the benefit of restructuring.

How many years I worked in my collective, and I had never heard the words "migrant" and "invader." But now I have heard them. I believe that only joint, honest work for the benefit of the republic and true friendship lead to common success.

Zheniya Katkovska, deputy director of the VEF Production Association Palace of Culture and Technology and secretary of the party organization:

None of the speakers has seriously reflected on his stand. Yet everything good that we want—in the final analysis, restructuring—does not depend solely on us. If there were Communists among the speakers, the words that have been spoken do not become them. If you Communists had started conducting yourselves as you should have, and as was decided at the 19th Party Conference, there would have been no need to establish any sort of Internationalist Front.

I believe that the documents adopted by the People's Front are very good. Only one must read them more carefully. It seemed to me that someone simply took personal offense at the word "migrant." I want to object to the comrade who spoke here: if you have worked here for so many years, why did you decide that someone would ask you to leave the republic? Especially since you say "it's my republic too."

Therefore, I am surprised that one can put the question that way. And there can be no Internationalist Front if we are Communists. We should do one thing together and do it in such a way that there is order. And everyone must start with his own work place. After all, we cannot reason as though M. S. Gorbachev would go around everywhere and establish order, can we?!

I have many assignments and have contacts with many people, and I can judge what is going on around. Some people pay money to get an apartment within a year, using hook or crook to register far-away grandmothers, yet you, say, have worked here for 30 years, are crowded together in a little tiny room, and cannot get an apartment. One must think about whom all this benefits. Who has a stake in there being a fight among the nationalities? After all, what difference does it make what nationality you belong to? That's not the way the question should be put.

Everyone who really wants to help the republic should read the documents of the People's Front closely and go help through deeds. And not wait until Comrade Vagris comes.

Nikolay Kazachok:

The preceding speaker expressed his own opinion. I also work at VEF and want to say that the party organization

at our enterprise took a passive stand. I wrote an article for our plant newspaper where I expressed my own opinion on this matter, but it was never published.

I want to say that the Internationalist Front is historic and has been summoned to life by the moment. Excuse me that I am agitated, but it was established precisely because the working class saw that there were practically no workers' representatives at the congress of the People's Front of Latvia, and that the ladies and gentlemen did not need the working class. Such concepts as ladies, gentlemen and Soviet Latvia cannot stand side by side. How is one to understand that? They are the spokesmen for an ideology; they act as educators in the Marxist-Leninist legacy, and principally on the nationalities question—precisely as educators; I can't call them anything else. The workers have supported me, and I follow an ideological policy on this issue to the extent that I am able. The draft decree "On measures to halt the mechanical increase of the population in the Latvian SSR" recently was published in SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA. To take it and sum it up, in this connection one can say unequivocally, comrades: The Council of Ministers is following the policy and decisions of the People's Front. Forcibly. But dressed up in the following fashion: comrades of the Russian-speaking population, don't worry, sleep peacefully. But what is happening in actual fact? Here is an example: by 1 March 1989 draw up a program for closing dormitories with dormitory-style sleeping accommodations, etc. There are approximately 500 dormitories in Riga, and you realize that their principal residents are members of the working class. They have temporary residence permits, and some of them have lived here for 10 or 11 years. And can you imagine what that would mean? That would mean disaster for thousands of people. So I do not understand what it means to close dormitories.

I reread the document of the People's Front of Latvia—all it contains are the words, we demand, we demand, we demand. And the appeals contained the words: we follow, we follow, we follow. To all intents and purposes, the Council of Ministers is under the thumb of that front. The Internationalist Front was established in order to defend the working class and in order that it be represented in elections as an equal member of the socialist community. That is its main task.

Following the congress Comrade Vagris, Comrade Gorbunov and Comrade Ivans, president of the People's Front, said that they were happy on that account. Happy for what? Back on 3 October, before the confirmation of Comrade Vagris as first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, it was clearly stated that the party central committee did not support the uninational orientation of the actions of any organization. On 10 November certain comrades spoke out saying that everything was normal. But what television shows surprises me: before the congress—for Soviet

Latvia, everything is fine, but on the next day we heard something completely the opposite. That staggers me. The movement that is taking place among the informal groups is assuming a nationalistic, bourgeois nature. And such movements have always been strongly linked with anarchism.

I think that today we must work together on economic and political issues and not think up terms like "migrants" and seek various pretexts for throwing us out of here. Most likely, the party organization should also put in its weighty word, checking its actions against Leninist principles.

Question from the floor:

"Why not record everything? As it is, we see what's advantageous—television records what's not—it is stopped. And the reloading of cassettes begins, and jumping around the hall. What's the point? Why does this happen? They immediately turn away and turn off the microphones. We demand objective showing."

Dzintars Rasnach, grinding-machine operator at the VEF Production Association:

I would like to ask Comrade Medvedev questions, which interest the majority of Latvia's residents, pertaining to the new draft law on changes in the Constitution of the Soviet Union. The first question: who has revised the Constitution? That is, created the draft? The second question: who set up the group that is drawing up that draft? I think that in the period of glasnost that is important to know. And the third question is this: are the union republics represented individually on the commission that is drawing up that draft? And finally: tomorrow a forum of the republic's legal specialists will be held in the Great Hall of Latvian State University. Have you been invited to it?

The moderator of the meeting proposed deferring answers until the end of the discussion in order that V. A. Medvedev could treat them in his speech.

Gvido Bukeyko, the VEF Production Association's chief specialist for varnish and paint coatings:

I would like to talk about what has affected me as a citizen. I was a delegate to the congress of the People's Front of Latvia. I do not want to engage in polemics; they are not necessary. I will simply say why I joined that movement.

I have lived in Latvia for 47 years, am a Pole by nationality, and work for the good of our Latvia to the best of my ability. I have been in the Polish People's Republic and Czechoslovakia, and I have seen the tremendous prestige of our state and Gorbachev. His portraits are displayed there like the Virgin Mary's. That is a very significant fact.

I returned home and realized that to stand to one side and not take a stand is tantamount to treason. At that time I was on vacation. I went to my collective, and support groups of the People's Front were forming there. I feel that there is a need for that. I live in a charming little rayon that, more accurately, was at one time pleasant—it's Mezhapark. The rayon has been brought, so to speak, to a state of impasse.

Long ago I would go to the rayon authorities with questions, and nothing has been done. We enthusiasts decided first to set up support stations, and then we organized a rally and met with representatives of the rayon authorities. And we decided to take a new path and seek out our own forms and not wait until something changed. And then I went to that congress.

A great deal can be run down, but there were also good things. Right now people here are speaking in a one-sided fashion and taking some things out of context. But it is a good movement. It is with the people, and it is for restructuring. And an unnecessary confrontation clearly shows by whom it is needed. It is needed by the bureaucracy, by those whose chairs, I think, are cracking under them. Clashes on a nationality basis are always advantageous to them.

The main thing today is work, actual work. I have met with our former VEF employee Yan Okherin; we talked about how we would go on from here and what we would do in the future at our native VEF. After all, our VEF today is not independent, either. We do not feel ourselves to be proprietors, and we cannot determine what we are supposed to do and how much to produce. But if we are proprietors on our own land, we should know what is advantageous to us and what is not.

If the priority today has been given to agriculture, maybe we should make tractors? After all, we once produced airplanes!

As a chemist I assume the boldness to say that our main problem in the republic is ecology. If we do not have a clean environment, we will not have any politics either. We won't exist. I would like to call on everyone to sense his or her civic duty and not to seek confrontation: Internationalist Front or People's Front. We once met here in the Red Hall. And there, it seems to me, a clear-cut rebuff was given to the Internationalist Front.

Intars Turins, saw operator and secretary of the Komsomol organization of the VEF Production Association's No. 4 production facility:

I would like to speak on behalf of the young people about their attitude toward what is taking place in our republic at the present time. Young people have divided up into several parts. Some support the People's Front, and others support the Internationalist Front, but there are yet others who do not support either movement. Why is this happening? I think it is because young people have

always been inclined to be maximalists: all or nothing. There even exists the opinion that they have created one front and will create a second one, but who will cover the rear? Unquestionably, social activeness is a good thing. Thus, thanks to the People's Front the question of Latvians' national dignity has been raised, and there are other positive aspects, but who will resolve the economic questions? People go out to rallies and demonstrations, but who, after all, will concern themselves with the economy, if everyone has left for the front?

I think, comrades, that more opportunities must be given to young people to take part in managing production, and that young people should be nominated for leadership positions. We in the No. 4 production facility, for example, want to set up a Komsomol detachment that will concern itself with matters of production standards, because a great deal has not yet been done at our association. We must work, roll up our sleeves and work.

Andris Zarinsh, tool maker at the VEF Production Association's No. 14 production facility:

I will speak Russian in order that the majority of those in the hall can understand me. My father was a Latvian and my mother a Russian, and I am fluent in both languages. We never divided people up according to nationality in my family. When the People's Front of Latvia was organized, I read the platform and charter and agreed that something needed to be done. But to this day I cannot understand why the republic's Russian population remained on the sidelines when the People's Front was being organized. Evidently some people very much needed not to provide the information about it that would be required so that the Russian population, especially the Russian-speaking population that does not read newspapers in Latvian, could understand what the People's Front of Latvia was driving at. That is one thing. Why did that happen? I believe that the newspaper SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA bears a great deal of blame here. I constantly read TSINYA, SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA and PRAVDA, because there is constantly dissonance in the press.

The Internationalist Front started to be organized. Maybe the Russians are ecstatic about that name, but for Latvians, excuse me, it is grating. I will explain why. Many Latvians took part in the fighting in Spain as part of the international brigade. And when the name Internationalist Front started to be heard everywhere, many people looked around and said: but where are those fascists against whom the Internationalist Front is being organized?

To continue, the use of the words ladies and gentlemen arouses opposition and misunderstanding among many people. I want to say that those who know Latvian culture should recall that that is the way Latvians have addressed one another from time immemorial. The wall

between the Latvians and the Russian-speaking population must be torn down, and we must find a common language in order to unite on a common platform.

Igor Melnik, engineer and computer programmer at the VEF Production Association:

I was reared by the Soviet Armed Forces and consider it best to preserve internationalist traditions. I gave 30 years to the Armed Forces and have been 30 years in the party. As a Communist I recognize one ideology—the ideology of Marxism-Leninism. I do not need to try to prove anything or tell anything about this matter; I will be true to that ideology to my very death, because I am proud of my party.

As a Communist, I am concerned by the lax ideological work of the Latvian party organization. We might not have reached the state we are in now if we had called a spade a spade. But for that it is necessary to do ideological work among Communists. Yet in our republic, most unfortunately, executives at the middle party level not only do not know how to speak freely, they do not know how to speak with Communists. I have been in Latvia for 22 years; destiny cast me here. I did my army service here, and I have already worked here for 10 years, and I want to say that I was struck for the first time after the army by the fact that we are not interested in the human being and do not know how he lives and what his living conditions are like. Therefore, it seemed ridiculous to me after the army party organization to raise and try to resolve all the issues. I should have had a better knowledge, as a Communist, of my comrades' living conditions.

I do not want to criticize the People's Front. But it was strange to see at the congress of the People's Front of Latvia, where Communists were present, the absence of the state flag of the Latvian SSR. I can allow compromises, but there are moments when they are impermissible. We have a Constitution, and let there be a People's Front; let there be an Internationalist Front; and let them show us our shortcomings. But we must follow the sort of policy that enables Latvians, Russians, Belorussians and Ukrainians to live in concord. And what is needed is not to hold rallies but to make a contribution through one's work to the common cause.

Valeriy Zuyev, brigade leader at the VEF Production Association:

Let us not close our eyes to the fact that we have a very acute situation in our republic. And here is what is surprising. It used to be that when you rode a bus you could hear laughter and cheerful conversations. Now the people has fallen silent. What is going on? Before the congress of the People's Front everything was the way it probably should be, and everyone was seemingly unified. That congress divided them into two camps. Some are supporters of the front, and others are those who are not with them. At the given stage the People's Front could be

called something entirely different: the National Front. That is the reason for the establishment of the Internationalist Front. And this confrontation continues. I do not want a repetition of Sumgait. But why do we close our eyes? Why does our party organization remain silent? Why can't we unite? Why can't we live all together here? If we close Latvia and the other republics do not provide us with anything, we will suffocate here. We cannot exist alone. Do you understand that? That is stupid. Everyone must clearly see that.

The people is worried over its future and thinking about how to go on after this. We should not try to figure out who is who, Russian or Latvian; we should do one common thing. So that things are good for everyone regardless of nationality, faith, etc. And one final point. Why has it happened that before holidays our stores are empty? Have there been objective reasons for this, or some other reasons?

Alida Igale, assembly worker at the VEF Production Association:

I think that I am expressing not just my personal opinion but also the opinion of Latvian workers. Why has the front been called a nationalistic mob here? What gives anyone the right to such a definition? There at the Mezhapark there were so many people. One had to go down and see it. And one of the previous comrades, a representative of the Internationalist Front or the People's Front, was right in saying that the press does not translate all publications verbatim into Russian. Therein alone lies the whole problem. It turns out that we don't have tires, and the Russians are to blame.

Why did this Internationalist Front arise? Because people are not informed about everything. And why, I don't know. I have been a worker at VEF since 1955, and I have been a worker the whole time. Even when I retired I was a worker, and I am not ashamed of that. But I feel ashamed for those who undertake to pass general judgments. For those who say: why are there few workers there? What should we do? Comrades, first and foremost, economists should engage in economics, workers should work, and diplomats should engage in diplomacy. And our intelligentsia has undertaken to express the opinion of the whole Latvian people. In the People's Front there were certain incorrect speeches, so should we stop that movement for this reason? No, comrades, we cannot denigrate our Communist Party on account of a few thieves, scoundrels and swindlers. Nor can we denigrate the People's Front merely because there were several incorrect speeches there.

Dmitriy Ivanov, milling-machine operator at the VEF Production Association:

I have two granddaughters. One goes to a Russian kindergarten and the other to a Latvian one. They speak both languages freely. But a poor job is being done in the republic of training Latvian language instructors. Can that be the Russians' fault?

A great deal has been said on television about special stores and special polyclinics, but has our republic government repudiated them? If they stood next to us in lines, there would be more stores and fewer lines.

I was born in Latvia in 1931. And my father was born here, and my mother. I lived in Latvia until 1947. Now people are saying that things were good in bourgeois Latvia, and they have proposed putting up a monument to Ulmanis on every street. But I know what life was like then.

A second question. The occupation. I spent four years under the occupation, and I know what it was like. And I know who the occupying forces were. Now people are shouting that the Russians were to blame for the repressions. But who was in the government in 1949? And who drew up the lists?

The next question. Why does television record and show what is advantageous to the People's Front and erase what isn't? And listen to "Labvakar," what people say there. In my view, in our republic right now the editorial staff of PADOMYU YAUNATNE is commanding both the Latvian CP Central Committee and the press system. My personal opinion: the Internationalist Front is needed, if only for negotiations. The platform of the People's Front of Latvia is very handsome, and I agree with 80 percent of it. But there is one thing that spoils it. At our plant a milling-machine operator and two Latvian lathe operators are clearly declaring: we will create such laws that you will leave on your own accord. I won't go anywhere! Look at today's and yesterday's issues of SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA. Everything will become clear. Even the Finns are not making any complaints, but a writer declares that we should apologize to the Finns and rehabilitate Lenin. But in what respect should Lenin be rehabilitated? Our republic government itself wants to secede from the Soviet state; they were so happy after the congress of the People's Front.

Vladimir Mikhayev, an engineer at the VEF Production Association, delivered a critical analysis of the procedures for electing delegates to the 19th All-Union Party Conference, the practice of voting according to a central list, and the shortcomings of the report and election campaign that is presently under way, and he raised the questions of intraparty democracy. Why, according to the instructions, can't we hold direct elections for secretary, and why do we have to elect the buro first?, the speaker asked. Once again you get a closed system wherein a higher party comrade is unaccountable to and not subject to the oversight of Communists.

Ariis Kundzinsh, division chief at the VEF Production Association:

I am a member of the People's Front. I believe that many of Latvia's internationality problems are interconnected.

The speaker illustrated this idea by citing the growth of the waiting list for obtaining apartments, as well as the increase in the population over the past few years, which our agriculture and, thus, the supply of food to the republic's residents, have not kept up with. That has also not contributed to the intensification of industry, which has not been oriented toward the use of local resources and science-intensive production processes.

Atis Kraminsh operator of numerically programmed controls at the VEF Production Association:

As a delegate to the 19th All-Union Party Conference, I have had occasion to speak a lot at various enterprises. And I think that I feel the pulse of our labor collectives.

Those who followed the conference saw with what tremendous effort and work it adopted the policy of further restructuring. The policy put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. We should clearly realize that it is a policy of affirming Leninist principles, including in internationality relations.

Today I should apologize to our guests, because everyone present here has clearly seen how low the level of political consciousness is and how poorly we understand the principles of Leninist nationalities policy, and that ideological work in that area is in bad shape in our republic. I think that the majority in the hall are Communists. And I am surprised that we are not observing the party Charter and not submitting to the decisions of our party's Central Committee and to that Central Committee document that expresses its attitude toward the People's Front. My personal opinion coincides with the opinion of the Central Committee. Today I am ashamed of the fact that we have slung so much mud from the rostrum. I think that we ourselves can cope with that mud.

Our Central Committee and government, including the first secretary of the republic Communist Party Central Committee and the chairman of the Presidium of the republic Supreme Soviet, whom the deputies unanimously elected to that position, enjoy the complete support of our Communists. One must reckon with the fact that they are supported by the majority of our population.

V. A. Medvedev spoke at the meeting. He said:

A strong, working discussion has been held. If one excludes certain extremes, the discussion has been substantive and useful for all those present here, since it has reflected the actual situation, your thoughts and concerns, and has identified urgent issues that demand immediate attention. This discussion and the very fact that such a heated and lively discussion has taken place indicate that the process of restructuring is advancing, and we are now living and working under different conditions from three or four years ago. Our society, party and people have changed. The tremendous

upswing in public activeness, openness, full disclosure, the bold raising and discussion of all questions that agitate each Soviet person—that, in and of itself, is a tremendous accomplishment of ours and a tremendous accomplishment of our party's April course, the course of the 27th Congress, the course that found such a vivid manifestation in the work of the 19th Party Conference. And it is no accident that at the present time we measure everything by the standards of the party conference and rely on it in our search for the solution to the problems that were raised at the conference and found reflection in its documents.

Right now a very important, exceptionally responsible moment is arriving in restructuring. We are entering a period in which discussions, rallies, debates and emotions alone are absolutely insufficient. We have clarified a great deal from our history, and we have profoundly, candidly and without hesitation analyzed the situation in which our country has found itself in the recent time period. We know the problems that must be solved. We know the ways to solve them. We must get down to practical deeds and the specific resolution of questions.

The party has won a great credit of confidence. But that credit is not unlimited, and it must be repaid. It should no longer be supported and continued by acute criticism of the past and debate, but should be supported by practical deeds. I am referring primarily to the basic processes of restructuring, to real changes in our society, its political system and its economy. And I dare say, first and foremost, to real results in the improvement of people's lives and the resolution of urgent social questions. Without that, movement will be impeded. Without that, our rallies, discussions and debates will not lead to the desired results and even, to the contrary, may lead to opposite results. To the fact that people will start doubting that we are capable of any practical and decisive deeds.

Right now the questions of reforming the political system have advanced to the foreground. That has its own logic and its own reasons. We started with reform of the economy and with scientific and technological progress, but then we became convinced that without a deepening of our democracy, economic reform could not lead to the proper results. This is the source of both the conference's decisions and the decision to hold it. And right now practical measures are being adopted in order to implement the conference's decisions.

Here the approach is somewhat different than toward economic reform. It began with the primary unit, the enterprise. The Law on the State Association or Enterprise defined the rights of collectives, and on this basis the restructuring of the higher levels of our economic structure began. It is another matter that not everything, when compared to the law, is working out as conceived. Many problems are arising.

But in the political reform the logic is different—begin with the party as the nucleus of the political system on which everything depends. We are beginning with the restoration and more precise definition of the party's role as the political vanguard of society, as political leader. Since the 19th Party Conference major steps have already been taken in that respect, and extensive work is being launched. The system of party agencies and their apparatuses are being restructured, starting with the central apparatus and ending with the apparatus of the rayon committee. The party and its agencies are being relieved of functions that do not belong to them. Attention is being focused on functions that stem from the party's role as the political vanguard, on organizational, political and ideological work with people. The party apparatus, its methods and forms of work, and intra-party democracy, including the procedures for electing party agencies, are being restructured accordingly.

Now for the restructuring of the state apparatus. Certain practical steps have been taken without waiting for changes in constitutional norms. I have in mind, in particular, the election of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee as chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In some republics the leaders of party organizations are also being elected chairmen of the presidiums of the union-republic supreme soviets. That does not contradict the present Constitution but agrees with it. That is being done in order to rely on the force of party prestige right now in the practical implementation of the slogan, "All power to the soviets!"—in the reorganization of the Soviets and enhancement of their role.

Otherwise it will be difficult to implement what was agreed upon at the 19th Party Conference. And specifically: to transfer the entirety of state power to the entity to which it should belong—the soviets. A second step has also been taken: the drafts of two laws—amendments to the Constitution and the draft of a new election law—have been published. Questions were asked here as to who the author of those drafts was. Were representatives of the republics involved in drawing them up? I should say that the author of the drafts was collective. To be more precise, the author of those drafts was the 19th All-Union Party Conference. I must firmly object to the assertion that these drafts go back even an iota on the decisions of the 19th Party Conference. That would be an incorrect interpretation of what we are discussing here. Both drafts have in mind resolving just one of the questions of the 19th Party Conference, yet someone has attempted to represent them as an answer to all the conference's questions. Including those that at the given moment have not yet been worked out, are not being raised, and are not yet being submitted for broad public discussion. What question am I referring to? So far, just to the structure of our country's supreme bodies of state authority, i.e., to what was stipulated at the conference and accords precisely with its decisions and recommendations. The concern is with the establishment of a

Congress of People's Deputies—that question was discussed by the conference and recorded in its decisions. The concern is also with elections to the Supreme Soviet as a kind of state council—a continuously, or almost continuously, functioning agency—at the Congress of People's Deputies, and with the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Thus, the new draft laws consider a number of questions that are connected only with that and cannot fail to be resolved in connection with the upcoming elections, because the people should know what the Congress of People's Deputies and Supreme Soviet that will be elected are. They should have an idea of what the prerogatives of the chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet are. And only that is what is involved. As for delimiting the rights of the USSR and the union republics and the sovereignty of the republics, that issue is not raised in the draft laws in question, and it has not yet been prepared. The issue of regional cost accounting is not raised in the draft, either. That is a subject for future work, which is already under way.

In the near future the Council of Ministers will discuss the question of regional cost accounting. An authoritative commission has been set up to work out the questions of local self-government and local economic management. And internationality relations will be analyzed in depth at a plenum of the party Central Committee, which it has been decided to convene in the middle of next year. And tremendous work will be undertaken in preparation for that plenum. These are, after all, extremely delicate and complex questions that require that the resolution of each of them be weighed 10 times, 100 times, before even submitting them for general discussion. Opinions must be gathered in the republics, in collectives, among the working class, in the countryside—among the entire population. Therefore, frankly speaking, one is perplexed by the approach to the two drafts as supposedly deviating from the decisions of the 19th Party Conference and infringing on the union republics' rights. And some people are even trying to capitalize and play on the fact that these two drafts supposedly claim to be a complete answer to the decisions of the 19th Party Conference. That is the wrong attitude toward the drafts. Obviously, all of us, both in the country and in the republic, must carry out very serious explanatory work. Including, I think, work with specialists in jurisprudence who, while taking a strict look at certain words and wordings, should first and foremost see and evaluate the general meaning of those documents—documents that treat, I repeat, just one issue—the structure of the supreme bodies of state authority and the need to make appropriate changes in the Constitution.

The prospects here are very serious and great. A session of the Supreme Soviet will consider these questions. Elections for the Congress of Peoples Deputies will be announced. That congress will meet in the spring and form the supreme bodies of state authority. At the same time, work will begin on corresponding questions at the level of the republics, oblasts, krays and our other

national state formations. Including work on revising the Constitution and making amendments to the union-republic constitutions. All that is on the agenda.

Concerning regional cost accounting. The development of its principles should be launched on a very broad scale in the near future with the involvement of all the union republics and on a profoundly democratic basis. In the fall it is proposed to hold elections to the union-republic supreme soviets and the oblast, kray, rayon and other soviets. The structures of state bodies at all levels will be formed. Thus, the political reform should be carried out, by and large, approximately in the course of a year. It is being said that not enough time has been set aside for the discussion of those drafts. But in the first place, all these issues were discussed before the conference and at it, and they have been discussed since it. In the second place, putting off all this work would mean seriously delaying resolution of the questions of the structure of our state bodies. Yet there are other urgent matters that also need to be taken up. The economic reform about which we have spoken a lot here. Right now in the economic sphere we are beginning what is most important, i.e., the restructuring of ownership relations and of production relations themselves, and we are introducing full cost accounting, leasing arrangements and cooperatives. It may be that we still do not see perfectly well and in full detail what is to be done. But we must return the sense of proprietorship to people everywhere—not just in agriculture but in industry, the services sphere and other branches of our activity. That is the fundamental problem, the problem of the renewal of socialist society, on the solution of which the enhancement of its dynamism depends. If we don't solve it, nothing will come of the economic reform.

I, unfortunately, do not have the time or opportunity to speak in detail about that. But I think that our economic managers have a good sense of the necessity of such an approach. A person should feel the need to work according to his abilities. So that he has earned every ruble of his wages. We still have a lot of disorder in this respect. Wages, unfortunately, have been rising faster than labor productivity. Isn't that what explains the fact that the saturation of the market with foodstuffs and industrial goods has been improving very slowly in our country. And in some places, it has even been deteriorating. Not because fewer goods are being sold; at the present time we have a good rate of increase in light-industry volumes and in the services sphere. And even in the production of food there has been an increase. But wages are rising faster. Historically it has developed that for every kilogram of meat, the state loses at least two rubles. No other country in the world has a situation in which the retail price is only half the procurement price. And such a relationship between the prices for foodstuffs and industrial goods does not exist anywhere else, either.

In the economy we must solve the problems of material and technical supply and of improving the pricing system. You have probably noticed that for the first time

the figure on the state budget deficit for the following year has been published—36 billion rubles. This figure has been published in order that we might know the situation in which we find ourselves and seek ways of resolving the cluster of problems. And they the same problems. The state budget deficit, the surplus of money in the economy, imbalance, the lack of correspondence between effective consumer demand and the quantity of goods in trade.

Restructuring also affects such a sphere of our life as internationality relations. Here many problems have accumulated. They have accumulated because they were previously not given the necessary attention. They were driven inside, and because of that became more acute and painful. Many of them are connected with our republics' rapid development and the increase in people's national awareness. That process is also normal, inevitable and positive.

The atmosphere of openness, democracy and glasnost has brought all these problems to the surface. They have started to be openly discussed and have attracted people's attention. In the general context of restructuring, the problems of internationality relations have assumed their place, and it is far from the last place.

What can be said here? Indeed, unhealthy phenomena can be observed and have arisen in state and economic management. But they, incidentally, do not only concern internationality relations. They concern all the issues that are connected with the shortcomings of the administrative-command system of management and the excessive centralization of management functions. But it is one thing when this concerns oblasts and krays of the Russian Federation, and it is another thing when it concerns the union republics. Here these problems receive a certain national aspect and coloring.

Hence the idea of regional, including republic, cost accounting. It contains a great deal that is healthy and correct; it contains a great deal of what Lenin once invested in the idea of the tax in kind—there are certain economic obligations to society, and dispose of the rest yourself. That same idea lies at the basis of cost accounting—in particular, its second model. After all, if an enterprise fulfills its obligations to society and the state budget, it disposes of the rest itself.

Language problems and the problems of the national makeup of the union republics' populations have in a number of cases developed to a considerable extent under the influence of ongoing economic needs, spontaneously. In particular, they have developed in the course of the republic's rapid industrial development. This must not be blamed on someone in the center who established industry here, because the central agencies are following their own goals. They must develop their branches—let us say, electronics or microelectronics. They look to see where that can be done best, most

efficiently and most rapidly. Even less, should one blame the people who are hired at the new enterprises and in new branches of industry. They are absolutely beside the point here.

Unfortunately, social questions do not always receive the same sort of understanding in central agencies as purely economic and technical questions and the questions of developing new products. And the social questions are dumped on the local soviets. That is a fundamentally incorrect position. Without the solution of social problems, the economy cannot develop and scientific and technological progress cannot be carried out. That is now an elementary truth for everyone. Especially since it is also connected with the formation of the working class's national detachment. There is a problem in this. It cannot be avoided. And we must carefully analyze where the problem lies. Why is there not the proper ratio among students in vocational-technical schools—just as there is not, by the way, in the working class. Even in the technical higher schools there is not the proper ratio. That must be monitored. The director of the Alfa Association has reported that specialists of the sort he needs are not trained in the republic. They have to be brought in from outside. One wonders why this matter has not been resolved and is not being resolved. That is abnormal. In short, it is the subject of close analysis, but here we should not give free rein to our emotions. They will lead us far away. We must solve these problems through economic and social methods, but in no case through administrative methods. As attempts were made to link the question of citizenship with the regulation of the national makeup of a republic and its working class.

A few words about the language problem. It has been neglected, and it is a very acute and sensitive problem. It is an issue that wounds anyone. It also must be approached in a healthy manner, taking the real state of affairs into account and also not getting carried away seeking to place the blame, to find out who is who. We must, proceeding from the real state of affairs, find solutions to language problems. The sort of solutions that flow from a Leninist attitude toward these issues. And Lenin's principle was simple: no coercion and no administrative pressure with regard to the language preference and language affiliation of each person and each nation.

In conclusion, I would like to say that complex processes, which on the whole are positive, are now taking place in our society. We have unleashed people's initiative, their thoughts and actions. And that is a great accomplishment. But that initiative and people's independence must not be given over to the forces of uncontrolled elements, but must be taken into account and directed into a channel that will strengthen the socialist foundations of our society. The processes that are taking place have also given rise to a great many negative and undesirable phenomena, including extremist manifestations. They should be denied a place. But not by means of orders and reprimands. We must work using political

and ideological methods. Therefore, when people ask whether a Communist may be a member of the People's Front or the Internationalist Front, I would answer as follows: wherever there are people, wherever there are working people, there should also be a Communist. And he should pursue his work and his line among them.

Unhealthy processes and extremist manifestations are another matter. In relation to them one must work out a precise and clear position. Here I would emphasize the role of the working class. Over the course of many years we have often repeated that the working class is our society's vanguard and its leading force. The moment has come in which the working class should really manifest its guiding, regulating and—I would say—stabilizing role. It should put in its weighty word, and the party and all of its party organizations should help it in that regard.

Today we have discussed these matters with the leadership of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and reached the conclusion that a precise, clear and, of course, realistic position must be taken with regard to all the acute aspects of the republic's life and all the problems of restructuring that have become the subject of rather heated discussions and clashes, and that that position must be more vigorously defended by everyone in the spirit of restructuring. By all like-minded Communists, and by everyone regardless of national affiliation. That will make it possible to overcome the centrifugal tendencies and the growth of negative phenomena and contradictions and to master the course of events and turn it in the direction of constructive work for the good of the straightening out of relations among the republic's Communists and working people, in the direction of common, harmonious work in the field of restructuring and in the single internationalist family of our peoples. By relying on the working class and the republic's party organization, as comrades have correctly said here, you can solve the problems in the republic with your own forces. Every possibility for that exists.

You have tremendous traditions. The Latvian Red Riflemen were the force that supported the October Revolution in the most active fashion and ensured its development. I think that Latvia's working class, the republic's working people and Riga's workers will also, at the present stage of restructuring, which is a direct continuation of the cause of October, work together with our entire people and all the country's working people in order for restructuring to win a complete victory and result in the solution of all problems and the strengthening of our socialist state.

Then Ya. Ya. Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, took the floor.

He read a note the text of which was as follows: I ask you to comment on the draft decree of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers on migration from the standpoint of the observance of human rights and the USSR Constitution.

"Comrades," said Ya. Ya. Vagris, "this is a draft that has been published for broad discussion, and please submit your proposals."

Now for today's discussion. While fully accepting the criticism directed at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, I nonetheless want to remind you that the Central Committee Buro spoke out concerning the People's Front twice, before and after the congress. So appropriate judgments were given. Today the newspapers TSINYA and SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA have published my answers to a number of questions asked by correspondents. And we have figured that at the present time there is no need to analyze every article in the platform of the People's Front; its actual deeds will show what it is worth.

Today's meeting will make it possible to better prepare for the plenum of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee—precisely the plenum, and not the buro—where we will be able to analyze our today's debates and work out, as Vadim Andreyevich has said, clear-cut positions on all questions—work out, precisely, the platform of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee. The discussion that has taken place today will unquestionably help us prepare that plenum.

Comrades have said here that following the congress of the People's Front I called myself a happy man. But I did not say that. The following question was asked: what is happiness, and are you happy? I replied that it is happiness to live in such a tempestuous time, but I would only be happy when I succeeded in this position, which I have held for a very short time, in doing something for restructuring as a whole.

And furthermore, comrades. I was also born during the times of bourgeois Latvia and know first-hand, not from magazines, what the capitalist system is like and what bourgeois Latvia was like. And to hear that I, one of the republic's leaders, am arguing for Latvia's withdrawal from the USSR is simply insulting. Therefore, a request that, when criticizing, you do not let your emotions get the upper hand over your reason.

And finally. We do not have stores for executive personnel. In that case, let people name a specific address. We have people's control and workers' control; indicate the address where such a store is located. Then there will be a concrete discussion. Yes, there is in the Central Committee, the Council of Ministers and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet an order desk for food products. But I advise you to compare the VEF order desk with those order desks, and you will see for yourself to whose advantage such a comparison works.

Right here at VEF a meeting took place between V.A. Medvedev and a group of executives, party committee secretaries, and chairmen of the councils of industrial enterprises' labor collectives. P.F. Nefedov, general

director of the Latvia Production Association; I.Z. Gerchikov, general director of the Dzintars Production Association and chairman of the presidium of the standing assembly of councils of labor collectives in the city of Riga; R.Ya. Vintolinsh, director of the Yelgavselmash Plant; Ya.Ya. Tselms, director of a bakery combine in Proletarskiy Rayon; N.P. Bolshakov, secretary of the party committee of the Riga Railroad Car Plant; G.V. Izranova, chairman of the Proletarskiy Rayon Ispolkom, and other economic-management and party executives shared their views on the course of restructuring in the republic.

In the course of a businesslike and thoroughgoing discussion, they told about the problems that are worrying labor collectives. It was stressed that it is necessary to work more energetically to speed up economic reform, to grant greater independence to labor collectives, and to consistently work to implement the requirements of the Law on the State Enterprise (or Association).

The speakers expressed concern over the exacerbation of internationality relations in the republic. Matters are reaching the point where at a number of enterprises an exodus has begun of workers of nonindigenous nationality who are worried about their fate. The number of unfilled jobs has increased, which may result in a lowering of the pace of production and reduction in the output of consumer goods.

Serious criticism was addressed at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and other party committees, which have been taking a wait-and-see stand with regard to the resolution of many acute questions and losing the initiative. The policy of noninterference, the executives said, has never led to anything good. It was also said that all important decisions and decrees that affect people's interests should be discussed beforehand in labor collectives.

The economic-management and party executives leveled serious criticism at the mass media for tendentiousness and the lack of objectivity in the treatment of the complex problems of internationality relations. A wish was expressed to the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee concerning the need to enhance the party accountability of Communists working in the mass media. Presentations by journalists, the speakers said, should unite, not divide, people.

In concluding the meeting, V. A. Medvedev spoke. He noted the great role of the party organizations and economic-management executives in creating a normal atmosphere in each labor collective. He stressed that today it is especially important to direct the working people toward concrete deeds and create every condition for constructive work.

22161

59

NTIS

ATTN: PROCESS 103

BEVERLY FARRADAY

5285 PORT ROYAL RD

SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.