

JPRS-UPA-91-016
25 MARCH 1991

Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service



A N N I V E R S A R Y
1 9 4 1 - 1 9 9 1

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19991028 097

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

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Soviet Union Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-91-016

CONTENTS

25 March 1991

NATIONAL PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

- Yeltsin's Conflict With Gorbachev Viewed
[S. Kolesnikov; MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 21 Feb 91] 1

REPUBLIC PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

Baltics

- Estonian Delegation Demands Government Resignation
[A. Sandre; VECHERNIY TALLINN, 17 Jan 91] 3
- Estonian CP Position on 17 March Referendum [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 14 Feb 91] 4
- Future of Estonian Communists Pondered [I. Yastrebov; GLASNOST No 7, 14 Feb 91] 4
- Estonian Anarchist Describes Current Movement
[V. Doronin; MOLODEZH ESTONII, 5 Feb 91] 5
- Estonian Deputy Urges Law on Citizenship [S. Sovetnikov; MOLODEZH ESTONII, 8 Feb 91] ... 8
- Future of Coalitions in Latvian Parliament
[I. Kudryavtsev; BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA No 5, 24 Jan 91] 9
- 'Equality' Faction Returns to Parliament
[A. Petropavlovskaya; SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH, 27 Feb 91] 10
- New Latvian People's Front Program [BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA No 1, 8 Jan 91] 10
- Democratic Labor Party Official Views Latvia's Political Future
[J. Goldmanis; SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH, 27 Feb 91] 15
- 9 Feb Poll Election Commission Statistics [EKHO LITVY, 12 Feb 91] 17
- Rayon, City Voter Turnout for 9 Feb Poll [EKHO LITVY, 12 Feb 91] 17
- Legality of Vagnorius Appointment Affirmed [EKHO LITVY, 26 Feb 91] 17
- U.S. Congressmen Told Lithuania Wants Diplomatic Ties [EKHO LITVY, 23 Feb 91] 18
- Citizenship, Immigration Articles of Draft RSFSR-Lithuania Treaty [EKHO LITVY, 6 Feb 91] ... 18
- Lithuania's Humanist Party Chief Interviewed [V. Kazlauskas; EKHO LITVY, 8 Feb 91] 19

RSFSR

- Yeltsin Policies Assailed, Recall Demanded [A. Andreyev; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 9 Mar 91] .. 20
- Anti-Yeltsin Campaign in Army Denied [V. Nagorny; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 13 Mar 91] 24
- Yeltsin Critic Responds to 9 March Speech
[A. Andreyev; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 13 Mar 91] 25
- Moscow Oblast Autonomy Plan Criticized [G. Maloyan; PRAVDA, 12 Mar 91] 26
- Rayon Soviet Chairman Zaslavskiy Assailed [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 13 Mar 91] 28
- Zaslavskiy Responds to Press Attacks [I. Zaslavskiy; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 2 Mar 91] . 31
- Moscow Poll on Patrols, Referendum Cited [MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 14 Feb 91] 32

Western Republics

- Belorussian Supreme Soviet Considers Two Constitution Drafts
[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 15 Feb 91] 33
- Moldovan Draft Law on Self-Government Discussed
[A. Safonov; SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA, 5 Jan 91] 35
- Workers In Moldova Seek Jobs Abroad [I. Tronin; SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA, 20 Feb 91] 37

Caucasus

- Gamsakhurdia on Policies, Recent Events [ZARYA VOSTOKA, 19 Dec 90] 38
- Georgians Discuss New Local Administration Organs [VESTNIK GRUZII, 6 Feb 91] 43

Central Asia

Kolbin Blamed for 1986 Kazakh Riots, Republic Problems [V. Yanelis et al.; LENINSHIL ZHAS, 30 Nov 90]	45
Kazakh Writers' Union Secretary on Writer Activism in New Social Environment [LENINSHIL ZHAS, 25 Dec 90]	52

NATIONALITY ISSUES

SOYUZ Ethnographic Dictionary: Lak [SOYUZ No 1, Jan 91]	53
---	----

LAW AND ORDER

Statistics on Capital Punishment in USSR From 1985-1989 [V. Gubarev; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 26 Feb 91]	54
Rising Crime Figures in 1990 Detailed [B. Mikhaylov; GLASNOST No 7, 14 Feb 91]	55
Statistics on Suicide in Estonia 1985-1989 [A. Varnik; VECHERNIY TALLINN, 2 Feb 91]	55
Abortive 'Provocation' at Riga OMON Base Reported [A. Vladimirov; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 26 Feb 91]	56
Turkestan Military District KGB Chief on Tasks, Goals [N.K. Demik; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 4 Jan 91]	57

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ISSUES

Armenian Refugee Resettlement Problems [GOLOS ARMENII, 23 Jan 91]	62
Creation of 'Islamic Party' Seen as Unnecessary [PRAVDA VOSTOKA, Feb 91]	64
Kazakh Muslim Leader on Growth of Islam [EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN No 4, Jan 91]	65
Religious Leaders Call for Unity, Dialog [IZVESTIYA, 15 Mar 91]	66

Yeltsin's Conflict With Gorbachev Viewed

91UNI031A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 21 Feb 91 p 3

[Article by TASS political observer Sergey Kolesnikov:
"Who Needs a Split?"]

[Text] So, the words have been spoken. The process that has throughout the last three-plus years sometimes subsided, sometimes rushed full steam ahead, and sometimes dodged around the "broken terrain" of our political space has reached the logical conclusion. In a live television speech Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin declared that he dissociated himself from the "antipopular" policy of the president of the USSR and demanded his immediate resignation.

An exceptional statement, there is no denying. It essentially means a declaration of war against the country's constitutional leadership. And if account is taken of the high official status of the speaker and the special attitude toward him of many, many people in the country and the considerable degree of trust in all that the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet says and does, it is hard to exaggerate the consequences of this step. In a society that is in turmoil, whose temperature has already leaped above the danger point and where nerves have been stretched to the limit, such appeals are a straight road to destabilization and the political, social, and moral division of the people.

Why was this step taken, what kind of logic led to such an outcome of the political struggle?

In order to answer this question it is not enough to confine ourselves to an analysis of the surprise "declaration of intent" that concluded the lengthy and evasive television interview. But the reasoning contained in the statement, which was read out per a text that had been prepared in advance, also calls us back to the quite recent history of the perestroika years. It is important to note first of all B.N. Yeltsin's very attitude toward perestroika. If the result of its entire six-year history, in his opinion, has been only blood, collapse and manipulations, was it worth venturing upon the undertaking itself, fidelity to which the speaker has sworn repeatedly. Indeed, he himself also, as a politician, is in fact a child of perestroika with whom many of its striking pages are connected. There is a manifest alogism: Since perestroika has brought the people some sufferings, should we grieve over a "recoil in the reverse direction?"

The proposition concerning "would-be perestroika" is being heard quite loudly, incidentally, from the side of the political spectrum opposite to that to which B.N. Yeltsin and his team attribute themselves. Is this touching coincidence accidental?

More about history. Boris Nikolayevich recalled his speech at the CPSU Central Committee October (1987) Plenum, in which he allegedly warned against the danger

of an "absolutization of the personal power" of Gorbachev, which, allegedly, has led the country to "dictatorship."

There is no need today to indulge in myth-making since the stenographic account of the plenum has been published (albeit considerably behind time).

One further painful issue, which requires clarification in connection with the statement of the chairman of Russia's Supreme Soviet: concerning relations in the "Gorbachev-Yeltsin" copula and what has aided or prevented their cooperation. Boris Nikolayevich called as a witness the Lord God himself in order to establish for himself the role of peacemaker in the history of the complex relations of the two political leaders. Truly, notes about harmony in strategy and only some variant readings in tactics have been heard more than once in the speeches of B.N. Yeltsin. "There is no war between us," he declared exactly 13 months ago in an interview with the Japanese paper MAINICHI. But the very next day, 20 January 1990, a Dutch weekly carried one further B.N. Yeltsin interview under the arresting title "We Have Had It With Gorbachev...". And such "pendulum" quotes are scattered in abundance in the world's press. But the longer it goes on, the more palpably this pendulum has swung predominantly in one direction....

Yes, a hand toward concord and cooperation was preferred. Following B.N. Yeltsin's election to the highest state office of Russia, M.S. Gorbachev observed: "I am prepared to subscribe to much of what Comrade Yeltsin said in the final days before his election. And this being so, everything else is not an obstacle. The most important thing is that these be our common tasks and goals, the main thing is cooperation, particularly now, and consolidation. I would be dismayed and disturbed most were there at this stage of profound change in our society to be a split in the democratic forces, the forces of perestroika, all healthy forces in society. It is now very important that we have national harmony and a profound understanding of the necessity for what we must accomplish in these months of our impending work."

Joint work on the economic program of perestroika could have been an important step on this path. Unfortunately, it was not. We will not go into evaluations here of the different versions of the programs that were at the epicenter of the turbulent debate last fall. We would mention just one thing: The search for agreement and compromise came up at that time against the reluctance of the leader of the Russian parliament to make contact with the president of the USSR, and then came B.N. Yeltsin's abrupt statement at a meeting of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, a statement anticipating his recent television speech to some extent.

But let us turn from history to matters closer in time. The recent words and deeds of the leader of Russia enable us to get a fuller idea of the tactics of the actions aimed at the removal from office of the country's president. Whereas a year to 18 months ago B.N. Yeltsin was

disavowing in every possible way the idea of constituting competition for the head of the Union state, new notes in his pronouncements appeared shortly after: "I am not opposed to a presidency.... I am opposed to the haste with which this matter is now being decided. After all, presidency of what is not known. Questions of the country's form of government have not been decided. A law on the separation of functions between the center and the republics has not been enacted. The level of the republics' independence has not been determined...." Thus an original plan of the struggle for power had begun to mature even prior to Boris Nikolayevich's election to the office of leader of the Russian parliament: to achieve via the limitation and, subsequently, the reduction to a minimum of the functions of the Union structures a shift of the political center of gravity to the republic level. And Russia's very position here afforded an opportunity to become the "first among equal" leaders of sovereign republics. It is possible that this chain of logic, like any plan, for that matter, does not incorporate a multitude of other components and oversimplifies and coarsens the motivations. But, after all, it is this or a similar plan that is being implemented today, when attempts are being made in circumvention of the center to create one's own, "horizontal" union of four or five republics, when the transfer of the power of the president of the USSR to the Federation Council, in which, naturally, the head of Russia could not fail to play first fiddle, is being proclaimed and so forth. And the language of gesture, to which Boris Nikolayevich resorted at a recent meeting in Zelenograd, when he graphically showed the dimensions of the center to be "as little as this" and the powers of the republic authorities "I-i-ke this," becomes more comprehensible. And in order to achieve this literally everything is being employed—half-forgotten populist appeals for the abandonment of price reform (never mind the liberalization of prices per the calendar of the "500 days" program), muddled statements concerning a Russian army or national guard, appeals to the United Nations, and reproaches leveled at the U.S. administration, which allegedly "knows the situation in our country in insufficient depth."

All is working for the conclusion: "We cannot have a better life given the center as it exists currently." But where is the solution and how are we to break through toward this better life? In response, again and again reproaches leveled at the Union structures, and any measures of the president and government of the USSR aimed at a stabilization of the situation in the country

are rejected with a persistence worthy of a better application. It is, therefore, hardly appropriate to shift responsibility for the "war of laws" onto the Union leadership. And it is difficult shedding the impression that common sense here is frequently being sacrificed to purely political struggle. The "image" of a martyr and sufferer for the people's happiness created over three years ago is being exploited over and over, what is more....

And in conclusion an extract from a letter from a person who got to know B.N. Yeltsin closely during his trip to the United States in the fall of 1989. Jim Garrison organized this visit and accompanied Boris Nikolayevich on his tour of America. I would like to offer the reader Jim Garrison's political analysis. "As I see it," he writes, "the Soviet Union is experiencing an agonizing period of disintegration, democratization, and revolutionary change, when something akin to the classical models of the revolutionary movement would seem a real possibility. Gorbachev is undoubtedly an outstanding leader who is attempting purposefully, displaying exceptional farsightedness and restraint, to dismantle the old system and create a new one while trying at the same time to hold on in the center. In order to be successful he has to change the Soviet Union, having created a new union without violating the integrity of the present union here. If he succeeds, he will be virtually without parallel in modern history.

"Instead of helping Gorbachev in the accomplishment of this most arduous task, Yeltsin considers it his goal to 'swim against the tide,' skillfully expressing and channeling the discontent that Gorbachev is engendering and that he cannot satisfy.... In short, his rhetoric is of the left, but his policy is of the right.

"It is here that I consider it appropriate to quote Churchill's words about the difference between a statesman and a politician. The statesman, Churchill said, is oriented toward the next generation, politicians, toward the next election. I cannot rid myself of the thought that Gorbachev is creating democracy to save the Soviet Union. Yeltsin, on the other hand, is using democracy to realize his ambitions. The present crisis may be settled only by statesmen. Politicians represent a threat to the country."

Truly, Jim Garrison has, in my opinion, quite accurately defined the essence of the present collision.

Baltics

Estonian Delegation Demands Government Resignation

91UN0977A Tallinn VECHERNIY TALLINN
in Russian 17 Jan 91 p 1

[Article by Ayli Sandre: "Two Against Nine"]

[Text] To bring prices to the level that existed prior to 15 October, to review laws on taxation and bring them into accordance with the laws existing in the USSR, to restore the Constitution of the USSR and the Estonian SSR, to carry out the orders of the president of the USSR, to form a new government on a quota basis—these, briefly, are the demands presented by participants of a rally at Toompea on 15 January to the Supreme Soviet; a response to them was supposed to be offered by yesterday midday.

At 1200 at the Toompea palace Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, and Speaker Ulo Nugis were seated on one side of a table. On the other side sat a more impressive group: Igor Shepelevich, chairman of the OSTK [United Council of Labor Collectives]; Yevgeniy Kogan, USSR people's deputy and representative of Intermovement; Pavel Panfilov, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party (loyal to the CPSU); Aleksey Lukoshkin, chairman of the council of directors of the OSTK; Vladimir Lebedev, leader of the deputies group "For Equal Rights"; and others, nine people in all. Inasmuch as people from various movements, organizations, institutions, and enterprises were represented, Arnold Ruutel proposed that they state their position and clarify their demands—those demands presented on 15 January were of an unspecific, general nature. The Supreme Soviet Presidium would examine them later in accordance with established procedure. Before responding to the proposal of the Supreme Soviet chairman, Pavel Panfilov turned to journalists and the Supreme Soviet Commission on the Press and asked them to report objectively on the events of recent days. In his opinion, everything that had been written until this time had been close to the truth but not the truth itself. Pavel Panfilov added that this, perhaps, was only his subjective point of view. The representatives paid no attention to the proposal of Arnold Ruutel and ignored the fact that over the last few days the Supreme Soviet Presidium had received approximately 1,000 statements and proposals from various enterprises and organizers of the rallies on 15 January in other places of Estonia—it had been physically impossible to respond to them all over the short period of time. Igor Shepelevich wanted to hear a concrete response as to whether the chairman and speaker of the Supreme Soviet want to continue the dialogue that has lasted more than a year or begin a new one or simply part ways immediately. Ulo Nugis noted that it would be possible to begin a dialogue. (After all, dialogue is possible in regard to several of the demands.)

"We cannot now conduct a dialogue on this question (of the resignation of the administration). I do not have such authority. That must be discussed at another level, not here at this table," said Arnold Ruutel. Then he proposed that concrete proposals be discussed. But nothing came of it.

The delegation noted that they are not the only ones to demand the resignation of the administration and the dismissal of the Supreme Soviet (as incapable of resolving the most important problems) and that such demands have been made since the administration and the parliament first began to function (Kaydo Kama, who continues to take a hard line on this issue, was cited as an example). Pavel Panfilov went on to say that their positions are clear but not inflexible and that there is room for alternatives and different variants... Incidentally, he was the only one in the delegation who expressed understanding for the problem of the shortage of time noted by A. Ruutel, and he proposed that they assemble again after the Presidium was prepared to offer answers and proposals. For his part, Ulo Nugis proposed that the matter be conducted in legal fashion. Inasmuch as representatives of the delegation belong to the Supreme Soviet (the reference was to Lebedev and Panfilov), let them design their own draft bill (for example on taxation, etc.) and present it for discussion to the Supreme Soviet. That would be the most logical answer—to resolve the issues in a parliamentary fashion and not with ultimatums. A small argument took place that was cut short when P. Panfilov received a note from V. Lebedev, after which all nine members of the delegation stood up and headed for the exit—the meeting ended without result. There was a promise to convene a coordinating committee by evening (in the building of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee), which should decide what step to take next...

At the exit Pavel Panfilov was surrounded by journalists. Here are some of his responses to questions. The coordinating committee will decide whether or not there will be a strike. In advance, referendums will be conducted at the enterprises to clarify the opinion of the workers. We demand specific responses to specific questions, but this should not be taken to mean that we demand the immediate dissolution of the government. The coordinating committee will be created with the goal of finally ensuring Estonia a government that will care about the welfare of the entire population and ensure that government work is carried out by specialists and not politicians, as at present. According to Pavel Panfilov, the leaders of the administration of Estonia should be Estonians (the president, the prime minister, and the majority of ministers). He does not see a place for himself in the administration.

What will happen tomorrow? "Nothing. As I have already said, the coordinating committee will meet, and it will make a decision," noted P. Panfilov. In his opinion, military units will not be introduced into Estonia. "We do not need soldiers. You see yourselves

how the meeting passed and what the general circumstances are. They are completely different here from those in Lithuania or Latvia—no one is seizing buildings, and the party is not making any demands. In my opinion, we are conducting negotiations in a cultured and civilized fashion, as people should. The main thing is for our life to change for the better. We are not so naive as to suppose that if a new man were to replace Savisaar everything would immediately improve...”

Wise words. If only their demands were also wise... How can one demand from the government, the Supreme Soviet, and the Estonian people, who have chosen the path toward independence, execution of the orders of the president (even in this so-called transition period)?! Or the restoration of the USSR Constitution?

Estonian CP Position on 17 March Referendum

*91P50125A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
14 Feb 91 First Edition p 1*

[Article by TASS correspondent: “Participation in the Referendums”]

[Text] The Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia did not support the appeal of Intermovement, which unites primarily the non-Estonian population, to boycott the referendum on the republic’s status scheduled for 3 March.

In the published statement of the Estonian CP Central Committee Secretariat the party leadership appealed to all “who cherish peace, tranquility, and justice to participate in both the republic and the all-union referendums.” As it reported, the all-union referendum on the future of the USSR as a Union state was planned by the country’s leadership for 17 March, but the three Baltic republics anticipated it with their own referendums.

The Estonian CP Central Committee Secretariat believes that it is the task of Communists to participate in the republic referendum and to vote “no” on the question posed: “Do you want the restoration of the state independence and non-dependence of the Estonian republic?”

In the opinion of the Estonian Communist Party leadership, “the boycott of the referendum will be only at the hand of the advocates of breaking ties with the USSR.” There is support for the initiative of the joint session of the soviets of the primarily Russian-speaking industrial cities of Narva, Kokhtla-Yarva, and Sillamye to conduct a regional referendum among the population of the north eastern part of the republic on the status of Estonia within the USSR.

Future of Estonian Communists Pondered

*91UN1036A Moscow GLASNOST in Russian No 7,
14 Feb 91 p 3*

[Article by I. Yastrebov, doctor of philosophical sciences: “Communists and the Future of Estonia”]

[Text] A year ago the still united Communist Party of Estonia numbered 106,000 members. Today it has

approximately 57,000 members, but only 33,000 of them are paying membership dues. Another part of the Communist Party of Estonia, called the Independent Communist Party of Estonia (SKPE), has 5,000 members, and 1,300 of them, what is more, still maintain dual membership—of the CPSU and the SKPE.

Despite the fact that a common action program was adopted and a coalition Central Committee was formed at the 20th Communist Party of Estonia Congress (March 1990), a split in the party occurred. The 21st Communist Party of Estonia Congress (on the Standpoints of the CPSU) and a conference of the SKPE held simultaneously in Tallinn on 15 December 1990 enshrined it. The “i” was conclusively dotted by the 21st SKPE Congress on 26 January 1991, which formed a new party with its own program, rules and membership.

The resolution of the 21st Communist Party of Estonia Congress observed that the renewed Communist Party of Estonia was the successor of the communist workers’ organizations formed back at the start of the century at enterprises of Tallinn and Narva. Constituted at its first congress and emerging from clandestine activity in 1940, the Communist Party of Estonia has trodden a complex and contradictory path together with the CPSU. Today it operates within the CPSU as an independent territorial organization on the basis of its own program and statutory documents. L.E. Annus, first secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee, has been elected a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

In turn, the SKPE also considers itself the successor of the movement of workers and all working people of Estonia, but differs from the Communist Party of Estonia ideologically. As distinct from the Communist Party of Estonia, the SKPE sees as the sources of the present crisis of society not the distortions in party and state building that led to tyranny and lawlessness but the deficiency of the socialist idea. This party believes that the activity of the Communist Party of Estonia could under present conditions stimulate an increase in inter-ethnic conflicts and the anticommunist mood. At the same time, however, both parties confirm their devotion to the principles of democracy.

So two communist parties have emerged in Estonia, each of which adheres to different positions on questions of the social system and the official status of the republic, priority of forms of ownership and the nature of market relations, attitude toward the USSR and the CPSU and the Soviet Army and the implementation of nationality policy. One (the Communist Party of Estonia), still populous and with a social base, mainly among the so-called Russian-speaking population and industrial workers, remains an important political force in the republic. The other (the SKPE), small and wishing to

become a parliamentary-type party, is relying increasingly on the middle strata, of the indigenous population, in the main.

In order to understand the reasons for the split in the communist movement in Estonia it is necessary to have an idea of the sociopolitical and ideological background against which it occurred.

Take, for example, the problem of the Russian-speaking population constituting one-third of the inhabitants of Estonia. The legislative and executive authorities of the republic had adopted a number of discriminatory enactments seriously infringing and limiting its rights and liberties. The laws and directives governing the official language, citizenship, migration, residence permits and the procedure of the allocation of housing, the termination of social and material provision for servicemen and their families, the charge for tuition and so forth put them in the position of "second-class" people. Persons who acquired Estonian citizenship prior to 1940 and their direct descendants are declared full citizens of the republic. The rest may merely apply to obtain citizenship. And if we add to this "bouquet" active nationalist propaganda, primarily in the mass media, it is understandable why the bulk of the indigenous and Russian-speaking population, Estonians and Estonian landmen, are divided, despite the practically common living conditions.

Big monies from the pocket of the working people, regardless of their nationality, are currently spent on the maintenance of an unprecedentedly swollen machinery of state, militarized formations and miscellaneous novelties connected with the policy of proclamation of Estonia's independence. But is it not clear that the policy of the rash severance of economic ties to the USSR will do nothing good for people either? The recent almost five-fold increase in the retail price of food and consumer merchandise, which has caused acute social tension in the republic, was an inevitable result of such a policy.

Acting in defense of the interests of all working people and opposed to a winding down of the process of democratization and glasnost and the formation of totalitarian structures of power, the Communist Party of Estonia is working actively in parliament and in the workforce and exposing separatist and extremist forces, which have recently embarked on the path of open confrontation. The Communist Party of Estonia sees as its task the achievement of civil harmony and the development and strengthening of ties to all democratic organizations, movements, parties, and platforms. Under conditions where a sobering-up from the intoxication of nationalism is under way, its ties to the peasantry, unhappy with the present agrarian policy and the violation of the rights of people and their associations to property, are being restored. Many peasants are protesting the breakup of the kolkhozes and the projected return of the land to its former owners—landowners and kulaks—and this is leading them to

unite with the Communists. The Communists are cooperating actively with youth and women's organizations also.

It is not fortuitous that the actions of the authorities are aimed against the Communists. A legislative instrument similar to the law on political parties that has been enacted in Lithuania is being prepared in Estonia. Its adoption will be the legal basis for the elimination of the Communist Party of Estonia and other social and political organizations upholding the socialist choice and the unity of our multinational state. So it is by no means the activity of the Communist Party of Estonia that is contributing to the intensification of interethnic conflicts and the anticommunist mood in Estonia. Civil peace in the republic will not be restored without the repeal of all legislative instruments violating human rights. And the SKPE, whose documents speak of the equal rights of all inhabitants of Estonia, could be the ally of the Communist Party of Estonia in this respect.

The Communist Party of Estonia and the SKPE have things in common. It is for this reason that the recent joint plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission decided to create a commission and send it to the party organizations of Estonia to study the situation with a view to seeking ways of consolidating the forces of the Communists and ensuring civil peace and social harmony in the republic.

Estonian Anarchist Describes Current Movement

*91UN1050A Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII
in Russian 5 Feb 91 p 2*

[Article by Vladimir Viktorovich Doronin: "Anarchy and Order in the State"]

[Text] Lately, political parties have been appearing in the USSR like mushrooms after the rain. Among these new associations, the anarcho-syndicalists have been declaring themselves more and more loudly. We do not know much about this movement, but after all at its origins stood such prominent figures as Prudon, Bakunin and Kropotkin... But when we think about the black banner of the anarchists, we merely nod in the direction of Father Makhio...

There are followers of the anarchist ideology in Estonia today. One of them, V. Doronin, asked the editors of "ME" to grant him some space in the newspaper in order to describe this curious movement in its present stage:

No doubt many people who hear the slogan, "Anarchy is the Mother of Order," exclaim in exasperation, "Now look what we have sunk to! We do not even have enough anarchy to make us happy." But...One of the leaders of the anarchists said: "When the people have grown weary of all kinds of political power and all kinds of dictatorships, when they have had enough of various kinds of parliamentary windbags, and when their stock of faith in government is completely exhausted, then the people

themselves will consciously arrive at the idea of anarchism..." At present, unions and associations of anarchists are being formed in various cities and republics—true, often under other names (in order to not scare off the mistrustful). And so it makes sense to take a good hard look at the true ideas of anarchism, which have been distorted by the ideologues of pseudocommunism (like a lot of other things in our country, that were buried in 1917 under the wreckage of the bourgeois state, upon which we built what we have now, for which there is no name). Now we do not need a multi-party state, which dissipate our minds, our will and our energies among a multitude of parties, factions, and movements; and we do not need the inter-ethnic outbursts which the outspoken leaders of nationalistic groupings are provoking as they hide behind their alleged concern for the people and sow trouble among the workers, multiplying the bloody carnage, and the suffering and tears of mothers, widowers and orphans... They have nothing to share with the working people; no one will take their "burden" from them. We have only one enemy; and we have a common enemy: the state bureaucracy. Its flaws are plain to everyone.

...The new phenomenon of political dilettantes often argue themselves hoarse over a subject the true meaning of which is extremely hazy to them, or else they introduce to a specific concept only the meaning which they need. That is the way it was with the ideas of communism, democracy, the market... Anarchy has not avoided this fate either.

Just who cannot recall anarchy today? From the tender-hearted old women standing in line for macaroni, right up to the President. It turns out that wherever there is sabotage, there is anarchy; where there is bureaucratic arbitrariness, once again, anarchy. When the government blunders, anarchy is blamed; where there is economic chaos and banditry—it has to be anarchy. And even if there is a drunken brawl and a debauch, or snotty youths and equally snotty young girls stage an orgy, then they are just anarchists, there is just no two ways about it.

Well, you had better fear the wrath of God, at last! Who in this wretched country could start anarchy, and when? Or socialism, not to mention communism? Everything that we have been able to breed in the years of "soviet" power in our country, such as those government parasites, thieves and bribe-takers, who have bred an entire army of departmental bureaucrats, has in turn opened the way for arbitrary rule, corruption and drunkenness. And all this under the cover of beautiful words about the "good of the Fatherland." Soviet propaganda has also successfully done its work on the minds and ears of the naive, trusting people weighing out the "noodles" (All one has to do is to recall the film "The Optimistic Tragedy," where anarchists were represented as a gang of cruel and imbecilic syphilitics). And so we conjure up an image of an anarchist as a kind of highway bandit in a torn vest, with a Mauser at his side; a murderer and a drunkard.

But let us open a textbook on scientific communism: "As a rule, a new stratum breaks off from the bourgeoisie and grows rapidly—the bureaucracy, which operates the state enterprises in conditions of growth of the state sector. Lack of control over its actions promotes a wild outburst of corruption, embezzlement of public funds, and bribetaking, which stimulates the growth of parasitical layers of bureaucratic bourgeoisie. As the experience of a number of countries bears witness, these strata are one of the chief causes of chaos and economic crisis in the country." All this pertains to our country also, and to Estonia in particular. The number of state bureaucrats has not only not decreased during the years of perestroika—on the contrary, it has grown. Former communists quickly bailed out of the CPSU and attached themselves to the national movements, whereby they ensured themselves of positions at the levers of power. As always, they made lavish promises of the wonders to come, moved to other cushy jobs, switched the nameplates over their offices, made themselves over into "gentlemen," and decided that is all there is to perestroika. It is possible that this suits them, but it hardly suits the worker, no matter what nationality he is.

They feel no shame over the fact that we, the ordinary people, have to walk about in the world like beggars, in a ragged jersey; cold, hungry, with galoshes on our bare feet. We are like clowns in the world arena: we jump out at the people, do a few somersaults, make the crowd laugh, and walk around the ring holding out our caps, begging for a little something... Have we really lost so much self-respect that we cannot get ourselves out of this swamp? Are we really such incompetent workers, such idlers and drunkards? I do not believe it! It is the incompetent state leadership that has made us so. We are forced to lie, steal, deceive, and bow and scrape before low-down extortionists, despising ourselves for it. And as we despise ourselves, we also despise those around us, venting our anger on them. We are searching for the guilty parties, and we are finding them in places where they have never been...

Negative energy has been building up in the country all this time. Now it is as if we have almost broken down into our basic elements. It would seem it is time to stop, take stock of what remains of us, and start to build something worthy of a civilized society. Having no conception of any other form of administration except the state, we have turned to the West in search of a suitable model. They have democracy there; they have abundance there (incidentally, thanks to the "anarchy" of production); they hold the law in esteem there; they respect the rights of man there; it is cozy and warm there (True, not for everyone either). But that is theirs and it is over there; but this is ours, and it is here. And what they have there has been cultivated and passed down from generation to generation; whereas, on our soil it does not produce the expected shoots. Everything that we are now dragging home from the "trash heap" of capitalism, once again takes on the form of a monster. That is the way it was with us with the ideas of socialism and communism,

and that is what we observe right now. The democratization of society has turned into an empty talking-shop; into lawlessness, arbitrary rule and an inter-ethnic brawl: the cooperative movement has become a legalized swindle, and the transition to a market has turned into an uncontrolled and unrestrained increase of prices and taxes. The government is in shambles. Now the classic question is: "What is to be done?" Restructure ourselves! (Well then, restructure yourself again! And if it does not work for you...) Probably it would work, but it will not get you anywhere. Just what to restructure, and into what? It is the structure of the governing of society that must be restructured: it is necessary to support the transition from state administration to societal self-government. Right now if you were to stop a passer-by on the street and ask, "Do you consider yourself an anarchist?" in most cases the answer would be, "No." However, I am convinced that the majority of them are in their hearts, anarchists. And I could prove this if newspaper space would allow. In any case, communists (I have in mind true communists, and not imposters) simply would be unable to not be anarchists: after all, true democrats cannot help but share the basic principles of anarchy.

Just what is anarchy then? It is a socio-political movement that stands for the elimination of all kinds of state power, and the creation of federations of small, autonomous associations of producers. The highest form of organization of the working class is considered the trade unions (French, syndicates), to which the means of production must be transferred. Anarchism rejects the political struggle of the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and political parties. For the most important things in life for man are liberty and freedom.

The leaders of today, in their zealous struggle for independence, are completely forgetting about the main thing: the purpose of the struggle is the interests of the people. Certain zealous fighters for freedom and democracy have cried: "It would be better for us to eat peelings than to abandon the struggle for the independence of our dear and fervently-loved Motherland." Their intentions are laudable, and I personally support them, but...I would like to at least take a peek at those peelings which these political adventurers have gathered. And independence from whom? From the Moscow party-administrative bureaucracy? But what, I ask, difference does it make to an Estonian or a non-Estonian worker, whether it is a comrade from Moscow, or a gentleman from Tallinn, who sits on his neck and rifles his pockets? As they say, perhaps something will turn up there, in the workingman's pockets, that you might still be able to "communize." Once upon a time Mr. Savisaar, replying to the demand that government step down, recalled the saying, "Do not change horses in midstream!" To be honest about it, it is hard for me to imagine him and the gentlemen like him in the role of a motive force. To me they are all lumped together in the rickety "wagon" of state, along with the embezzlers, petty thieves and speculators; shouting, pushing and shoving, grabbing the

reins from one another: every one wants to be the driver, but they do not have a clue where to go... And to pull this "wagon," they have presented a skinny worker-peasant "horse," with wobbly legs, pinched with hunger, his ribs sticking out. However, those who are in the "wagon" keep urging it on and keep trying to tighten the bridle even more. They try to persuade it to hang on another ten or twenty years...

But is it enough to be patient? After all, there must be a limit to the workers' patience, and to the impertinence of the rulers. It is already high time to shake all those teamsters out of the "wagon" and lay the "horse collar" on them; drag them all out together. And so that it does not turn out like Krylov's tale of the Lobster, the Swan and the Pike (And it is turning out just like that right now), we must come to an agreement about just where we would like to go; where we want to pull our "wagon" to. I know where I want to go, and what is needed to do so, and every one should decide for himself, where he wants to go. And only then get into harness. Unfortunately, there is not enough space here to expound fully and in detail the ideas of anarchism; but one can cite as a convincing example the order and harmony which prevail in nature (if, of course, the "tsar of nature" does not creep in with his experiments): where no one gives anyone any orders; where everyone carries out his definite function in his own place, and everyone is subject to the one true law: TO THE LAW OF UNIVERSAL REASON, that is, TO GOD.

In nature problems do not exist; they are all resolved by natural means. In the life of a society, problems and complex situations are created by people; therefore, it is only for the people to untangle them. And for this, every one must master yet another principle of anarchy—the "principle of Dary": "Before you undertake anything, think about it and give yourself an honest answer to the questions, Is this wise or unwise? Is it just or unjust? Is it noble or ignoble? To whom will it be of use and how? To whom will it cause harm, and what kind?" I will not at this time set myself the task of turning everyone into an anarchist; this would be naive at the very least: the ideas cannot be grasped immediately. It is hard to convince a person, and to make one change one's mind is almost impossible. My task is to arouse if not interest, then at least curiosity about the idea of ANARCHISM and, to the extent possible, to present these ideas in their true sense. And to unite those who share these ideas and basic principles under the common banner of the struggle with bureaucratism, with arbitrary rule, with taking the law into one's own hands, with political adventurism, and with party imposters.

People have abandoned reason. They are hostile to, hate and kill one another, and if you ask "Why?" they themselves do not know. Just ask the question of an Estonian or a Russian: "What do you want for yourself personally as a result of this struggle?" Only no ringing words about the freedom of the Motherland are needed (It is man himself that must be free: A free society can be formed only from free people). No one on the sidelines is

capable of helping us today. There is not a single government nor a single party that is capable of controlling the social processes today. We ourselves are the only ones who can help ourselves, supporting one another. When a person is alone, and ahead lies the unknown, fear and uncertainty are sown in him; but if he sees next to him his comrade's shoulder, on which he can lean, the fear departs. Let us offer one another our shoulder. And let us not forget the old truth: What one of us is not strong enough to do, we are strong enough to do together.

And how one hopes that one were surrounded by kind, honest and respectable people, who would not cheat you, would not fleece you, would not put a pea in your shoe. I think I am not the only one who wants this. Therefore, I invite those who wish, to unite their efforts. You may tell about your own desires (or give good counsel) on a post card, where I ask you to tell about yourself: who you are, where you are from, where you live, what you do for a living, and what your hobbies are. I would be happy to find like-minded people, comrades-in-arms, and comrades. Send the postcards to: Doronin, Vladimir Viktorovich, Box 1064, Tallinn-3.

Estonian Deputy Urges Law on Citizenship

91UN1071A Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII
in Russian 8 Feb 91 p 1

[Article by S. Sovetnikov, deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Republic, chairman of the International Relations Commission: "The Question Point-Blank: Citizenship or Statehood?"]

[Text] Which came first—the chicken or the egg? This philosophical question has been of interest to curious people throughout the centuries. And today well-known Estonian politicians are arguing over a similarly "unsolvable" question: "Which is first—the Law on Citizenship or a Proclamation of the Statehood of Estonia?"

Unfortunately, a majority of Estonian politicians, including Marju Lauristin, deputy speaker of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Republic and chairman of the working commission of the Supreme Soviet on matters of citizenship, believes that it is first necessary to proclaim an autonomous, independent Estonian state, and only then to adopt a Law on Citizenship. Such an opinion, in my view, first of all puts in doubt (or even negates entirely) the resolution of the Estonian Republic Supreme Soviet adopted 30 March 1990 "On the State Status of Estonia," the Estonian Republic law "On the State Symbols of the Estonian Republic" of 8 May 1990, and the law "On Principles of Temporary Procedure for Governing Estonia" of 16 May 1990. Secondly, in such event the present Estonian Republic Supreme Soviet is deprived of the right to adopt a Law on Citizenship, being an "illegal" ("occupation") highest legislative organ of authority. What amazes and astonishes me more than anything else in all of this is the fact that in deciding this—indisputably the main issue of our internal interethnic policy—we are cutting off the branch

on which we sit. They say, let us have the Law on Citizenship adopted by a State Assembly, while we limit ourselves to adopting laws "On the Register of Voters," and "On Elections to the State Assembly," and...on this note conclude our work in the Supreme Soviet, yielding to the newly elected State Assembly of the Estonian Republic.

It is all quite simple. With the exception of one "trifling" matter—will the deputies and thousands of their voters agree with such a decision?

It is clear to everyone today that we must adopt as quickly as possible the base version of the Law on Citizenship, affording equal rights to all who consider Estonia their native land.

State procrastination of this issue in the form of "intermediate steps"—adopting the Law on the Register of Voters, as well as the Decree on Referendum enacted according to the Law on Elections to the Supreme Soviet and adopted 17 January 1989—elicits doubts and worry on the part of the non-Estonian population over their future, and creates additional political and interethnic tension in the republic.

In the performance of my duty as chairman of the Standing International Relations Commission of the Supreme Soviet, I see as the single possible solution to our interethnic problems the immediate adoption of the Law on Estonian Republic Citizenship. For prior to restoring the autonomous and independent Estonian Republic, 600,000 non-Estonians want to know what "sort" of citizens they are going to be in this democratic, free state, what political, economic, and social rights they will be guaranteed. What these people fear (and I am one of them) has nothing to do with a free and independent Estonia, but rather reflects their uncertainty with respect to tomorrow.

In short, the Russian-speaking population should obtain guarantees that they will not be discriminated against following restoration of the Estonian Republic. Non-Estonians must be provided constitutional guarantees of full rights—full political, economic, and social rights.

In order to eliminate interethnic tension, in my view, citizenship (and all its ensuing rights and obligations) should be extended to everyone who expresses the desire and possesses a permanent residence permit here. I would note that the following paragraphs appear in the Basic Law of the Estonian Republic, adopted 15 June 1920 by the Constituent Assembly, the first in the history of the Estonian people:

"20. Each Estonian citizen is free in the determination of his own nationality."

"22. In those localities where the majority of inhabitants are not Estonians, but belong to a local ethnic minority, the administrative and business language in institutions of local self-government can be the language of this ethnic minority."

"23. Citizens of German, Russian, and Swedish nationality have the right to engage in written correspondence with central state institutions in their own language."

"31. Citizens have the right to demand that the Law be issued, amended, or repealed through procedure of popular initiative of 225,000 citizens who have the right to vote."

According to the 1920 Constitution, all citizens of former Tsarist Russia in the territory of the republic following the Civil War were afforded the opportunity to acquire Estonian citizenship if they so desired, regardless of nationality or religious beliefs.

It would be strange, to put it mildly, if the newly adopted Law on Citizenship turned out to be less democratic than the Basic Law of the Estonian Republic of 1920.

I would like to note in conclusion that neither the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet—in its appeal to the Coordinating Committee empowered to represent the interests of participants in the January demonstration in Toompea—nor Chairman of the Supreme Soviet A. Ruutel—in his response to the demand of representatives of Narva labor collectives ("to immediately put up for discussion the draft Law on Citizenship and submit it for the review of international expertise")—say anything decisive about the main issue of today. But this means that political tension in the republic will continue to rise as before. Under such conditions, the only proper course would be to adopt the Law on Citizenship.

The people of Estonia are today awaiting this law from us. It is this law which will put an end to dividing things up between "ours" and "not ours," "our own" and "others," "indigenous" and "migrant." For we are living in a single Estonian land, under one roof, under the same Baltic sky—either comforting or threatening...

The well-being and happiness of any people cannot depend on a paragraph or point of one law or another. If the laws are imperfect, if they do not conform with the interests of citizens, they must be changed.

Future of Coalitions in Latvian Parliament

91UN1063A Riga BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA
in Russian No 5, 24 Jan 91 p 2

[Article by I. Kudryavtsev: "Is Coalition Possible?"]

[Text] "We consider ourselves a part of the Supreme Soviet, although we are not present at its sessions," Sergejs Dimanis, chairman of the "Equality" faction, said at a press conference on 22 January. "As to the ties between the faction and the National Salvation Committee, I state that there are no documents that would indicate our cooperation. Until lately we supported the government; now we believe that it should be reorganized."

Thus, it appears that the opposition faction in the parliament has defined its position toward the Republic

of Latvia's power organs: It will utilize constitutional methods. What remains is the question of their return to the Supreme Soviet building; at this moment it is in the process of active negotiations, the participants in which are S. Dimanis and other faction members, and A. Gorbunovs and J. Dinevics, chairman of the majority faction. The "Equality" walkout has been explained by two main reasons: barricades erected around the Supreme Soviet building, and the signing of a joint document (on 13 January) by the parliament and the Citizens Congress. The barricades are being removed now. Whether it will be just as easy to sort out the relationship between the parliament and the Citizens Committee is hard to say, but one thing is clear: Their cooperation contradicts the Republic of Latvia's Constitution that is currently in effect, since it stipulates the existence of only one legitimate REPRESENTATIVE organ—the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet.

Speaking of the possibility of returning to the parliament, Sergejs Dimanis emphasized that the faction would like to truly participate in its work. "We are ready to share responsibility with the majority, but in reality this does not happen, since the standing order of the parliament excludes the minority faction from the decisionmaking process," underscored Dimanis. "The collective responsibility of all political forces in Latvia, however, would be a better guarantee against antigovernment actions." Nevertheless, he believes that so far the probability of creating a coalition government remains low.

On the whole the position of the faction, even after everything that has happened in Latvia during the last month, has not changed much. And there is little chance that any serious changes will take place as long as the faction retains its existing membership.

Is the establishment of interfaction cooperation and real interfaction coalitions possible in the Latvian parliament? So far, hardly, since at this point an agreement between the two factions means an agreement between all deputies in the entire parliament—from the "Salvation Committee" members to the Movement for the National Independence of Latvia activists. Both factions have enough radicals whose political credo is confrontation, and to attempt to unite them is meaningless. The Lithuanian and Estonian parliaments have long ago gotten rid of huge factions uniting "all those who are for the independence" or "all those who are against;" an increasingly important role in these parliaments now belongs to the factions that have emerged after several months of work—the centrist faction, and the factions of "moderate" national-democrats and of "free" former communists. In these parliaments political confrontation has gradually been replaced by businesslike competition on specific issues, and winning by "numbers"—by competition in competence.

Perhaps the Latvian parliament could use the political experience of its neighbors?

'Equality' Faction Returns to Parliament

91UN1098D Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH
in Russian 27 Feb 91 p 1

[Article by Alla Petropavlovskaya: "Back to the Way It Was"]

[Text] So, since 26 February the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Latvia has operated with a full complement. The "Equality" faction has returned. The operation of the parliament has become considerably livelier: The very first joint plenary session began with a clash between independent Deputy A. Alekseyev and head of the Secretariat J. Dobelis. However, I believe that one of the deputies, who noted at a meeting of the majority faction that the return of the opposition would get the stagnant blood of the deputies circulating, meant something else. However, this is a remark in passing...

An issue of principle remains. In its time, "Equality" set for the remainder of the parliament several nonnegotiable conditions for its return—changing the quorum and severing an alliance between the Supreme Soviet and the Latvian Committee of the Congress of Citizens which, in the opinion of the opposition, existed. These demands have not been fully met, but the faction has returned.

S. Dimanis believes that "the quorum may be changed in the course of discussing new Supreme Soviet rules of procedure, and only if we work in the parliament. Without our help, radicals will 'crush' centrists, and nobody will be able to accomplish anything. This is why in the past two weeks the creation of an interfaction reconciliation bureau has been discussed, as well as the adoption of a joint declaration on behalf of the bureau.

"A careful review has revealed that at present there is no real alliance between the Supreme Soviet and the Latvian Committee. Moreover, unprecedented attacks against the current legislative and executive authorities have begun in the committee newspaper PILSONIS. In a joint declaration, representatives of the interfaction bureau have acknowledged that the entry of the Supreme Soviet into a political alliance with any party, committee, etc. is impermissible. If we feel that these general assurances are turning out to be hollow, we will leave and never return. A forthcoming critical situation may be the first test. If the majority faction rushes into the embrace of the committee again this will be the last day of the present composition of the Supreme Soviet."

New Latvian People's Front Program

91UN1051A Riga BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA
in Russian No 1, 8 Jan 91 pp 4-5

["Program of the Latvian People's Front"]

[Text] In the fall of 1988 the Latvian People's Front was formed in order to find a solution to all-encompassing social crisis and create a just and democratic society. That is possible only through restoration of Latvia's state

independence. The Latvian People's Front received a majority of votes in elections to soviets at all levels in late 1989 and early 1990. This has made it possible to create the prerequisites for a transition period and determine that a transition period is essential in order to bring about de facto restoration of the independence of the Latvian Republic established in 1918. The tasks of the Latvian People's Front during this transition period are defined in this new version of its Program.

1. General Principles

1.1. The Latvian People's Front is a social and political organization formed as a result of the patriotic and political activism of the people; it unites the democratic forces which are struggling for restoration of an independent, democratic, economically strong and socially harmonious national state for the sake of restoring the Latvian nation and the prosperity of the entire population of Latvia, and which are struggling to return Latvia to its place in the family of civilized countries.

1.2. The goal of the Latvian People's Front is to restore the de facto state independence of the Latvian Republic and create in Latvia a democratic society based on personal freedom, common human values, private initiative and responsibility to society.

1.3. In order to achieve its political and social goals the Latvian People's Front uses nonviolent, democratic and humane forms and methods of operation.

1.4. During the transition period to de facto restoration of the Latvian Republic the Latvian People's Front's tasks are as follows:

- complete de-occupation of Latvia;
- dismantling of the authoritarian administrative and bureaucratic system, and development of people's power;
- restoration of Latvia as a subject of international law.

1.5. The Latvian People's Front rejects the one-party system and the concentration of unlimited state power and guidance of society in the hands of any party. The Latvian People's Front feels that all democratic parties and sociopolitical formations must be ensured equal rights to develop their activities.

1.6. The Latvian People's Front feels that one of the most important aspects of its work is to strengthen unity among the Baltic states.

2. Restoration of State Independence: Foreign Policy

In 1990 elections to the Supreme Soviet a majority of the people of Latvia voted for deputies supported by the Latvian People's Front and thereby clearly expressed their will: to restore an independent Latvian State. During the transition period, which began on 4 May 1990 and should

be completed by recognition of Latvian independence by the USSR and elections to the Sejm, the Latvian People's Front's tasks are these:

- 2.1. de-occupation of Latvia, i.e. attainment of intergovernmental agreements and withdrawal of the USSR Armed Forces from Latvian territory;
- 2.2. termination of the powers and activities of all USSR institutions of state power and administration within the territory of the Latvian Republic;
- 2.3. conclusion of negotiations with the USSR concerning mutual settling of accounts and transfer to Latvian Republic jurisdiction of all-union enterprises which formally belong to the USSR;
- 2.4. creation of a genuine multiparty system. In the event of proportional elections to the Sejm it will be necessary to establish norms of parliamentary representation;
- 2.5. functioning within Latvia only of those independent parties and sociopolitical organizations whose supreme decision-making organs are located in Latvia and which do not violently oppose the independence of the Latvian Republic;
- 2.6. commencement of the formation of Latvian Republic self-defense forces;
- 2.7. acceptance of the Latvian Republic as a member of the United Nations;
- 2.8. development of foreign policy relations; particular attention should be paid to coordination of foreign policy among the Baltic states.

3. The Economy

Political independence and economic independence are interconnected. The Latvian People's Front will encourage radical economic reforms which will prepare the economy to function effectively in an independent Latvia.

3.1. In Latvia's economic system it is essential to make a transition to multiple forms of property. The process of privatization of property should be accompanied by preservation of political stability in order to prevent dissipation of Latvia's achievements and to protect the interests of Latvian Republic citizens.

The process of privatization should begin in the service sector, thus ensuring an increase in the quantity of and expansion of opportunities for services and thereby bringing convertible currency into the state treasury.

3.2. Land and other natural resources should become the property of the Latvian Republic and its citizens.

Only the Latvian State should exercise jurisdiction over its own economy and natural resources.

3.3. An agrarian reform should be implemented in order to renew the right to private ownership of land and other

means of production. Existing state farms and collective farms should be transformed into various types of public and private farms, while observing the rights of Latvian Republic citizens to a share of property.

3.4. The Latvian People's Front feels that Latvia's economy should be based on the principles of a market economy. The Latvian People's Front supports development of a common market encompassing Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia and cooperation among all the countries in the Baltic region.

3.5. A system of convertible currency and banking, market and customs systems should be established immediately, and other steps taken to ensure the state's economic sovereignty.

3.6. Taxes and contracts should form the basis for the state's economic operations and government. The tax system should stimulate commercial activity by corporate and physical bodies.

3.7. In addition to development of local government it is essential that administrative divisions be reformed simultaneously in accordance with geographical, economic and historical realities.

3.8. The Latvian People's Front supports decentralization and demonopolization of the economy and demands establishment of a state monitoring system for the purpose of implementing privatization in Latvia, preventing legalization of the shadow economy's means and ensuring depoliticization of the nomenklatura.

3.9. The structure of the economy should correspond to real capabilities and needs. Those sectors of the economy which use local raw materials should be developed and oriented toward high-technology and resource-conserving types of production. It is essential to develop a modern infrastructure of production and information science.

3.10. Latvia's geographical position must be utilized to obtain convertible currency revenues; Latvia's ports and transportation network should be modernized. The prerequisites (communications, transportation routes, etc.) should be created for the functioning of international marketing in Latvia.

3.11. Latvia's economic relations with other states should be based on interstate agreements.

In order to intensify foreign economic relations the creation of special enterprises should be supported and favorable conditions for capital investments should be offered to foreign entrepreneurs, including members of the Latvian emigration, and support should be given to all-round economic and scientific cooperation in the interests of Latvia.

During the transition period it is essential to ensure a foreign trade monopoly by the Latvian State on the export of any of the Republic's natural resources.

Human Rights and Freedom of Conscience

As an individual exercises his or her rights and freedoms that individual should also respect the rights of others, their legitimate interests and ethnic sensibilities, as well as the overall needs of Latvia and the interests of humanity as a whole.

4.1. The laws of an independent Latvia should be fully in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the UN Convention on Children's Rights, the International Accord on Civil and Political Rights, the International Accord on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the standards embodied in the Helsinki and Vienna Final Documents of the European Conference on Security and Cooperation.

4.2. Latvia must draft a new law on judicial procedure and create an independent system of justice.

4.3. The Latvian People's Front is participating in the creation of a mechanism of state and public monitoring designed to protect human rights, devoting particular attention to children's rights. It is essential to ensure that standardizing acts which are in violation of international legal standards and infringe upon human honor and dignity be repealed. The Latvian People's Front condemns efforts by USSR military circles to continue to draft the young men of Latvia into the armed forces of an occupying state.

4.4. The Latvian People's Front recognizes the priority of those legal standards which are aimed at ensuring the inviolability of person, home and property, protecting the secrecy of corresponding and telephone conversations, the right to free association in social organizations and parties, the right to demand and in accordance with legally established procedures to receive information from any source, and the right to appeal in court decisions made by collective decision-making bodies.

4.5. Human rights and freedoms within the territory of Latvia should be extended to all people regardless of their race, sex, nationality, religious or political views, social origin, material status, official position or other circumstances.

It is not permissible to censure a person or infringe upon that person's dignity on account of political, religious or atheistic views.

4.6. The Latvian People's Front feels that the repressions of the communist regime, as of the Nazi regime, are crimes against humanity. It is essential that the names of those who organized and carried out those crimes be made public, that they be stripped of the privileges they now enjoy and that criminal prosecution of such individuals be considered. In order to provide material compensation to those who were illegally repressed it is essential to stipulate in a treaty with the USSR that funds be allocated from the USSR's budget for that purpose.

The Latvian People's Front demands establishment of an independent commission to review the cases of all the

individuals convicted during the Soviet occupation of the Latvian Republic for activities of a political or religious nature.

4.7. The people of Latvia should have a guaranteed right to freely maintain ties with citizens of other states. Only institutions under Latvia's jurisdiction have the right to resolve matters pertaining to travel by Latvian citizens abroad and entry into and length of stay in Latvia by citizens of other countries.

4.8. There must be radical reforms in criminal, criminal trial and penal legislation, as well as in the system of internal affairs and state security services, and each person should be guaranteed an opportunity to defend his or her rights in court.

4.9. The Latvian People's Front recognizes freedom of conscience in all areas of public and personal life. The educational system should cease mandatory instruction in atheism and reject the mandatory study of any religion.

4.10. The Latvian People's Front acknowledges that religious organizations are of great significance in regard to the moral revival of society and inculcation of common human values. Confiscated churches and church property must be returned to their congregations. It is essential to guarantee religious organizations the opportunity to conduct charitable activities and do charitable work in prisons, hospitals, etc.

5. Social Policy

The state's social policy should guarantee a minimum standard of living worthy of a human being and smooth out the tumultuous processes of material and social stratification of society brought about by the transition to a market economy.

5.1. It is essential to sharply increase the financing of medical and social security by finding additional funding sources. The Latvian People's Front has set itself the task of achieving demonopolization of the present system of medical and social security. Under conditions of economic crisis and in the period of transition to a market economy the Latvian People's Front supports measures to assist the segment of the population which is unable to work and is poorly provided for.

5.2. Any privileges in regard to distribution of material benefits or in the realm of social services, including personal pensions, are immoral and impermissible.

5.3. It is essential to conduct on a regular basis scientifically-based calculations of the minimum living standard and poverty level, with the findings of these to be published in the press. Price indexes should be calculated regularly and salaries, pensions, stipends and aid payments increased accordingly.

5.4. The Latvian People's Front supports the establishment of trade unions. The most important task of those trade unions is to improve working people's working and

living conditions and provide legal protection for their interests. Yet at the same time trade unions should be separated from their social insurance function. State unemployment insurance should be reassessed and a system for worker retraining established. The Latvian People's Front feels that interference by political organizations in the production process is impermissible.

5.5. In order to bring about consistent solutions to social and demographic problems it is essential that an effective immigration law be passed.

5.6. The Latvian People's Front has set itself the task of equalizing development in all regions of Latvia and carrying out a special program to revitalize Latgale. A minimum social infrastructure in cities and rural areas should be developed using budget funds from the state and local governments and support given to private initiative.

5.7. It is essential that work places and a work infrastructure adapted to the needs of the handicapped be developed.

5.8. The Latvian People's Front actively supports the Charity Movement.

5.9. Activities by institutions of state authority and local government should emphasize concern for strengthening the role of the family in society. Efforts should be made to encourage the social movement for socioeconomic support for Latvian families.

5.10. The Latvian People's Front demands that the republican leadership develop fundamentally new housing legislation and bring about radical reform in the way existing housing is utilized. Over the long term a majority of apartments should become private, cooperative or stockholder property.

6. Nationalities Policy

The cause of ethnic tension in Latvia is the criminal ethnic, economic and social policy carried out by the occupation power. The renewed Latvian Republic should strive to eliminate the effects of colonization and restore the democratic traditions which existed in nationalities policy during the period of the parliamentary republic and ensure the survival of the Latvian people. Latvia should be both democratic and Latvian.

6.1. Creation of a democratic society in Latvia is possible if all the ethnic groups living in Latvia accept the idea of restoration of an independent Latvian Republic as the basis of their activities and participation in this process.

6.2. Interethnic relations can be made harmonious if clear-cut principles governing the rights and obligations of nations, ethnic groups and individuals are developed and implemented with consistent compliance with a model for interethnic relations which rejects condescension on the part of one group toward another, chauvinism, anti-Semitism, Russophobia, ethnic nihilism and an imperialist way of thinking. Everyone who wishes

to should be given an opportunity to learn the Latvian language, culture and traditions and be included in the environment of the ethnic state with the aid of a special cultural and historical program.

6.3. It is essential that there be strict compliance with the status of Latvian as official language and that a favorable psychological atmosphere be created for use of the Latvian language.

6.4. It is essential that ethnic self-awareness be actively molded both among Latvians and among members of all the ethnic minorities living in Latvia. The Latvian People's Front supports the activities of ethnic culture societies and their efforts to bring harmony to interethnic relations. The cultural needs of all ethnic groups can be met through realization by the state of a nationalities policy based on local autonomy and maintenance of ties by ethnic groups with their ethnic homelands.

6.5. The Latvian State especially supports and encourages the economic and cultural development of Latvia's native peoples, the Latvians and the Livs.

6.6. Every citizen of Latvia has a right to update the entry in official documents regarding national origin at his or her own discretion, guided by considerations of ethnic self-awareness.

6.7. Everyone regardless of nationality should be guaranteed the right to unhindered travel to his or her ethnic homeland or to another country.

7. Government

In view of the demands dictated by internal political struggle to reestablish the Latvian Republic gradual steps should be taken to create genuine people's power in which power at all levels will be exercised by the people of Latvia and in which parliamentary democracy will be harmoniously combined with strong local government and participation by broad segments of society in the management of the state.

7.1. During the reestablishment of an independent Latvia units of local government are not only of commercial and organizational significance, but also of political significance: they must organize people's resistance against the occupation authorities and the command-administrative system and protect individual liberty.

7.2. The Latvian People's Front feels that Latvia should join in the Statute of European States on Local Government signed in Strasbourg in 1985 and in accordance with that statute proclaim the following basic principles:

7.2.1. Central structures perform only those functions which are delegated to them by organs of government.

7.2.2. Organs of local government have complete freedom of action in regard to all matters; that freedom is restricted by the law alone. Organs of local government exercise full administrative authority within their territory, either directly or through services created by them.

Organs of local government cooperate with one another on the basis of contractual agreements.

7.2.3. Organs of local government are to restore the environment, architecture and commercial and service sector characteristic of Latvia and its people and encourage the development of culture and education.

7.2.4. At any level of government there should be strict compliance with separation of legislative and executive powers. At the same time, in activities outside of its administrative territory a unit of government functions as a single entity.

In its functions the executive authority primarily observes the laws of the Latvian Republic and the decisions of its government. The structures of an executive authority are administratively subordinate only to its soviet. Ministries and state committees perform only functions in defense of state interests within the territories of units of government.

7.2.5. In local government it is essential to replace the administrative system with contracts, differentiated tax rates and other economically-based methods. Organs of self-government have a right to determine the types and extent of local taxes and fees, as well as to grant partial or complete exemptions from them.

7.2.6. Budgets at every level of government should be formed from below. If necessary a budget may be subsidized by the state, which ensures correspondence between the local government's financial capabilities and its powers. Organs of local government dispose of their property and resources independently.

7.2.7. Decisions by organs of government may be appealed in court.

7.2.8. Deputies in organs of government may be recalled. Officials are not to be elected for the entire term of deputies' authority, and their reelection to a position is limited.

7.2.9. The presidium of a soviet (or its chairman) has a right to suspend for review at a soviet session any decision or disposition of an executive committee which is not in accordance with the laws of the Latvian Republic or decisions by the soviet.

7.2.10. The chairman of a soviet has a right to submit session decisions for reconsideration by the soviet.

7.2.11. A session may express its lack of confidence in any local government official.

7.2.12. The Latvian People's Front should make preparations for a transition to government on one level.

8. Culture, Education and Science

The rejection of common human values imposed by communist ideology in favor of a class-oriented world view undermined the ethical foundations of culture and education and the harmonious development of science.

8.1. The Latvian People's Front feels that even though cultural activity is a part of the economy it nonetheless cannot exist merely as a commodity. Therefore there is a need for guaranteed subsidies from the budgets of the state and local governments.

Cultural and educational budgetary organizations are not subject to taxation. Outstanding cultural activity (including basic science and the humanities) should be no less economically beneficial than the mass reproduction of cultural work for public consumption, and it should be supported through state orders.

8.2. It is essential to ensure balanced cultural development in all regions of Latvia, with particular support going to Latgalia as the part of Latvia which has become most Russified in terms of its culture.

8.3. It is essential to foster broader exchange of cultural and educational information and to support the establishment of cultural and educational centers in Latvia.

8.4. The Latvian People's Front urges cooperation with persons and organizations outside of Latvia for the purpose of restoring and preserving historical and cultural monuments, as well as studying and popularizing Latvian culture created abroad.

8.5. It is essential that preparatory work be done to ensure that state-subsidized training of specialists in higher educational institutions is done solely in the official language. Students in all specialized fields should receive the basics of literary work at institutions of higher learning, with particular attention devoted to greater mastery of Latvian. Adequate funds should be allocated from the budget for culture, education and science to meet the needs of effective functioning and development of the official language.

8.6. The Latvian People's Front demands development of an independent system of national education and science.

8.7. It is essential to transform the educational system, making both private instruction and home study a part of it. The requisite facilities and equipment should be allocated for indoctrination and academic work, and it is essential that licenses to undertake private instructional activity be issued. The prestige of teachers and schools in society must be increased. In regard to salary good work by a teacher should be equivalent in remuneration to the labor of a highly qualified scientist; by the same token, greater demands should be made both of future educators and those who train them.

8.8. Beginning with the 1991-92 academic year the status of Russian in schools where Latvian is the language of instruction should be made equivalent to that of other foreign languages.

8.9. The Latvian People's Front supports the right of ethnic minorities to receive secondary education in their native languages.

8.10. The Latvian People's Front supports training abroad for specialists needed by the state as well as recruitment of foreign instructors to teach students at institutions of higher learning in Latvia.

8.11. The Latvian People's Front demands that local governmental organs restore small village schools and urges that the greatest possible attention be paid to restoration of Latvian schools in Latgale.

8.12. The Latvian People's Front favors increases in budget allocations for the needs of education and science and for development of new textbooks, restoration of school buildings and improvement of education's technical outfitting.

8.13. It is essential that a system of legal protection for intellectual property be introduced which will be common to all the Baltic states and which will also extend to the copyrights of scientists and inventors.

9. Environmental Protection

The ecological crisis of Latvia and the Baltic Sea threatens the ecological stability of the region, human health and the survival of our genetic stock.

9.1. The Latvian People's Front demands establishment of an independent ecological and economic consulting body with judicial powers, including among other things a laboratory to test the quality of food products.

9.2. The Latvian People's Front feels that privatization of the economy is the principal prerequisite for bringing about an increase in personal responsibility for the state of the environment.

9.3. It is essential that environmental protection legislation be drafted which will make provision for establishment of a new, efficient and effective system of sanctions.

9.4. The state should effectively monitor the transportation and storage within Latvian territory of substances which pose a threat to the environment and health.

9.5. The economy should be reoriented toward use of ecologically clean production based on no-waste technologies and relatively harmless energy sources; it is essential that energy-intensiveness per unit of production be reduced.

9.6. The state should protect the landscape which is traditionally characteristic of Latvia. In the process of privatization of the land efforts should be made to ensure that valuable scenic and recreational areas remain accessible to the public. Specially protected regions should not be subdivided, nor should their status be reduced.

9.7. The state should monitor the ecological condition of areas used by the Armed Forces. Ecologically sensitive areas should be expropriated.

9.8. A system of ecological education and indoctrination of the public should be introduced. It is essential that ongoing, comprehensive information regarding the state of the environment be made available.

9.9. Based on worldwide experience and in cooperation with the countries of the Baltic Basin, Latvia should carry out coordinated ecological research. Economic activity should be based on the findings of that research.

9.10. The Latvian People's Front demands that the Latvian Government take urgent measures to create a toxic waste disposal area.

Democratic Labor Party Official Views Latvia's Political Future

91UN1089A Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH
in Russian 27 Feb 91 p 2

[Interview with Juris Goldmanis, secretary of the Latvian Democratic Labor Party Central Committee, by Yevgeniy Orlov; place and date not given: "The LDPT: 'The Pink Ones?' 'The Flip-Floppers?'"]

[Text] It is customary to approach this party with a degree of caution. It is equally disliked by both the supporters of the Communist Party and their alter ego, the anticommunists. Some dislike the party because the word "communist" has disappeared from its name and call them apostates and "flip-floppers," whereas others refer to them as "the pink ones." Some despise the members of this party for renouncing communist ideals, whereas others suspect them of somehow trying to have it both ways. Be that as it may, the former NKPL [Independent Communist Party of Latvia], and currently the LDPT [Democratic Labor Party of Latvia] (or, as they also call it, the Kezbers party) has been slapped in the face by all sides.

I will admit that personally I also used to be skeptical about the LDPT. However, the more differences developed between "former communists" and radicals on both poles, the more attentively I followed the course of their political struggle.

I met LDPT Central Committee Secretary Juris Goldmanis after a recent plenum, and I asked him to discuss in more detail what his party stands for at present and how he evaluates the situation in the republic.

[Goldmanis] The tragic January events in Latvia were a sobering factor. At any rate, everybody should have understood by now that we cannot deviate from the democratic path and circumvent democratic norms; we cannot approach lightly an issue as serious as compliance with generally acknowledged human rights. At present, we are observing a certain split both in the People's Front of Latvia and in the camp of the opponents of the 4 May declaration. Under the circumstances, we believe that the Goldmanis government and the leadership of the Supreme Soviet of Latvia have been given a new opportunity to broaden the base for democratic, realistic, and constructive changes in both our parliament and society.

At the plenum we voiced our position opposing the fate of Latvia being decided on 17 March, in the course of an all-Union referendum. We supported the idea of holding a poll of the permanent population of Latvia on 3 March. However, in doing so we once again set the condition that all democratic forces of the republic should consolidate. In this reference, we passed a special resolution on the activities of the leadership of the Republic of Latvia Citizens' Committee. To put it mildly, we disagree with the Citizens' Committee leadership on quite a number of issues. They include the position on the treaty between Latvia and Russia, the position on the poll, and the position on citizenship. The position of the Citizens' Committee leadership and its leader Aigar Irgens is definitely dangerous. Recently, a member of our party in Ventpils said: "What kind of democratic Latvia am I to vote for in the course of the poll? A democratic Latvia 'according to Gorbunovs' is one thing, and a democratic Latvia 'according to Irgens' is another. I may vote in favor of the former but not the latter..."

[Orlov] Many people have their own notion of what democracy is. However, virtually everyone calls himself a "democrat" nonetheless. There is also the opinion that democrats are only found in the camp of those who supported the Declaration of Independence. Do you acknowledge the presence of democratic forces in the camp of the opposition?

[Goldmanis] Certainly. It is a great pity that after the adoption of the declaration, the government and the Supreme Soviet, or more precisely the majority faction, not only have failed to add to the number of their supporters but, quite the opposite, have lost some, and have added to the number of doubters and even opponents.

[Orlov] Tell us please what, as you see it, undemocratic steps have been taken by our Supreme Soviet in eight months, and what undemocratic ideas circulating in our society have not been duly rebuffed by the official "big Riga?"

[Goldmanis] First of all, the Supreme Soviet itself has lowered substantially the plank of democracy by revising the quorum provision, thus virtually depriving the Equality faction of an opportunity to influence the work of the Supreme Soviet. Second, there was a resolution, currently suspended, which actually infringes on the rights of servicemen and their families. Unfortunately, tactical miscalculations have also occurred with regard to the issue of building an independent state: We have proclaimed a period of transition but have failed to develop either economic or other "stakes" which could have provided bearings for consistently moving forward. We have paid a great deal of attention to the West, but we have been too slow to understand that we would not get anywhere without the support of the East, the democratic forces of Russia, without a dialogue with Moscow—step by step, as Godmanis puts it. The episode with the House of the Press is a specific case in point. Those who bet on the decision of the parliament and

restricted themselves to that turned out to be short-sighted politicians. They should have done more work in Moscow, they should have argued more and reached more agreements. Of course, it is difficult if not impossible to fight "the berets"; however, as I see it, Bisers did not do everything he could in the course of dialogue with Moscow...

[Orlov] What is your personal view of the prospects for a "horizontal" Union of republics?

[Goldmanis] Recognizing the real independence of Latvia is the main point at present, especially after the January events, when Gorbachev painted the Vilnius events to the Supreme Soviet as "clumsy actions by the Army." After this, it will become both possible and necessary to discuss some kind of economic cooperation, some kind of Union that will be advantageous for the republics. I recall that in their time Finnish diplomats said that one needs to study geography carefully before engaging in politics. Latvia's geographic situation is such that poor relations with Russia or, say, Belorussia may lead to a tragedy for the republic...

[Orlov] Let us return to our discussion of the referendum and the poll. It appears to me that in both cases the wordings very much resemble the question "Are you going to eat meat if it has been cooked deliciously?", and this is why it is very hard to expect that either of them will amount to anything other than the usual political games, flirting with the people, and regular declarations...

[Goldmanis] Alas, this is the weakness of these wordings. In our variant we proposed to add a provision that would guarantee "compliance with international norms regarding the protection of human rights" to the phrase concerning a democratic Republic of Latvia. I will note that these were "human" rights rather than citizens'; this could have ruled out different interpretations...

[Orlov] Juris, literally a couple words about the Democratic Labor Party itself.

[Goldmanis] At present, our party is not going through the best of times. A certain decline in activism and apathy are evident in our society at large. At the time of the congress there were approximately 21,000 members in our party, whereas after completing re-registration we will apparently end up with just one-half of this number. We have been compelled to give up the apparatus, and we are doing so for two reasons: Our economic situation does not make it possible for us to maintain a superstructure; also, the desire is great to get rid of the inheritance received during our existence as "a ruling party."

We also hope to make our presence known in the parliament, where 10 deputies, members of our Central Committee, are at work...

As you can see, the views of the "Kezbers party" are now marked by a striving to use common sense. They are

geared primarily toward the people, toward creating fundamental conditions for the democratic development of the republic.

At any rate, "the former Communists," who could have been suspected of "trying to have it both ways" initially, have been engaging in quite consistent efforts to democratize the party itself and our society for a year now. SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH readers are likely to notice this themselves...

9 Feb Poll Election Commission Statistics

91UN1098A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
12 Feb 91 p 1

["Resolution of the Election Commission of the Republic of Lithuania for the Elections of Supreme Council Deputies on the Results of a General Poll of the Residents of the Republic of Lithuania on 9 February"]

[Text] The Republic of Lithuania Election Commission has summed up results recorded in the protocols of city, rayon, and precinct election commissions on a general poll of the population of the Republic of Lithuania conducted on 9 February 1991 on the issue of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, in conjunction with the fundamental provision of the Republic of Lithuania Constitution, and has determined:

The total number of residents of the republic on the voter rolls—2,652,738.

The number of republic residents issued ballots—2,247,810.

Those who took part in the poll on a day other than the one on which it was held—153,338.

Those who took part in the poll other than on the premises of the polling place—162,920.

The number of ballots in ballot boxes—2,241,992.

The number of those responding "Yes" to the premise of the general poll of the populace—2,028,339.

The number of those responding "No" to the premise of the general poll of the populace—147,040.

The number of ballots found to be invalid—66,614.

The general poll of the populace was held in strict compliance with the laws of the Republic of Lithuania and the resolution of the Election Commission dated 20 January 1991 "On Procedures for the Organization of a Poll of the Republic of Lithuania Populace."

[Signed] Chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Election Commission J. Bulavas

Secretary of the Republic of Lithuania Election Commission V. Rinkevicius

[Dated] Vilnius, 11 February 1991

Rayon, City Voter Turnout for 9 Feb Poll

91UN1098B Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
12 Feb 91 p 1

[ELTA report: "Statistics and Facts Concerning the Poll"]

[Text] Computers of the Republic Election Commission are completing the processing of data concerning a general poll of the populace that was held on 9 February.

Those who voted in favor of an independent, democratic Lithuania accounted for 76.39 percent of the total number of voters on the rolls. This means that more than three-quarters of the residents of the republic of full age, that is, those given the active right to vote, desire nothing but this kind of Lithuania. A mere 5.54 percent do not approve of it. Let us remember this: The ratio is 75 to 5!

Even international observers (about 90 of them were in the republic on the day of the poll) were surprised by the high citizen turnout. Where did the largest proportion of the citizens turn out? An absolute record was set in the city of Marijampole—96.95 percent of those on the rolls voted here. This was followed by Klaipeda Rayon, (96.22 percent), the cities of Druskininkai (95.60) and Panevezys (95.21), Lazdijai (94.30), Silalis (93.99), Anyksciai (93.95), and Sakai (93.82) Rayons. The lowest proportion of the people voted in the vicinity of Salcininkai Rayon—only 25 percent of those on the voter rolls. In Vilnius Rayon, 42.8 percent of the voters voted, in Ignalina Rayon, 54 percent, in Trakai Rayon, 68 percent, and in Svencionys Rayon, 74 percent.

An absolute majority of those voting was registered in Vilnius—almost 302,000—however, this amounts to merely 74 percent of those entitled to vote. On this indicator, the capital of the republic and Klaipeda (78 percent) rank immediately after the aforementioned "inactive" rayons. Out of the Vilnius residents who voted, 80.5 percent came out in favor of an independent Lithuania. This premise was not approved by 11 percent of the residents of the capital.

Legality of Vagnorius Appointment Affirmed

91UN1094B Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
26 Feb 91 p 1

["Statement of the Secretariat of Sessions of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council"]

[Text] The Secretariat of Sessions of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council directs the attention of the Supreme Council to the fact that certain of the Lithuanian and foreign mass media are expressing doubts or the conviction that the present government of the Lithuanian Republic is illegitimate, insofar as, with respect to the appointment of Gediminas Vagnorius to the post of prime minister on 13 January 1991, the necessary quorum of deputies was absent at the session of the Supreme Council.

The Secretariat of Sessions of the Supreme Council has established the following facts:

1. Minutes of this session were recorded beginning at 1445. The recorded minutes show that during the first voting (on establishment of a provisional defense leadership), 93 deputies were present in the hall. For the second (on the release of Deputy Albertas Simenas from duties of prime minister) and third (on the appointment of Deputy Gediminas Vagnorius as prime minister) votes, no doubts arose with respect to a quorum and therefore no recount of the deputies was conducted. With respect to the fourth vote (on the ministerial appointments of Vytas Navickas, Leonas-Vaidotas Asmantas, Darius Kuolis, Vaidotas Antanaitis, Kostas Byrulis, Algimantas Nasvitis, Jonas Birziskis, Algis Dobravolskis, Juozas Olekas, Algirdas Saudargas, and Albertas-Ambraseius Sinevicius), 95 deputies voted "for," and there were no votes "against" or "abstaining." During the fifth vote (on the appointment of Deputy Zigmaz Vaisvila as deputy prime minister), 95 deputies were present in the hall.

After listening to a sound recording of the session, the Secretariat asserts that the figures recorded in the minutes are accurate.

2. Deputy Rasa Rastauskiene, member of the Secretariat, recorded the attendance of deputies during the session and confirms that by the time voting took place on confirmation of the prime minister 99 deputies were registered as present (deputorial authority of two of them—Kazimieras Uoka and Vilius Baldisis—was restricted).

3. On 14-15 February 1991, 94 deputies confirmed, through their signatures, that they were present in the hall of sessions during the above-mentioned voting. One deputy (Vidmante Jasukaityte) did not confirm her presence due to illness on subsequent days, but the Secretariat and other deputies confirm that she too was present in the hall.

On the basis of these facts, the Secretariat of Sessions of the Supreme Council draws the following conclusion:

At the session of 13 January 1991, during voting on the matter of the appointment of the prime minister of the Lithuanian Republic, the necessary quorum of deputies (at least 92 deputies) was indeed present in the hall.

[signed] L.-N. Rasmavicius, chairman of the Secretariat of Sessions of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council.

Vilnius, 19 February 1991.

U.S. Congressmen Told Lithuania Wants Diplomatic Ties

*PM1303163991 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
23 Feb 91 p 1*

[ELTA report: "U.S. Congressmen's Visit"]

[Text] Vilnius, 21 Feb—U.S. Congressmen Stephen Solarz and Gary Ackerman and Congress staffer Richard

Bush are visiting Lithuania. They are accompanied by U.S. Consul in Leningrad George Kroul [name as transliterated].

Today the high-level guests were received by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet. The U.S. congressmen asked a lot of questions to do with our self-determination, the potential for negotiation with the Soviet Union, the introduction of a national currency, the protection of national minorities' rights, and the future of property under union jurisdiction. Specific answers were given to these questions. The guests were presented with a package of documents on national-minority, economic, and other questions.

The U.S. congressmen were interested to know how the United States could help Lithuania. Vytautas Landsbergis answered that the help needed was of the kind already requested of the United States—adherence to an extremely clear political position with regard not just to past events but also to the processes occurring today. The wish was expressed that the United States would say that the USSR has no sovereign rights in Lithuania. It would help us greatly if diplomatic relations were restored but, if for any reason this question is unclear or there are obstacles, the United States could stress that the Lithuanian problem is not the Soviet Union's internal affair; but up to now the United States has not stressed this.

Lithuanian Republic Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius gave a lunch in honor of the U.S. congressmen.

Citizenship, Immigration Articles of Draft RSFSR-Lithuania Treaty

*91UNI065A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
6 Feb 91 p 3*

[Release from the Information Department of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council: "Draft Treaty, Agreed Upon by the Parties, on the Foundations of Inter-State Relations Between the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and the Republic of Lithuania"]

[Text] (Excerpt. Full text of articles related to matters of citizenship, citizens' rights and freedoms, and also immigration.)

Article 4

The High Contracting Parties guarantee their citizens, regardless of their nationality or other distinctions, equal rights and freedoms.

The Republic of Lithuania guarantees those persons who have the right to claim RSFSR citizenship and who permanently resided before 3 November 1989 and continue to reside on Lithuanian territory, and who have permanent employment or other legitimate source of

income, the right to obtain Republic of Lithuania citizenship in accordance with their own free will and the procedures stipulated by Republic of Lithuania legislation, without requiring that they produce proof of length of residence, knowledge of the Lithuanian language, or any other preconditions for obtaining citizenship that apply to all other persons.

The Republic of Lithuania guarantees those persons who have the right to claim RSFSR citizenship and who have arrived in Lithuania between 3 November 1989 and the date this Treaty is signed, reside permanently in the Republic of Lithuania, and are employed on a permanent basis at enterprises, organizations, or offices of the Republic of Lithuania, or have other legitimate source of income, the right to obtain Republic of Lithuania citizenship. Such persons have a right to acquire Republic of Lithuania citizenship of their own free will and in accordance with the procedures stipulated by Republic of Lithuania legislation. Such persons will not be required to produce proof of length of residence or knowledge of the Lithuanian language.

The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic guarantees persons who have Republic of Lithuania citizenship, or the right to such citizenship, and who, as of the date this Treaty is signed, reside permanently on RSFSR territory and have permanent employment in the RSFSR or other legitimate source of income, the right to acquire citizenship in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, in accordance with their own free will and the procedures stipulated by RSFSR legislation, without requiring that these persons meet any conditions other than those established in regard to all other persons.

Persons who fall under the definitions of Part 3 and Part 4 of this article may freely express their will in regard to acquiring the citizenship of the other High Contracting Party until the date specified by a separate agreement between the Parties.

In cases where persons who fall under the definitions of Parts 2, 3, or 4 of this article and who, on the basis of their own free will, the legislation of the country of residence, and provisions of this article, choose not to acquire the citizenship of the country of residence, they have a right to preserve, or acquire, the citizenship of the other High Contracting Party in accordance with the legislation of the other High Contracting Party.

Article 5

Each of the High Contracting Parties will define in its legislation, in accordance with universally recognized principles and norms of international law, the rights and duties stemming from the status of this Party's citizenship.

Each High Contracting Party guarantees all persons, regardless of nationality, who fall under the definition of Article 4 of this Treaty and live on its territory, civil, political, social, economic, and cultural rights and basic

human freedoms in accordance with universally recognized principles and the norms of international law and the legislation of the country of residence, including the right of persons who are members of ethnic, religious, or language minority groups to, together with other members of the same group, practice their own culture, profess their faith and perform its rites, and use their native language.

Each High Contracting Party guarantees those citizens of the other High Contracting Party and persons who have the right to such citizenship, who stay temporarily on its territory, all rights and basic human freedoms that universally recognized principles and norms of international law and the legislation of the state of stay accord to such persons.

The High Contracting Parties guarantee citizens of one High Contracting Party who stay on the territory of the other High Contracting Party, the right to apply for legal, humanitarian, and other aid in the empowered representations of the state of which they are citizens.

Article 6

Recognizing the right of each of the High Contracting Parties to adopt its own immigration legislation and to conduct its own immigration policy, the High Contracting Parties will regulate the issues arising in this area in accordance with universally recognized principles and norms of international law by signing separate agreements.

Issues of employment-related migration will also be regulated by separate inter-government agreements.

The High Contracting Parties will define, through special agreements, the procedures and conditions for the relocation of citizens who choose to move, in accordance with the expression of their own free will, from the territory of one Party to the territory of the other Party, as well as mutual obligations in rendering such person material or other help.

Lithuania's Humanist Party Chief Interviewed

91UN1064A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
8 Feb 91 p 2

[Interview with philosopher Vytautas Kazlauskas, chairman of the Lithuania's Humanist Party, by R. Osherov, EKHO LITVY correspondent; place and date not given: "With Faith in Humanity: Multiparty System as a Reality"]

[Text] [Correspondent] The name of your party is self-explanatory, but still: What are the Humanist Party's goals?

[Kazlauskas] Our main goal is to build a humane society. That is, a society whose ideals will be Mutual Understanding, Justice, Humane Attitude, and Good Deeds. Harmony in society can only be achieved through the harmonious development of an individual; therefore, it

may be said that our main goal is Man and his spiritual development. We see our task in helping each citizen of Lithuania, regardless of his nationality, to find his road in life. Any individual has talents, and the essence of his life is the expression of creative love. An individual should be permitted to go where his calling is, where his interests lead him—then he will develop his abilities, his talent; he will acquire true interest in life; and then his life will have no place for alcohol, drugs, and such.

[Correspondent] This sounds very attractive, but I am afraid, the realities of today do not give us much grounds for optimism...

[Kazlauskas] I think that this is not entirely true. Even today people are not the same as they were 10 years ago: They are beginning to tell the truth, to freely express their thoughts. Without truth, a man is doomed to spiritual slavery, but we are gradually freeing ourselves from these fetters.

[Correspondent] What do you think is most important today?

[Kazlauskas] To stop enmity in Lithuania; not to fan up the passions. Citizens of Lithuania are brothers and sisters; it does not matter what nationality they are—we have our common destiny. We have to bring back the lost trust in each other, the sense of confidence and security. To remember something that unites us all—that we are all people. We must respect each other; violence can only lead to enmity and hate. The Humanist Party sees it as its task to reduce the alienation. People continue to be afraid of each other; this should not be happening.

[Correspondent] Does the party have an economic or social program?

[Kazlauskas] The main goal of our program is to channel the process of social development in the direction of humanism and progress; to search for ways to bring humanistic ideals into the real-life economic, social, and political activities.

In the political sphere, we believe that it is necessary to have equal rights for all political forces, since the political progress may only be achieved through the dialog between different trends.

The most important thing is the independence of Lithuania, and the creation of a democratic republic. As long as the nation is not free, individuals cannot be free. Independent Lithuania must have its own army, borders, and representations—all the attributes of a state.

[Correspondent] The January tragedy has changed a lot in our lives... In your opinion, how will events develop in the future?

[Kazlauskas] I have already offered my prognosis in *POLITIKA*, Nos. 23/24, 1990. In particular, I have predicted the January events. I can foresee many other complications in the political and economic areas

because of the complicated situation in the Soviet Union and in the world as a whole. We can only expect some improvement after the Persian Gulf crisis is resolved—this is in the sphere of politics. In the economic sphere, the situation will grow worse, and it will only be possible to overcome the emerging difficulties by acting together, by forgetting about the arguments, and by uniting in the name of the sacred goal, the name of which is FREEDOM.

[Correspondent] What are the political prospects of the party you head?

[Kazlauskas] At this point, conditions are not ripe for the Humanist Party to become one of the mass political movements in Lithuania in the near future. But we will, in our activities, strive to earn the honest people's trust, by protecting their rights in everyday life, by improving—first of all—ourselves, our environment, and by creating conditions for improvement for everybody. Our truth is our faith in humanity. I think that the hour for spiritual unification of all citizens of Lithuania is approaching—time works for us...

[Correspondent] Thank you for the interview.

RSFSR

Yeltsin Policies Assailed, Recall Demanded

*91UN1048A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 9 Mar 91 First Edition p 2*

[Open letter to B.N. Yeltsin from Moscow civil engineer A. Andreyev: "By the Right of One Who Believed You"]

[Text] Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich!

Until recently I was a sincere supporter of yours. I believed unreservedly in your desire and mainly in an opportunity for you to help overcome the economic and political impasse in our country that has set in in recent years. This is why I tried to ignore the, so to say, errors in some of your pronouncements and in individual actions. Moreover, I fervently argued that they are random and a consequence of the fact that people are interfering with you. Unfortunately, however, the "errors" multiplied as time went on, and it has become altogether impossible to consider them a random occurrence. I have had to "pay attention."

I am an engineer, and that is why I am used to thoroughly analyzing, as far as possible, all information of interest to me that is published in the press and drawing corresponding conclusions with a maximum of objectivity. So, this habit has brought me to the point of ceasing to be your supporter, despite my good will toward you, Boris Nikolayevich, which remains.

Let us look at, for example, the current "affair of the century"—an attempt by the Russian Government to exchange 140 billion rubles [R] into \$7.56 billion or, in essence, an attempt, thank God unsuccessful, to betray

the interests of not just Russia but the entire country. How else can we call opportunities given to our foreign "partners" to purchase in our country with our depreciated rubles raw materials, enterprises, land, and so on (likewise ours), while we first give them these rubles for foodstuffs purchased at prices which could easily make us choke on them (for example, between R15 and R18 per kilogram of meat)? However, I will not repeat what has already been said and written a great deal, and over which even criminal proceedings have been instituted. Therefore, as the playwright Shatrov says, "everything is yet in store" for all those privy to the "affair of the century." I would like to talk about something else.

Boris Nikolayevich, I was very much put on my guard by your strange response to the unintelligible and infantile explanations provided by G.I. Filshin on account of this very attempt to exchange rubles for dollars at a black market rate which, as is known, is dictated by the barons of the shadow economy. Boris Nikolayevich, I was very much surprised by a kind of incomprehensible flippancy, a virtual playfulness which sounded in your question to the members of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet: "Well, should we acquit him?"

I gave much thought to this: What was it? Was it complete unfamiliarity with the heart of the matter and a reluctance to learn about it in the future? However, this is highly unlikely given the value of the "heart" amounting to R140 billion and your ever-dominating character. Or was it a desire to and an interest in hushing up the inopportunistly uncovered shady deal? After analyzing all the pros and cons, I came to the conclusion that it was most likely the latter, and as they say, I read the crystal ball right.

It turns out that as early as 11 December 1990 I.S. Silayev notified you, Boris Nikolayevich, of the intention of his government to convert rubles into dollars at a black market rate, including, as was written, R140 billion immediately, and asked for your permission to do so. Judging from the fact that the government began to process such an exchange, it was given permission. Therefore, you were fully informed about the proposed transaction. In this case, why not say so frankly and honestly? Moreover, why try slipping a "dead horse" to TV viewers concerning the KGB's alleged participation in this affair when you spoke on Central TV? In general, what is the reason for this avid desire to change the subject and, as they say, cover your tracks?

Certainly I have no data on dollar-ruble incentives for the participants in the "affair of century." But I do not have any data on the lack of dollar-ruble incentives for them either. However, let investigators work on it after all. I believe that something else is important in this instance. Knowing from the very beginning all the underpinnings of the "affair of the century" full well, you, Boris Nikolayevich, concealed it from us and even tried to misdirect our indignation. In view of this, **pardon me, Boris Nikolayevich, but I am compelled to accuse you of premeditated deceit!**

Let us look at another example. All of us, and you more than most, are aware of how difficult life is for our fellow countrymen residing, in particular, in the Baltic republics, of the discrimination they have to endure, having now been turned into second-class citizens and pariahs in keeping with the new republic laws. Who should help them in their time of trouble, who should defend their rights, honor, and dignity, who should seek an end to this immoral and shameful discrimination if not Russia, if not you, the chairman of its Supreme Soviet?

To our great shame and disgrace we do not defend, do not help, and do not seek! You, Boris Nikolayevich, failed to attach the indispensable condition of absolutely upholding the equality of rights of our fellow countrymen and the local nationalities even while signing treaties with the governments of these republics according to which Russia once again must shower them with raw materials for peanuts, so that, for example, oil costs less than soda water. Moreover, you even failed to meet with their representatives, did not grasp their needs, did not lend your ear to their offenses, wishes, requests, and proposals.

Analyzing this "phenomenon," I came to the conclusion that you, Boris Nikolayevich, sacrificed the needs of Russians residing there for the sake of establishing the contacts you need with the nationalist governments of these republics which are set against the Union center. Why? Just because you need allies in your struggle against the president, the Supreme Soviet, and the Union government. However, these gentlemen will not be your allies for nothing. This is why your neutrality on the issue of discrimination against our brothers and sisters became a bargaining chip. Incidentally, I noted long ago that as soon as leaders who are aggressively disposed toward the Union center come to power in a republic, you are immediately on the scene, reaching out in friendship with offers of help. You are no longer interested in why Russian-speakers suddenly appear there (this is a disrespectful and insulting word in itself) and why they are subjected to merciless discrimination. Moreover, you are not even interested in complaints by the Russians in our republic, for example, the citizens of Pskov, concerning territorial claims by Estonian nationalists. It turns out that allies are dearer to you than your own people.

This is why, Boris Nikolayevich, with all due respect I am compelled to accuse you—pardon a somewhat harsh word, but it is, perhaps, the only one to describe the essence of this correctly—of betraying the interests of our fellow countrymen residing outside the borders of Russia, and within these borders as well.

Furthermore, everything Soviet has disappeared from not only the wording but also the very content of the draft Constitution of the Russian Federation worked out under your direction, due to eliminating the soviets; everything socialist has disappeared, due to omitting the

main principles of a socialist society: the right to work, free education, health care, the right to a dwelling, and so on.

Actually, your Constitution raises the issue of switching from a socialist social system in Russia to a capitalist system, because "a free entrepreneur" should be the foundation of the republic economy, and economic relations will be built on a "partnership" between "employees and employers." What kind of "assertion of freedom" is this if the plan is to divide the society into people who are economically free and those who are not, one group actually being free at the expense of the other? The division of the territory of Russia into not only sovereign republics but also federal territories (krays, oblasts, lands, and so on) proposed in the draft Constitution will bring about its disintegration, whereas the creation of its own armed forces will bring about the break-up of the country as a whole.

These are only some examples of what awaits us in the nearest future if we adopt the Constitution developed under your direction, Boris Nikolayevich.

This is why, with all due respect, I am compelled to accuse you of aspiring to bring back capitalism in Russia, of intending to mess up our republic, and destroy the USSR, that is, once again, betraying the interests of the peoples, but this time those of the entire country.

As you might recall, Boris Nikolayevich, in October of last year SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reprinted an article from the English newspaper THE GUARDIAN. It communicated quite convincingly that the American CIA contributes through various foundations to financing our Interregional Group of Deputies which you head as one of its cochairmen.

Naturally, this publication caused a storm of protest, due to which the USSR Supreme Soviet set up a commission to investigate this fact. I recall that the chairman of the commission threatened to "stick it good" to the slanderers while still "getting himself to the battlefield." Several months have been passed, but nothing has been heard about it. They have failed "to stick it good" or stick it otherwise. The desire to keep silent about this information is the only explanation for this attitude. Naturally, this brings up the serious assumption that THE GUARDIAN spoke the truth and that some of our people's deputies, including some among the interregionals, get their "chow" from the CIA trough, and that their operations are subsidized by a foreign intelligence service—even the thought of that is outrageous. However, foreign as well as non-foreign money is not given for nothing—one has to earn his keep, and of course not by taking care of his own state and his own people. Therefore, by what means is this to be done, and how?

This is why, Boris Nikolayevich, I am compelled to accuse you of concealing information about CIA financing for the operation of the Interregional Group of Deputies and even of... pardon me, I cannot bring myself to say this.

Furthermore you, Boris Nikolayevich, were the first to publicly raise the issue of the need to eliminate the privileges of the functionaries of the party apparatus, as well as those of soviet and government officials, and the issue of the need to reduce the bloated staff of such officials and cut their high salaries. Incidentally, this was the main reason for your sudden and resounding universal popularity. To this day you keep revisiting this issue from time to time. All of this is correct; there should not be privileges, and everything else should also be available within reasonable limits.

It would appear that, having come to head the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, you should have once and for all eradicated, at least within the borders of Russia, privileges, bloated staffs, and high salaries. Actually, the exact opposite has happened. The staff of soviets and their services, beginning with the Supreme Soviet, has almost doubled and in some places tripled. Salaries have grown even more. In addition, the deputies have rushed to travel abroad in droves. Some of them spend virtually half of their business time visiting. The privileges that members of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet have, for example, were but an impossible dream for the old party, soviet, and economic apparatchiks. I asked a member of the Supreme Soviet of yours whom I know: "Why do you need a car? After all, it has not even been a year since you bought a Volga." He answered: "I do not want to be a black sheep. Why not take it if they give it? I will pass it on to my children." "Why do you need an apartment which is, to top it off, furnished with furniture sets and outfitted with all kinds of appliances, including video equipment? Why would you want to purchase it, even on an installment plan? After all, you do not plan to live in Moscow." Turns out this was also in order not to be a black sheep. Therefore, it appears that the new people's officials are even more voracious than the old ones. This was when I recalled an ancient Indian parable:

"A passer-by, having seen a multitude of flies on the bleeding wounds of a beggar, pitied him and wanted to shoo them away. The beggar pleaded with him: 'Good man, do not shoo these flies away. Let them sit; they are already full, and I can bear their biting. If new hungry flies come I will have to suffer a lot again until they are full.'"

It would be interesting to know whether you, Boris Nikolayevich, have analyzed how much time the new officials need to "get full?" In general, why and for what are such privileges given to them—privileges that were definitely introduced with your knowledge?

This is why, pardon me, Boris Nikolayevich, but I am compelled to accuse you of being sly.

Finally, the last point. Pardon me, Boris Nikolayevich, but how much longer is your confrontation with M.S. Gorbachev going to last? How much longer will our, Russians', heads crack while you ambitiously slug it out "at the summit?" Having analyzed your presentations since 1987, I came to the conclusion that you still cannot

forgive him for failing to support you in 1987, when the communists of Moscow, driven to the brink by your trampling on their lives, decided to get rid of you, secretary of the CPSU Moscow City Committee. You rushed to M.S. Gorbachev, and he, as is usually the case, postponed taking his measures until later.

However, Boris Nikolayevich, I am convinced that at the time Mikhail Sergeyevich failed to help because he did not know that the ground was slipping from under your feet, that your entire political career could crash at any moment, and that you absolutely could not afford to wait until "later," rather than because of ill will. I believe that this very reason prompted you, as they say, to go all out at the very first CPSU Central Committee plenum that came along at the time. This is what I believe to be the vulgar origin of your denunciatory speech at this plenum and, accordingly, the beginning of your popularity.

Of course, Boris Nikolayevich, we may appreciate your resentment from a purely human standpoint. However, how much longer can you structure your relations with the president of the country, with the Union Supreme Soviet, and with the government on the basis of your resentment? Vindictiveness has never been a credit to anyone. Please understand that accusations leveled against M.S. Gorbachev in your TV interview on 19 February cannot hold water. After all, as they say, any idiot could see that you needed a scandal in order to boost your so-called rating, which had sunk to a dangerous level. It is your habit to drive up your rating by means of scandalous presentations, following which your supporters begin to prove that you are right anyway, as I did in my time. You acted with cunning in your interview, worming your way out of giving specific answers to specific questions concerning your participation in the affair with the R140 billion, as well as your statement concerning the creation of the RSFSR armed forces. You came down hard on the president of the Union.

Tell me please whether one can take seriously your words to the effect that M.S. Gorbachev is to blame for all the woes of Russia, that he "would not let" you work, that he "interferes" and "blocks," and that for this reason you demand his resignation and ask that the people support your demand? It turns out, Boris Nikolayevich, that you are absolutely not to blame for the fact that after almost a year of your chairmanship the life of the people of our republic has deteriorated quite a bit, that the output of manufactured goods and foodstuffs has declined considerably, that despite a record-breaking crop we are on a starvation diet, that all construction plans have gone unfulfilled as never before, that hundreds of thousands of cars are not being unloaded, that millions of tons of foodstuffs are getting spoiled, our malnourished condition notwithstanding, that the crime rate keeps growing catastrophically and continuously, that the discipline of execution has collapsed because nobody is responsible for anything, and that the economy of the republic is no longer on the brink but over the brink of collapse.

Meanwhile, the Supreme Soviet of the republic which you lead is drowning in verbiage instead of working. Your closest aides from among the Interregional Group call on the working people to strike. They organize rallies with 100,000 people in attendance during harvesting campaigns as the crops perish; they sabotage all proposals and resolutions of the president, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the government aimed at stabilizing and improving the situation in the country, give them a hostile reception, and distort their essence.

Pardon me, Boris Nikolayevich, but against a background of the above your accusations leveled at the center resemble the shout "Get the thief!"

Meanwhile, Boris Nikolayevich, it appears to me that you should have pondered why the economic situation is improving in the republics in which the leaders have tried to overcome the impasse through joint efforts with the center, such as Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, the Ukraine, and some republics; this is but a dream for us Russians. So, it comes out that, pardon me, it comes down to you rather than the president.

Incidentally, Boris Nikolayevich, I have always been amused by your firm conviction that you have the right to speak and make decisions in the name of the entire Russian people—despite your becoming chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet by a majority of just several votes (it seems 535 deputies voted for you while 531 votes were necessary). Let us say straightforwardly that one-half of Russia was against your chairmanship. To my mind, you would do well to always remember this, all the more so because this vote occurred before your desertion from the ranks of the CPSU. Had you deserted sooner you would have never gained the seat of chairman: Our people do not like deserters.

Incidentally, Boris Nikolayevich, it was reported in the press that during your conversation with President of the All-European [as published] Jewish Congress E. Bronfman you asked him why it is said that they do not take you seriously. So, Boris Nikolayevich, I believe that this is the rare occasion when an answer is found in the question. Yes, precisely because of this! Your ambition, your great conceited self-righteousness, even if you said one thing yesterday and say the opposite today, the constant inconsistency of your convictions, views, and actions are the reason why.

This is why, Boris Nikolayevich, with all due respect, I am compelled to accuse you of dangerous dictatorial leanings, of excessively striving for power, for the sake of which you are prepared to do anything. I dread the thought of what will happen if you get into the chair of president of our republic, to say nothing of the seat of president of our country which you so persistently seek. Judging from your attitude toward the people during your party secretarial appointment in Moscow alone, we may say with confidence that the reprisals the people have lived through will seem like child's play.

Therefore, as you can see, I have tried with a maximum of good will to invite your attention to some shortcomings and point out that you should not be chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

At the same time, I understand full well that you will not voluntarily leave a position to which you are clinging as the devils used to cling to the souls of sinners, because you have hungered for power all your life, regardless of which power it is—party or soviet, during rampant stagnation or rampant democracy. As I understand it, it does not matter for you when and where; the main point for you is power!

This is why in the present letter (this is why it is open) I appeal to your still-numerous supporters who continue to trust you blindly, as I did until recently. We have already suffered a great deal due to blind faith. God save us from believing you, Boris Nikolayevich, blindly. This will mean the end of our state, our republic; you cannot be trusted even with our eyes open, to say nothing of blindly.

This is why, despite all of my good will toward you, Boris Nikolayevich, I am compelled to call on all Russians to recall you as a deputy of the Supreme Soviet of Russia. I believe that I have a right to do so as your former sincere supporter, as your constituent, and as your well-wisher.

A. Andreyev,
Civil engineer, Moscow

Anti-Yeltsin Campaign in Army Denied

91UN1073B Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 13 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Letter to Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, from Major V. Nagornyy: "Protest of Tank Crewmen From the Kaliningrad Garrison—This Is an Outright Lie"]

[Text] In your interview on Central Television on 19 February of this year, speaking of the beginning of "attacks" on you, you declared that "this campaign is developing very rapidly in the Army and there are special questionnaires, and I was in a tank division in Kaliningrad, and, so, it is interesting, they showed me how exactly by platoons, meaning the platoon commander comes up and signs, and then the rest sign, a protest to Yeltsin that he really, so to speak, is against the Army."

I categorically declare: This is a downright lie.

There was no such fact in our tank unit. By declaring this publicly, you are thereby throwing not a pebble at the Army, but a bomb. You say, look, good people: There are tanks in Vilnius and tank crewmen against the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, that is, against B. Yeltsin, the fighter for democracy.

I was in the headquarters when a regimental commander reported to you and indicated on a map where and in

what place every subunit is located, and what training task it is fulfilling. I was next to you, Boris Nikolayevich, when you inspected the barracks, the bays with combat equipment, and the soldiers' mess hall. I was also in the club of the division staff, where your meeting took place with servicemen of the Kaliningrad garrison. And I did not see any lists, much less soldiers stepping up briskly "by platoons." Indeed, where would they come from, if some were on the training ground, some were maintaining equipment, and still others were on detail. Incidentally, you did not say anything about this fact in the club or in the meeting with Kaliningrad residents in the House of Political Education. You only said that the military gave you a somewhat cool reception, but that you parted normally. Moreover, I am confident that if you actually did see "soldiers signing a protest," then your meeting with the servicemen would not have taken place.

At the meeting, you accused everyone and everything: "He," "they" are to blame, and the mass media are reporting on you in a biased way and incorrectly. You say, it is "he" and "they" who deceived the people. But how does one treat these facts? In the unit club, representatives of Russian nationality from Klapeida came to you, and you took a note from them and put it in the pocket of your jacket, promising to study it later. In the House of Political Education, one of eight Russian workers who arrived from Latvia addressed you at the end of the meeting. You did not even let him say a word, but you invited 800 persons to Moscow (that is how many fit in your hall) and promised to look into things there. But even if they did come to Moscow, they would have to wait at least two months for a meeting with you (every one of your days is scheduled for two months—these are your words).

After all of this, how are you to be believed, the zealot for Russians and for Russia? And how are your words about Russian soldiers serving in the USSR Armed Forces to be assessed, when you were unable to say anything intelligible concerning proposed measures for the social protection of servicemen? And how is your appeal to the UN to be understood? You told us that you cannot legally appeal to the international organization, but, you say, you had no other choice. Some among us assessed this as blackmail, and others, as adventurism.

It is apparent from some of your speeches, especially from the television interview, that it is you who are deceiving the people. The fate of the USSR, the fate of Russia, and the fate of Russians absolutely does not trouble you and interest you. You made your way to power in order to settle your own scores through the help of the people, and you are thereby pushing it into an abyss of chaos and the division of USSR. But this is adventurism!

Neither Gorbachev, nor Yazov, nor the party compelled me or asked me to write this letter. Your deception compelled me to do this. And in this letter I express the

opinion of the Russian soldiers of the tank division who declare: A deceiver must not stand at the head of Russia.

Tank crewmen support the policy of the USSR president!

Major V. Nagornyy

From the editor. The protest of tank crewmen soldiers of the Kaliningrad garrison, signed by 353 soldiers and officers, is attached to Major V. Nagornyy's letter.

Yeltsin Critic Responds to 9 March Speech

91UN1073A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 13 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Letter to Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, from A. Andreyev, civil engineer in Moscow: "I Would Be Happy To Be Proven Wrong"]

[Text] Dear Boris Nikolayevich!

In your speech of 9 March of this year in the House of Cinema, you casually mentioned my open letter "By Right of Believing in You" (SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA of 9 March), speaking ironically in a nice way regarding my having the same surname as Nina Andreyevna. But what can one do if our surname Andreyev is encountered far more often in Russia than, for example, Yeltsin. Honestly, we are not to blame for this. Do not let this offend you.

Of course, it pleases me that in your speech you quoted a small paragraph from this letter. However, it should not have been distorted beyond recognition. Let us compare for the sake of clarity:

I wrote: "Therefore, forgive me, but I am compelled to accuse you of trying to revive capitalism in Russia and of intending to ruin our republic and to destroy the Union SSR; that is, besides betraying the interests of the people and even the whole country."

You attributed to me: "But what is most important is that I cannot forgive him (that is, you) that he (that is, you) is heading for capitalization, that he is against socialism, and that he does not want to go together with us to our bright future—communism."

In my opinion, it is difficult to find anything common in these excerpts, with the exception of the words capitalism and capitalization. One acquaintance said to me, why does he (that is, this means you) distort so unscrupulously, and perhaps everything else in his (that is, your) words is nonsense? Really, who will believe someone who has already deceived once?.. So, it turns out that, in telling a falsehood, you harm yourself most of all. However, it is not worth trying to convince you that it is bad to tell lies, which is taught in school... But this is in passing...

Now something about another matter. I was really upset after reading carefully and hearing your House of Cinema speech on radio. Honestly, I was struck by the

kind of doom, and I would even say death-throes, that permeated it. Hence, the labels for political opponents—"enemies"—and the appeals for support of the striking miners, for whom it is even now terribly difficult—and this is instead of helping them resolve the difficulties—hence also, the appeals for war with the leadership of the country, and the waving of fists, etc. All of this in such anguish and shouting!.. This may seem outrageous, but the tone of the speech in my mind was associated with a broadcast I once heard over Berlin radio at the very end of the war. I cannot say that our chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet speaks and appeals in the very same tone!

But Boris Nikolayevich, dear man, you must understand that you must not do this, that this is inadvisable for you... Or this kind of a post is inadvisable. However, I am persuading you in vain. You are not leaving. As I understood it, you, Boris Nikolayevich, once again staked your all, as you did at the October 1987 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. Yes, only in vain. I am confident that you will not succeed in breaking the "bank of popularity" this time. The Russian people are already beginning to understand pretty well what is what. They are finally beginning to understand to what discord your democrats, headed by you, are dragging them, to what kind of dissension and war, and to the collapse of the republic and the country. They are finally beginning to understand that should you become president—say farewell to democracy and freedom. That a cruel dictatorship of your rule and your deputies will be introduced. And the Russian people once again will be bogged down in the blood of repression.

In your speech, Boris Nikolayevich, you said that you do not know who A. Andreyev is. Quite true, you do not really know me. However, you could listen to me. It was I who wrote a letter in 1989 to you as chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Construction and Architecture (EKONOMICHNAYA GAZETA No. 34). If you will recall, I wrote then that the program outlined by your committee to bring capital construction in the country out of ruin by means only of reducing capital investment in industrial construction, without resolving organizational-legal-legislative problems, will not help, but, on the contrary, in the near one and a half to two years, it will aggravate the breakdown. A year and a half has passed. Unfortunately, I proved to be right.

I very much fear that in my conclusions set forth also in the open letter "By Right of Believing in You," I will also prove to be right. God forbid anyone this kind of rightness. Honestly, I would be exceedingly happy, if I turned out to be wrong. Boris Nikolayevich, I beg you, prove that I am wrong!

Respectfully,
A. Andreyev,
Civil engineer, Moscow.

Moscow Oblast Autonomy Plan Criticized

91UN1059A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 91
Second Edition p 4

[Article by G. Maloyan, doctor of architecture and head of the department of large cities and agglomerations of the Central Scientific Research and Design Institute of Urban Planning: "Into Moscow and the Oblast Through Customs: When the Desire for Sovereignty Reaches the Absurd"]

[Text] What have glasnost and democracy produced in abundance in our country if not a multiplicity of platforms and opinions? A particular theme of innumerable polemics today is the question of sovereignty. Its range is wide: From the sovereignty of republics and national-territorial autonomies, which largely exist as a reaction to the policies of the center, to that of rayons, cities, and even microrayons. There are already anecdotes making the rounds about the sovereignty of streets, enterprises, and even separate houses. And now the little island of Kunashir—the most southerly of those islands that belong to the Kuril chain—has quite seriously proclaimed full independence...

In short, in a few short months the problem of sovereignty has taken on a decisive significance for our future. It is directly connected with the principles of forming and restructuring outdated socioeconomic, administrative-territorial, and political structures.

But while solving some problems it seems that the issue of sovereignty causes others. I have in mind, for example, the paradoxical situation connected with aggressively promoted proposals to proclaim Moscow's sovereignty and create a so-called Moscow Autonomous Republic composed of Moscow and Moscow Oblast. That was the title—"A Moscow Autonomous Republic. It Is Quite Probable"—of an article in an issue of the journal STOLITSA, a weekly publication of the Moscow Soviet.

Citing the unanimity of the city and oblast commissions on the perspective of developing jurisdictional territories, the article seriously discussed the question of creating an administrative-territorial unit, the country's fifth largest in terms of population, with its own Supreme Soviet and government and with the rights of an autonomous republic. Excluding, however, the right to secede from the USSR and the RSFSR.

Why has this question arisen? It turns out, according to the article, that it is expensive to be the capital of a large state because of the abundance of ministries, departments, and administrators, the enterprises which give the city little and have a negative affect on its ecology, the railroads, etc. Another problem is that the development of industry in Moscow Oblast hinders, for example, agricultural production. (It would be something to see in any country a large city of more than a million residents which was free of industrial enterprises!)

Given the way the problem is stated, I would like to turn the reader's attention to the following: The need to design unified strategies for the development (and to avoid phenomena that slow such development) of large cities, and of the territories and oblasts surrounding them in our instance, is a well-known theme. There are practical examples of creating appropriate design strategies. Similar projects were worked out in particular for Leningrad and Kiev.

The problems of London and Paris, which also arose on the basis of strong centripetal tendencies, were similar to ours in many ways: The need to limit their growth and to balance the development of the city and the adjoining territories. It is understandable that the decisive role in solving these problems was played by economic successes and scientific and technical progress. Nonetheless, let us remember that the concepts of the socioeconomic and urban development of these cities, which helped in adopting rational decisions, were never exclusively reserved to the city itself or to its immediate surroundings. A program was carried out on the scale of all of the United Kingdom for the construction of more than 30 new cities, redistributing regional ties and reducing the size of the population and the jobs both in London itself and in other large cities. The development of Paris relied on a national concept for the creation of a system of so-called cities in equilibrium and a related program for the introduction of satellite cities.

What does the concept of autonomy introduce that is new by comparison with such practices, which are unfortunately little used by our own country? In the first place, it abruptly displaces accents and priorities from the sphere of the search for optimal socially conditioned economic, scientific, and technical decisions to the realm of ideology and politics. In the process the desire for mutual coordination of urban and rural problems with macroregional and national problems is pushed aside and the tasks of "self-development," self-sufficiency, and self-support within the framework of the oblast move to the forefront—that is, the desire to survive difficult times independent of one's neighbors.

Is such a concept appropriate to a large city, never mind the capital of a state? Will it not become the precursor to self-destruction?

For an answer to these questions I will touch upon theory and I remind the reader that a state is first and foremost a regional phenomenon. Its material facilities and its economy are a derivative of regional "play," not that of city and oblast forces proper. The "high rises" of Kalinin Prospect in Moscow, just like the skyscrapers of Toronto, and the economic basis of the city, its infrastructure, and the very professional and sociodemographic makeup of the population—all of this is a reflection of complicated processes taking place on the scale of giant economic and social spaces. As a rule, the larger the city and the more specialized and progressive its economy is, the greater its participation in the process of the division of labor.

Moscow, as a scientific, technical, cultural, informational, administrative, and political center is affected by the functions and ties that encompass the country as a whole. A weakening of these ties will lead to degradation, and their interruption will in essence eliminate the fundamental principle of the existence of the city. The future of the development of the capital lies not on the path of limitations and oblast exclusivity but, on the contrary, on that of broadened participation in the division of labor, including international labor. Only the most shortsighted people will not notice this.

Regretfully, such incompetence appears in many situations as a threatening and quite real destructive force. Thus, for example, it would seem that a clear course toward self-financing and cost-recovery that is carried out locally without consideration for the nature of already existing political and national structures and that is mechanically introduced in enterprises, rayons, and cities cannot help but lead to the destruction of present ties. Indeed, nothing else is possible under the conditions of a chronic absence of a market of producers. Mass shortages of everything from clothing and shoes to soap and matches is the result of incorrect tactics.

Large cities are a concentration of hundreds of enterprises tied by thousands of threads to practically all the regions of the country. It is not difficult to imagine what losses and economic chaos the separatist ambitions of particular autonomies, both internally and internationally, will lead to and are already leading to. Let us recall how, for example, people were alarmed by the report at the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies that more than 60 percent of contracts for delivery of resources to enterprises had not been concluded in the country.

Autonomist and localist tendencies are terrifying because of their uncontrollability. The negative stimuli that they engender go to absurd extremes. This includes the orders of the soviets—at all levels, by the way—to leave up to one-third of output produced on their territory for subsequent barter transactions; permission for deliveries abroad without worrying about the domestic market and the virtual destruction of existing economic ties; the adoption by soviets of measures limiting the rights of enterprises to conclude contracts to sell their own output beyond certain administrative boundaries; the establishment of lower taxes and the granting of exemptions and resources to enterprises transferring from the jurisdiction of central organs to that of local organs... Nor is there any abatement in the war of laws being adopted at different administrative and territorial levels and mutually excluding one another, whereby rash proposals are literally woven out of air, such as, for example, to move to the settlement of accounts between republics in foreign currency. The process may, without ceremony, reach down into the oblasts and cities as well.

The confrontation, as we see, is reaching critical levels. One cannot get out of it alone, nor can one set one's own economy right independent of one's neighbor. All such

hopes are completely absurd, as is another which we may one day reach—that the country does not need its capital.

And what about the sociopolitical situation? Declaration of the sovereignty of the capital is mistaken on this level as well. Particularly because it is socially explosive. This is the very sphere where the new soviets, which have inherited the populism of the rallies, have unfortunately been quite successful. There are many factors to be taken into account. Accountability to the voters, which has finally been won, is impelling deputies to avoid offending the average Muscovite. And this is unceremoniously being done through the usurpation of control over everything that lies on the territory under their jurisdiction and through an irrepressible desire to manage, often turning administrative boundaries into customs boundaries. It is not wrong to talk about "appanage principedoms" on the scale of inner-city rayons. Trade in accordance with residency permits—for their own people!—is already being introduced in Moscow. The Leningrad Soviet is creating an economic zone with temporary credit ration cards to provide for, I stress, the interests of residents of Leningrad, and in essence it is threatening to buy food in the West if a corresponding interregional system is not established.

Yes, Moscow and Leningrad are in a difficult situation. There are certain objective causes which might force people to speak in the language of diktat. But is this not being done too hastily? Have all the opportunities to come to agreement and preserve harmony and unity been exhausted? Is it appropriate to talk in the language of the epic merchant Kalashnikov?

One recalls the article by Yu. Kazarin, published in *VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA*, entitled "But in Kaluga They Are Drowning in Delicacies..." Apparently we genuinely do not recognize what a terrible blow we dealt our neighbors by introducing trade according to shopping permits, our neighbors who for decades shipped off the goods they produced to Moscow and then travelled to the capital on trains and electric trains on "food runs" and stood in line for it. We did not understand that there, both then and now, the situation was worse than in Moscow. Nor did we understand what political consequences might result from the chain reaction of mutual animosity and fencing oneself off and the accompanying wave of oblast autonomies with their own governments, supreme soviets, etc. (in the RSFSR alone there are more than 70 oblasts, krais, and districts).

There is one more aspect—the moral aspect. The difference between the conflicting parties, if one may put it that way, in terms of their socioeconomic setting is too great, and their weight levels and starting positions are contradictory. For decades the practice of economic activity, regardless of any equalization programs, in essence robbed the small cities and villages, the territories that were weak in potential, and particularly the

middle of Russia, which has been named the Non-Chernozem Region, in favor of the large cities of the center.

And now today, at a time of democracy, they are trying to exacerbate the animosity. Will it not result in a reaction, will we not deprive ourselves of the base on which we maintain ourselves? To ensure that this does not happen, we must explain to that same rural youth from the oblasts close to the capital who tills our land why Moscow with its television entertainment shows is becoming even more inaccessible to him. And how will you explain that?

Rayon Soviet Chairman Zaslavskiy Assailed

91UN1072A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 13 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Letter from group of Oktyabrskiy Rayon Soviet deputies, followed by "excerpts" of interview with USSR People's Deputy I. Zaslavskiy, chairman of the Oktyabrskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies, by Voice of America correspondent Ludmilla Flam; place and date not given: "Why We No Longer Trust Our Chairman"]

[Text] The situation that exists now in the Oktyabrskiy Rayon Soviet in Moscow would have been unthinkable if its chairman, I. Zaslavskiy, were a democrat not in words but in deeds.

Judge for yourself—83 deputies signed a collective petition demanding to put a vote of no confidence in him on the session agenda; 78 out of 95 who voted, that is, 52.7 percent of the total number of deputies in the rayon soviet (148), voted for his resignation; nevertheless, he has not resigned.

When he was elected chairman he won by a majority of 82 of the 114 who voted. Now the majority of his confederates, who last spring participated in the elections as a bloc with the Democratic Russia movement, speak against him.

What has happened? I. Zaslavskiy explains it as a massive campaign "conducted against the democrats and democracy on the scale of the entire country." (I. Zaslavskiy. "Is All Power To the Soviets No Longer Needed?" KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 2 March 1991).

Moreover, striving to win the support of the Democratic Russia movement—he is a member of its coordinating council—he continues to proclaim his adherence to the democratic program.

But this is not true. The distrust toward I. Zaslavskiy developed precisely because the deputies, after encountering him in person rather than on the television screen, suddenly discovered that he was implementing a program that was quite different from the one he had advocated before the elections.

This is how he himself describes the program he is implementing: "We are facing... a period of privatization without a market, that is, the creation of monopolistic structures... Such monopolistic structures, naturally, represent the economic basis of a dictatorship. Not of a classic—communist—type, but nevertheless a totalitarian method of administration." (I. Zaslavskiy. Interview on the radio, First Channel, at 1715 on 5 March 1991).

The number of deputies demanding his resignation has grown proportionally to the number of deputies who have discovered from personal experience that Zaslavskiy was not keeping his election campaign promises but, on the contrary, having achieved power was single-mindedly implementing a program of establishing a personal dictatorship in the rayon.

The strongest stimulus for building a totalitarian-type dictatorship on the basis of the privatization of state property without a market and the creation of monopolistic structures comes from the situation in which the same people hold leadership positions in the power organs and commercial enterprises.

It is well known from the developed countries' experience that the market mechanism is powerless in regulating the development of the national economy if the law and democratic institutions do not prevent the creation of organizational monopolies or provide public control over physical ones.

Therefore, the legislation of all civilized countries categorically prohibits representatives of power at all levels to combine this post with administrative positions in commercial firms. Such a combination, if permitted, inevitably leads to the emergence of uncontrolled monopolies and, as a result, to shortages of goods and higher prices.

I. Zaslavskiy completely agreed with this point in his election campaign statement, in which he wrote that "in case of success the well-known principle of combining the posts will no longer be applied." (I. Zaslavskiy. "From Liberalism To Democracy," YVBOR, No. 1, 1991).

However, just one month after being elected, he supported the demand of candidates to the rayon soviet executive committee to set their remuneration not by salary but by establishing commercial companies for them.

The resistance to this proposal on the part of deputies who are market supporters was so great that a candidate, mostly supported by I. Zaslavskiy himself, was not confirmed by the session. Then personal confirmation of all other candidates was denied. Instead, a no confidence vote in the... future, not yet confirmed, executive committee, was brought up.

This is the way the executive committee was formed on 21 May 1990.

At first, this deviation from one of the principal planks of the election campaign did not affect the deputies' opinion of their chairman to a substantial degree.

However, the situation started to change when more and more deputies started to notice in his actions a deliberate sequence of steps, meticulously prepared before the elections.

The question arose: What program is I. Zaslavskiy implementing?

Immediately after the formation of the executive committee, I. Zaslavskiy started to voice his doubts on the efficacy of the soviet sessions as a collective decision making organ. Soon the deputy chairman of the rayon soviet distributed among some deputies a set of documents for review that contained a plan for concentrating power in the hands of a small group of people. According to this plan the session would be stripped of the exclusive powers granted to it by law. The soviet would be temporarily preserved to serve as camouflage for the de facto personal power of the chairman until such a time as such power would be legitimized by establishing the office of mayor.

It was then that some deputies heard I. Zaslavskiy speak the words he now publishes in the press:

"This slogan—'All Power To the Soviets'—was a progressive one as at the time when we were talking about transferring all power from the party to the soviets."

(I. Zaslavskiy, "The Nomenklatura Hoof Kicks Democracy," KURANTY, No. 11, January 18 1991)

"Should a sudden demise befall the rayon soviet,... the rayon administration will become more effective."

("In the Country of Unneeded Soviets," STOLITSA, No. 4, 1991, p. 3).

"A small group of people should manage the rayon."

("What Ilya Zaslavskiy Wants," MOSKOVSKIYE VEDOMOSTI, No. 2, 1991).

A significant step in this direction was made on 21 May 1990. At that time, contrary to the law, in accordance with the session's decision its powers during the periods between sessions were placed in the hands of the soviet presidium. De facto, they ended up in the hands of the chairman.

This permitted him to basically form a new power structure in the rayon by the beginning of August. Several companies sprang to life at that time: The Assistant (Sh. Kakabadze), Firit (Yu. Fogelson), The City (G. Vasilyev), UKoSo (Yu. Gusev), The Five (D. Shusterman), The Future (I. Zaslavskiy, M. Mazo, I. Getsenvey, and I. Shleifman), The Medical League (I. Zaslavskiy), The Arab Cultural-Business Club (I. Zaslavskiy), The Evening Glow (I. Zaslavskiy), Oliviya, and others.

According to the rayon executive committee decision, and in violation of the RSFSR Constitution, these companies have been vested with power functions, including the right to implement the policy of de-state-ization of the rayon economy; to own, use, and administer enterprises, buildings, and structures on rayon territory; to rent them out, lease them, or convey them as property to individuals and organizations; to establish prices and receive rent, lease, or purchase payments for the said buildings and structures, while keeping no less than five percent of the profit from these transactions (the total value of communal property alone is about 22 billion rubles); to carry out the responsibilities of the state contract system (centralized material and technical supply, allocation of stocks of goods, assignment of suppliers); leasing (including the option for future buy-out) of capital assets and working capital, and transfer of property rights for stocks, equipment, technology, raw materials, and financial resources; licensing of various types of activities; and so on, and so on.

The contracts with these firms have been written in such a way that even a reorganization or liquidation of the founder (that is, the rayon executive committee) does not cause the liquidation or reorganization of the company. And how could it be different if those who are now in power are using this opportunity to establish these companies for themselves?

Trying to justify the program of privatization without a market and the creation of monopolistic structures, I. Zaslavskiy says in his television interview:

"The program is working and brings concrete results. The rayon budget has received additional millions and tens of millions of rubles; it has also already received its first millions of dollars. This money is going for very specific uses. Teachers' salaries have been increased 1.5 times."

Anchor: "In the rayon?"

I. Zaslavskiy: "Naturally, in the rayon."

("Good Evening, Moscow" program, February 1991).

However, here we have an official paper from the Finance Administration, dated 4 March 1991:

"In 1990-1991, NO PAYMENTS to the rayon budget have been received from UKoSo.

"The hard currency account in the rayon budget HAS NOT BEEN OPENED."

At the same time, however, "The Future" fund (with I. Zaslavskiy as one of its founders) has "accounts in banking entities in both Soviet and hard currency, and conducts both cash and noncash transactions." (The fund's charter, point 2.1).

In justification of the dual jobs arrangement L. Shleifman, director of "The Future" fund, told deputies at the

meeting of the bloc of those who support I. Zaslavskiy that the fund can pay its officers \$300 a month for their work.

Therefore, we do not question the fact itself that "millions and tens of millions of rubles, and also millions of dollars" had been received for I. Zaslavskiy to administer, which is what he said on television. The question is: What does it bring to rayon residents? Does it increase their income or their expenses? Each increase in the lease costs of retail, service, and other enterprises—a substantial percentage of which goes into the pockets of the monopolist companies—immediately leads to price increases. For instance, why do color television sets, sold to Muscovites by coupons, cost 775 rubles in Sovietskiy Rayon and 1,250 rubles in Oktyabrskiy Rayon?

But where did the money to raise teachers' salaries come from, the listeners may ask Zaslavskiy.

The money, according to the paper from the Finance Administration, came "from the budget surplus left in the rayon budget as of 1 January 1990." And the salaries were raised not to the rayon level, as Zaslavskiy would have us believe, but "in accordance with the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems Resolution No. 193/7-69 of 15 May 1990" and "in accordance with the RSFSR Council of Ministers Resolution No. 17 of 1 August 1990. The financing had been included in the draft 1991 budget by the Main Finance Administration."

No additional payments into the rayon budget from the monopolist companies were received. They, however, received money from the rayon. And not only money.

Among the companies, in whose operation I. Zaslavskiy actively participates and which, according to him, have nothing to gain from Oktyabrskiy Rayon, are the following:

- The Association for Authors Television, which received, on the soviet presidium decision of 28 September 1990, 482.4 square meters in Building 1, 11 Kazachiy Lane;
- The Regional Committee of Independent Journalists (430 square meters, 3 Staromonetnyy Lane);
- The public fund "Glasnost" (415 square meters, 3 Staromonetnyy Lane);
- "The Future" fund (304 square meters, 3 Staromonetnyy Lane).

I. Zaslavskiy is the chairman of the Benevolence and Culture association. Besides the functions indicated by its name, the association serves as the founder of a large number of purely commercial enterprises that are registered in the rayon and received hundred of square meters of office space here.

These facts are known to the deputies. Therefore they demand that I. Zaslavskiy resign his post as chairman.

The First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies resolved on 20 June 1990:

"The RSFSR does not permit the combination of a ranking position in a state power or administrative organ with any other position."

Compliance with this decision would have removed the personal interest of the leadership of the soviets and executive committees of various levels in creating monopolistic economic structures on the territories under their jurisdiction. But this would have been contrary to I. Zaslavskiy's desire for privatization. He signs an appeal: "A ban on combining positions... may lead to destabilization of the power structure." Referring to the decision of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, Zaslavskiy declares this point in the resolution "On the Mechanism of People's Power in the USSR" invalid on the territory of Oktyabrskiy Rayon.

I. Zaslavskiy replies: "I believe that the talk to the effect that... the executive power has no right to engage in commercial activities is... demagoguery..., in one African country even the president is engaged in business activities." (I. Zaslavskiy. "In the Country of Unneeded Soviets," STOLITSA, No. 4, 1991, p. 3).

Complaining that he is being pilloried for combining jobs, I. Zaslavskiy writes: "Liquidating these maligned dual-job arrangements would be like pouring salt on an open wound. This would be an illiterate and irresponsible act." (I. Zaslavskiy. "Under Fire... And For Combining Jobs, Too," MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTY, No. 2, 13 January 1991).

We have shown only part of the reason why for I. Zaslavskiy to liquidate a dual-job arrangement "would be like pouring salt on an open wound." Let the readers decide whether we are right in demanding I. Zaslavskiy's resignation.

We ask you to publish our letter.

[signed] People's deputies of the Oktyabrskiy Rayon Soviet of Peoples Deputies, Moscow:

Yu. Marenich, G. Markov, A. Nikolenko, M. Nizovtsev, V. Peshnoy, A. Zhokina, A. Krivtsov, A. Vinogradov, Ye. Chernov, A. Vlasova, D. Krymov, V. Yakovlev, V. Chursin, S. Atrokhov, B. Chizhikov, and others.

The Voice of America, 9 March

On the evening on 9 March we learned from a Voice of America broadcast that USSR People's Deputy I. Zaslavskiy is in Washington—just as the Oktyabrskiy Rayon Soviet deputies thought. Voice of America correspondent Ludmilla Flam offered Soviet listeners an interview with this famous traveler. Here are excerpts from this interview.

[Zaslavskiy] I was recently elected chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Democratic Russia movement. This public office, and this movement, are

only now taking shape; it does not have any staff; nevertheless, we have to try, to whatever degree possible, to achieve results in this volunteer work. And the result would be to establish contacts with parties and movements and the public in other countries, and to provide people in other countries with information about democrats in Russia, since their image is often quite distorted...

[Correspondent] I think you underestimate the West's attitude toward democrats in Russia. The West is very sympathetic toward the democrats. Since Gorbachev is the head of the central government, the Western powers deal with him.

[Zaslavskiy] I do not agree with you. First, if there is any sympathy, it is on the part of a small number of intellectuals, who seriously analyze the situation in the country—I mean the democrats. Second, Brezhnev also was at the helm of power, but it was Gorbachev who received the Nobel Peace Prize, and this is a reflection of the fact that his activity, as a rule, is viewed in a simplistic way... At first, Gorbachev was protecting the interests of the progressive nomenklatura, which wanted to grab the people's wealth into private possession, so he protected these interests from the communist ideologues; now he is protecting the interests of the same nomenklatura group from the rest of the people, from the democrats, and from the competition coming from foreign capital; thus the desire to worsen relations with other countries; thus the rabid pressure exerted on all independent economic forms...

[Correspondent] We have heard that Gorbachev ostensibly stated that it is unwise to let some deputies travel abroad since they advocate not giving financial help to the Soviet Union. What can you say in this respect?

[Zaslavskiy] This is a natural occurrence in the development of the conservative political line we have now... People are being accused of all kinds of things: that they are connected to the Central Intelligence Agency; that they have sold out to foreign capital; that they spend all their time abroad and spend money on this, and even if it turns out that no public money was spent, they say: "Then what do those foreigners give them money for?" This is a very one-sided, biased campaign...

[Correspondent] You are returning to Moscow almost on the eve of the referendum. What do you think about the referendum? What is your personal attitude toward this issue?

[Zaslavskiy] I am a member of the coordinating council of the Democratic Russia movement; when we voted on our position in regard to the referendum, I voted for the general resolution: to answer negatively to the question in the Union referendum, and to answer positively to the question in the Russian referendum; in short—no to Gorbachev, yes to Yeltsin...

We have to admit honestly that the democrats needed about six more months in order to create organized

powerful structures capable of counteracting this evil force. Now it is not easy for them, but nevertheless they felt compelled to speak up, to enter an open struggle with this evil force, because we could not wait any longer—the economic preconditions for a new dictatorship are being created and put in place right now. That is where, I think, Yeltsin's well-known speech directly against Gorbachev came from...

[Correspondent] Is there a way to measure to what degree this speech found support among the people?

[Zaslavskiy] It found quite substantial support; the people responded; we can see this by the rallies, by the solidarity that exists, and by the thousands of letters supporting Yeltsin and denouncing Gorbachev and other people who spoke against Yeltsin. But, of course, there is a powerful, organized counteraction that is coming not from the people but from the structures controlled by the president; the attack is conducted on literally all fronts; it is noticeable in the Supreme Soviet of Russia, in the Moscow City Soviet, and now they have canceled "Vzglyad" on television...

[Correspondent] What actions are you planning for the future?

[Zaslavskiy] We have only one plan: to continue the existing line; to continue fighting, and to strengthen the Democratic Russia movement, and to count on victory. I think that the victory will come either now or in a few years. But if it comes in a few years, it will be more costly.

Zaslavskiy Responds to Press Attacks

91UN1002A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 2 Mar 91 p 3

[Article by USSR People's Deputy I. Zaslavskiy: "All Power To the Soviets Is No Longer Needed?"—first and final two paragraphs are editorial introduction and conclusion]

[Text] On 20 December 1990, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA published an article by N. Andreyev entitled "Our Dear Soviet Power." Ilya Zaslavskiy, chairman of Moscow Oktyabrskiy Rayon Soviet, disagreeing with the critique addressed to him, asked our editors for an opportunity to respond.

Frankly, when I discovered an article by N. Andreyev in an issue of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA—a newspaper I deeply respect and read regularly—I could not decide at first how to react. Respond? But there are so many of them, articles like that. You cannot respond to them all. Nevertheless, it is necessary to respond, because now we are dealing with a massive campaign that the party is conducting against democrats and democracy on a countrywide scale.

For instance, the much-hyped information on the Interregional Group's alleged connection with the CIA, ostensibly received from the Ministry of Defense. Not too many people paid attention to the fact that the Ministry of Defense information turned out to be clippings from foreign newspapers.

The second prong is the critique of specific shortcomings and controversial points. The campaign organizers understood that the thinking majority cannot be pushed away from the democrats by just lies "from the right" alone; the thinking majority can, however, be split by forcing it to argue on various specific issues. The same scenario was applied in Lithuania: They selected one specific unpopular phenomenon—the price increase—and conveniently "forgot" that price increases are occurring on the territory of the entire country and that they are the result of the current state of the economy into which Gorbachev-Ryzhkov government has pushed us. Then, emphasizing this point of contention, they initially split away a part of the population.

Fortunately, it is not difficult to make a distinction between a critique and hounding. A critique is based on arguments; hounding cannot survive without disinformation and rumors. Even hounding camouflaged as "a disagreement between comrades-in-arms" is no exception. N. Andreyev, unable to resist this temptation, gives an example of "hare-brained schemes" in the decisions of the Oktyabrskiy Rayon Soviet Presidium: The presidium made a decision to demolish a large building on Gagarin square, with a purpose of bringing the area closer to international social-architectural norms. The cost is \$2 billion. What is not mentioned is what this cost figure refers to—the demolition alone or the entire project.

In reality the presidium's decision deals with the rayon's undertaking of a large construction project within the framework of Soviet-French cooperation. An appropriate agreement has already been signed on the Moscow City Soviet level. The dollars are provided by the French side. The rayon will get dependable income, ecologically clean workplaces, retail and sociocultural objects, plus, in addition to all this, several apartment buildings.

However, the ideological campaign is only half of the matter. To remove the democrats from power, the organizers of current tragic events had to find support in specific people and specific structures capable of mass actions; here we also observe the desire to mask the true role of the CPSU and to act through ostensibly independent organizations. From where do the main attacks to the Oktyabrskiy Rayon Soviet leadership emanate? From the independent deputies' bloc, from those who split from Democratic Russia.

The universally known Interregional Group has lost half of its membership. Among those who have left it are Deputies Alksnis, Kogan, Krayko... Similar processes are taking place in the soviets on all levels. Should it then be surprising that when it came to the choice between the

fight for a market and the talk about a market, far from all representatives of Democratic Russia behaved the way voters—who had relied on what is in the bloc's name—expected them to?

We should not forget that having taken power the democrats to a considerable degree simply made themselves open to attack, because they had been put into the system and therefore shortcomings of the system became our shortcomings. But on the other hand, having attempted to democratize the soviets, we have demonstrated the limit of their potential, and brought the people to an understanding of the next step—the necessity of reforming the system of power. By this I mean direct elections of the executive power leadership. The slogan "All power to the soviets" for a time represented progress because it dealt with the transfer of power from the party to the soviets. But times change, and slogans change with them. What was necessary yesterday may turn out to be reactionary today.

The situation in which the same ideas are criticized if they come from the democrats but at the same time are praised if they come from the mouth of officialdom's representatives (as a rule, with great delay and in corrupted form) is far from new. It is not a matter of sympathies or antipathies of this or that journalist. According to the design of those who stand behind a long row of countless campaigns, everything the democrats do should be assumed to be bad, since we have committed the gravest crime possible in the society of socialist choice and communist perspective—we have encroached on the CPSU monopoly on power.

BY THE WAY:

The Oktyabrskiy Rayon Soviet third session, which started its work in November, resembles a "permanent stalemate." Yesterday again the meeting was postponed due to lack of quorum.

The deputies' majority has managed to put on the agenda the issue of no confidence in regard to Soviet Chairman Ilya Zaslavskiy. In the deputies' opinion, the soviet leadership is out of control, does not care about voters' needs, and is leading the rayon toward "capitalism." An organizational committee of deputies has been formed with the purpose of initiating I. Zaslavskiy's recall as a USSR people's deputy.

Moscow Poll on Patrols, Referendum Cited

91UN1077A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 14 Feb 91 p 1

[Article by Moscow City Party Committee press center under the rubric "Urgent Problems: The Opinion of Muscovites": "The 'Scene' Over the Air and the Picture in Real Life"]

[Text] A week ago television and radio broadcasts and the pages of the radical newspapers were filled with "alarmed" outcries over the presidential ukase on the

organization of joint patrolling of the streets of major cities by members of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and the USSR Ministry of Defense. As has happened repeatedly recently, some of the mass media have been trying to create the impression that a majority of the people are reacting negatively to the president's ruling. And thus that the actions of the parliaments of several republics to invalidate the ukase are fully justified.

Under these circumstances many citizens who reacted positively to the president's measures have probably begun to have second thoughts: Are they not "anachronisms" in a sea of unanimous condemnation of the Union government? But again it has not occurred to them that they are witnessing the latest campaign to mislead public opinion.

Data of a public opinion poll conducted by the Moscow Political Institute confirm that this is indeed the case in the instance of the presidential ukase on joint patrols.

As opposed to street polls which (as every sociologist and journalist knows) are not at all representative (but they try to make up for it by emphasizing their populist effect!), this poll was conducted on the basis of a Moscow territorial and production cross-section worked out at the Institute of Sociology of the USSR Academy of Sciences which ensures objective representation of all the social and professional groups that are important to the city. In all, 1,021 people were polled.

Science showed that Muscovites decisively support the ukase of the president. To a question which ties together the motives for the adoption of this ruling by the president with the resulting measure, 70 percent of those polled answered yes, 22 percent answered no, and eight percent had no opinion. In this same fashion Muscovites not only approved of the ruling of the head of state but also unambiguously expressed their attitude toward the situation in country as a whole, a situation which demands effective attention, and not the kind indicated on the television screen, by state organs.

It is interesting that the most active support was found among workers, economic leaders, and retirees—80 percent of this social group of respondents gave a positive answer. Creative workers gave the most negative answers. Not a single one of those polled from this category approved of the measures that have been declared, and 55 percent answered with an unambiguous "no." Do not these figures show which group's opinion is being offered in the press and over the air as the national opinion?

The poll also sounded public opinion on the issue that will appear on the 17 March referendum. Coverage of this issue in the mass media is similar to that of the presidential ukase on joint patrols. It is identical to the attempts to spread doubt concerning the need for joint patrols in order to please interested political forces in some republics. Of course, in this case the entire struggle is still to come: It promises to be a stubborn fight

inasmuch as public opinion in this instance has been subjected to less of an informational and television onslaught and relies more on personal experience. The formulation of the question for the poll coincided with that which will be on the referendum. True, the respondents, as opposed to the situation on 17 March, were granted the opportunity to have no opinion if that was the case.

Nonetheless, 82 percent of those polled answered "yes"! We will agree that this is a very high degree of support for a renewed Union. Only 10 percent answered "no." The greatest amount of support for the idea of a Union occurs among workers, retirees, servicemen, and engineering and technical workers. The lowest occurs among workers of cultural institutions. Of them, 60 percent said "no."

The results of the sociological research shows how different the "scene" over the air is from the picture of real life. Previously such a difference was understandable—it was the result of totalitarianism and stagnation. Now we need to recognize that "pluralism" in the organs of information is strange at present: Life is reflected in a one-sided and distorted fashion.

Western Republics

Belorussian Supreme Soviet Considers Two Constitution Drafts

*91UN1037A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 15 Feb 91 p 1*

[Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet news service report: "The Priority Is Common Human Values"]

[Text] In the busy life of the Belorussian parliament there is yet another priority innovation, namely, that a constitutional commission has started the simultaneous review of two drafts of a new fundamental law for the republic.

The Supreme Soviet decided last summer to draw up a new constitution. At that time, at its first session, a Constitutional Commission was formed, led by Nikolay Ivanovich Dementey. Some 63 deputies asked to be included as part of this organ, which is very important in any parliament. Expert scholars, first and foremost jurists with a name, and experienced practical people were recruited. For greater efficiency two working groups were set up, each of which was to present its own draft. And now, after many months of strenuous work, they are having their first hearing.

Let us emphasize immediately that no one has decided to provide an exhaustive description of the draft "on the run." Rather, a certain caution is justified: An enormous amount of human labor has been invested, and any hastiness would smack of slipshod work. And indeed, haste is not required in this case. What is needed is in-depth, comprehensive analysis, and that takes time. For even a cursory acquaintance has shown that both

drafts contain much in common but also have significant differences. Here is just one example.

The working group led by People's Deputy V. Sholodov called its draft "The Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic." The draft from the group led by People's Deputy V. Gonchar was entitled "The Constitution of the Republic of Belarus." You will agree that there is a difference here.

Differences of principle also exist in the structure of the drafts, and in the formulation and content of the individual chapters and sections. And these differences are of a kind that could have set those who gathered seriously at loggerheads for a long time. No, they are not at loggerheads. The debate has been surprisingly friendly and constructive. Virtually each of the 25 people who spoke considered it his duty to emphasize that a good factual basis has been created on which to unite the efforts of the groups and prepare a single draft constitution.

So what issues were the focus of attention among the members of the commission and those who drew up the drafts? They were of the most topical kind: national sovereignty, citizenship and human rights, attitude toward the Union treaty, matters pertaining to property and the electoral system, the reform of management organs...

On the latter, the tone was set by I. Yukho, a professor from the department of theory and history of the state and law in the law faculty of the Belorussian State University. Iosif Aleksandrovich said the following, literally: The names of the highest organ of power as provided for in both of the versions, namely Supreme Soviet and parliament, are not suitable for Belorussia. The name "soym" should be used. And at the local level we should return to the administrative units known as the volost and the povet.

V. Piskarev, among others, did not agree with him: Who says that the rayon has become outdated? Viktor Alekseyevich also objected to those taking part in the discussion who believe that it is necessary to create political neutrality in the fundamental law. He is convinced that the constitution cannot stand outside politics, outside ideology. Whose ideology and what policy it expresses is another matter.

Many argued about the advisability of introducing presidential power in the republic. Provision is made in both versions for this possibility. In fact, there is food for thought here. Perhaps it is better to concern ourselves with further strengthening the influence of the parliament. For as People's Deputy L. Kozik stressed, this is concentration of power in one man's hands. But we are building a democratic, parliamentary republic.

We are building a rule-of-law state and this supported by the professional talk from the chief of the section for legislative initiative and legal questions in the Belorussian Federation of Trade Unions, B. Volkov. But it

should be a question of a socialist rule-of-law state, and this concept should be filled with specific content. The chairman of the Belorussian trade unions thought that the constitution must reflect the objective reality of the radiation damage done over a considerable part of the republic's territory.

A whole group of deputies stated the importance of introducing into the fundamental law the thesis on socialist choice, and here Boris Alekseyevich was not alone. The people's deputies said that by adopting the Declaration on State Sovereignty, the Supreme Soviet had already expressed itself in favor of retaining the definition "socialist" in the republic's name. The reasoning was emotional and convincing, as, however, were the arguments presented by their opponents.

And it must be admitted that the statement by the chief of the department of state law and soviet development in the legal faculty of the Belorussian State University, Professor A. Golovko, was even more emotional. Saying that the social order now actually existing should be underpinned in the constitution, Anatoliy Aleksandrovich spoke with emotion about the need to bring order to the union of the Belorussian, Russian, and Ukrainian peoples. "When they ask me what my nationality is I answer that I am an internationalist. I was born in Russia, studied in the Ukraine, and have devoted all my life and all my health and strength to Belorussia. I fought for its liberation and was wounded twice. It is impossible to set any kind of boundary between our brother-peoples. Belorussia will never be alone."

It is impossible in a newspaper account to give a full report on the statements of each person who took part in the debate. Nevertheless, in order for the reader (who is also the voter) to gain some idea of the range of opinions, let us cite, at least in schematic form, some more statements.

People's Deputy V. Gonchar: "We proceed from the premise that the constitution should not reflect the nature of the social order but as the fundamental law should strengthen human rights. If I have to express the essence of our concept in two words, then I would say that it should be a unique treaty between the individual, society, and the state. Accordingly, in answer to the question of what order the constitution should underpin—socialist, bourgeois, capitalist—our group states unambiguously that it is the constitutional order."

People's Deputy P. Sadovskiy: "If mention of the republic's capital is made in the constitution then it should be given its historical name—Mensk. From the viewpoint of heraldry the state emblem and flag will not stand up under criticism. We should also create a normal national anthem."

People's Deputy N. Kryzhanovskiy: "The two drafts complement each other. If we take the best from them then we shall be able to draw up a fine fundamental law. But we must set the main positions of principle. Perhaps a referendum should be held on some of them, as, for

example, the name of the republic, and whether it should be a presidential or a parliamentary republic."

People's Deputy V. Sholodonov: "No policy or political trend should influence the work on the constitution. Let us consider together how to create a fundamental law that would help to improve the life of our people."

People's Deputy Ye. Glushkevich: "I disagree with those who are saying that they do not know where they are living or what kind of a power this is. I know. I live in Belorussia, I was born here, and we shall all be living here together. I believe that in the constitution we are drawing up for the Belorussian people priority must be given to common human values."

Statements by Deputies M. Slemnev, N. Voytenkov, and Z. Poznyak, and Professor S. Dobryazko from the Belorussian State University, corresponding member of the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences V. Shabaylov, Professor N. Kudinov of the Ministry of Internal Affairs Minsk Higher School, and others were well-considered and well-argued.

Summing up the results of the debate, Nikolay Ivanovich Dementey noted that much work has been done by the groups and the experts. It is important that both documents be oriented on the individual in terms of their content. The individual is the measure of all social values. And those who favored priority for the individual over the interests of the state, the priority of common human values, and the creation of a humane civic society, are right. This conceptual approach should be preserved in the work on the new constitution.

The Supreme Soviet chairman asked members of the commission to continue their analysis of the two drafts and to give him their conclusions in writing.

The next meeting of the Constitutional Commission is scheduled for 25 February.

Moldovan Draft Law on Self-Government Discussed

*91UN0928A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA
in Russian 5 Jan 91 p 3*

[Article by Moldovan SSR People's Deputy A. Safonov: "Why Eliminate Soviet Rule? Let Us Discuss the Moldovan SSR Law 'On the Fundamentals of Local Self-Government'"]

[Text] The proposed territorial-administrative reform is being widely discussed in the republic of late. "Is it necessary? If so," the people ask, "then what kind?" A draft of the Moldovan SSR Law, "On the Fundamentals of Local Self-Government," was published in the press. Speaking out in the press in particular were economist S. Maksimilian and Lawyer (Moldovan SSR People's Deputy) Kotorobay. The discussion, however, continues; for the question is quite important. Moreover, it is politicized to a large extent.

Before commenting on the draft law, we should recall that for a long time there has been criticism; namely, of the large number of rayons. Hence, people often drew conclusions about the cumbersome administrative structure and the large number of administrators. From an administrative point of view that may be so; but I shall try to approach it from a different aspect.

What have many of those who are now parliamentarians been demanding for the last two or three years? The expansion of democracy, observance of rights and freedoms, and maximum expansion of the rights of local organs of power (self-rule). The slogan was—"All Power to the Soviets!" Incidentally, just five years ago such a slogan would have met with hostility.

If we had been talking about strictly administrative reform, then realistically it would have worthwhile to reduce the number of rayons. However, the draft law which the republic government has presented to us in fact envisages creating a completely new power structure; for it completely abolishes the power of the Soviets in our republic, as well as the Soviets of People's Deputies themselves. Does this expand the rights of local self-government? More accurately, it reduces them to practically zero.

Article 2 establishes two levels of local self-government: the kommuna and the city, the uyezd and the munitsipi. However, this is in no way more progressive than the present system, which envisages several levels as well: for example, the rural soviets, and then the rayon, and so on.

Article 3 gives rise to many questions, where it simultaneously speaks of the "election of organs of local self-government" and of their "accountability...to the government of the Moldovan SSR." One would think that they should not be subordinated to the executive organ, which is what the cabinet of ministers is. Indeed, the local Soviets should be subordinate to the highest legislative organ, that is, to the parliament; however, to subordinate self-government to the government means to open the way to unbridled bureaucratic red tape. True, it does speak of "openness and consideration of public opinion," and so on. But is there really less opportunity for consideration of public opinion in the Soviets? The moreso, since in the Spring of 1990, the parliament transferred press organs to the Soviets? Where is the logic?

Further. Article 4 speaks about "public participation in the discussion and solution of important problems," and about monitoring the activities of the organs of local self-government "with the help of direct democracy." Alas, there are a lot of declarations here. First of all, since 17 April our populace has not once discussed a single draft law in earnest. The Supreme Soviet has decided everything, and often in haste or incorrectly. And so what we have is what we have. Moreover, it is not altogether clear what kind of public monitoring one can speak of, if the organs of local self-government are subordinate to the government.

Article 6 discloses the composition of a people's soviet. But here too one finds no convincing arguments in favor of eliminating the Soviets; for they will hardly dissolve from the absence of a few people in the people's soviet or the Soviet of People's Deputies. How many people remain on the government's books is another matter. After all, the bureaucrats can inflate the staff of the "people's soviet" as well.

Article 7 says that the primar [executive] of a village, commune and city shall be elected by means of general elections, and that he can be recalled by the voters. But this too is no better than election of Soviets of People's Deputies from bottom to top. We are reminded again of the subordination of the organs of local self-government to the government, which largely reduces the significance of the elections. This is confirmed in point 2 of Article 7, which says that "the primar of a munitsipi and the prefekt of an uyezd shall be confirmed by the Moldovan SSR Supreme Soviet upon a motion from the government, and shall be members of the government of the Moldovan SSR." Thus, these responsible officials are in fact not subordinate to the electors, and once again everything is shut up in the cabinet of ministers.

Article 8 of the draft law speaks of the fact that the activity of the local organs of self-government shall be regulated by the present law and by other laws of the Moldovan SSR. Which laws? You see, this is a very simple mechanism: today we adopt this law, and tomorrow we adopt other laws which reduce to nothing even those insignificant rights which the People's Soviets receive, and officially it will not be possible to challenge anything. For example, after World War II, a Hungarian Autonomous Oblast was created in Romania; however, in the latter part of the 1960's a campaign directed against the national minorities began to gain strength, and in 1967-68 the Hungarian Autonomous Oblast was liquidated under the pretext of a return to the pre-war territorial-administrative system of uyezds (which is what is being proposed to us in 1990). Well, we know what happened to the Transylvanian Hungarians after that.

There is no disputing that there are many problems and sore spots with the present-day soviets. No one is disputing that. But multiple levels are raised again and again. One can go along with that; however, the draft law under consideration does not solve the given problem either: it is proposed that we divide the uyezds into volosts, and that the pretura represents the lower-ranking organ of the uyezd prefektura, whereas the pretor is confirmed by the government. Thus here too everything is in the hands of the highest executive organ, whereas the pretor, who controls the execution of the laws of the Moldovan SSR in the villages and the communes, is himself only an executor.

There is no question that the given draft law bestows an important task upon the organ of self-government: "the organization of public cost accounting" on the given territory (point 2, Article 11), as well as the formulation

and approval of the local budget (point 2, Article 14). It is hard to overstate the importance and the responsibility of the task. But are the Soviets not occupied with this at the present time? One can respond candidly that the "higher-ups" have interfered in the activities of the Soviets, and still do so. However, that can be the case under any system of government. Thus, it is not a matter of changing the structure, but that a mechanism be formed that would exclude the very possibility of interference, from any side, in the actions of the local organs of rule.

There is one another thing we shall not forget: At a time when everything around us is in crisis, a conciliation commission was formed for work with the representatives of the Left Bank and the South. And the populace there interprets the proposed reform as an attempt to "cut off" the South and the Left Bank, and to turn them piece by piece into large uyezds. There are forces in Modlova (Why try to cover it up?), which want to do just that. One recalls the alleged compromise proposal to form an uyezd within the area in which the Gagauz population is concentrated, although a number of deputies are not in agreement with such a concession either. True, one cannot understand how one could count upon a positive reaction from the Gagauz, if point 4 of Article 11 of the draft law says, "An organ of local self-government is forbidden to take decisions on political questions and questions of state legislation, or to promulgate protests or proclamations of a political nature."

Alas, one is forced to the conclusion that this point contains one of the key features of the proposed draft law. The question also arises, why an organ of local self-government, under conditions of observing the norms of the Constitution of the USSR and the Constitution of the Moldovan SSR, cannot express its opinion with respect to this or that aspect of socio-political life? Point 4 of Article 11 is undeniably antidemocratic. Thus the sharp reaction of many people to such "innovations" is not surprising. For example, the appeal "To the people of the Moldovan SSR, to the parliament and to the government of the republic," adopted at an assembly of the citizens of the village of Malinovskoye in Ryshanskiy Rayon, states:

"In connection with the severe economic situation we are categorically opposed to the new administrative-territorial division. We have already undergone experiments on ourselves, and unsuccessful ones at that. They provide neither more food, nor more clothing, and it does not become easier to live. We believe that this will lead to Romanization of the republic (Why copy the administrative-territorial division of Romania? So that it would then be easier to accomplish annexation?)" (MOLODEZH MOLDOVY [Young People of Mold-ova]), 11 December 1990.)

As we see, the question was put directly; and that means the answers to them must be just as direct.

Of course, we would all be making a big mistake if we automatically defended the twosome rayons we have today, as well as the name "rayon" itself. If the majority of the people like the name "uyezd" better, that is the way it should be. And if as a result of considered judgement that directly involves the study of public opinion, the parliament comes to the conclusion that 40 rayons is too many for Moldova, then that number should be reduced to an optimal level. But I am categorically opposed to elimination of Soviets of People's Deputies as organs possessing complete authority on the territory which they administer. I consider the attempt to eliminate the Soviets an attempt to eliminate all local opposition to the present political course under the sway of the republic. Those who speak of only changing the signboards or the names either do not understand the essence of the case or they are consciously leading the people astray. We are talking about changing the power structure. The Soviets have only begun to stand upon their feet and are still far from operating at full force. They are trying to cut them off at the roots before they grow stronger.

Let's say there are uyezds in the republic—let them be; Moldova has its own specific nature. But even in the uyezds, Soviets of People's Deputies must operate. Here is what I am truly convinced of: that we must not adopt this law in its present wording. One can clearly see in it the striving of the government of the Moldovan SSR to acquire enormous rights in the governing of the republic. I am opposed to this. I am for the power of the organs elected by the people.

In consideration of the importance of the question, I offer the following specific proposals:

1. To authorize the commission to present data to the Moldovan SSR Supreme Soviet on how many rayons (or uyezds) Moldova needs;
2. If necessary (in accordance with the wishes of the populace), to re-name the "rayons," "uyezd";
3. To officially submit the given draft law for nationwide discussion, for a period of 1.5-2 months; and,
4. To resolve the question of reform once and for all, by means of a republic referendum.

Will it really be necessary to raise the slogan "All Power to the Soviets" above the heads of the demonstrators once again?

Workers In Moldova Seek Jobs Abroad

*91UN1108A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA
in Russian 20 Feb 91 p 3*

[Article by I. Tronin: "Brain and Labor Drain: A Danger or a Boon?"]

[Text] The attention of many readers of Kishinev newspapers was probably drawn to the advertising statement that appeared some time ago inviting people to test their

abilities in work abroad. The estimated earnings were from 7,000 to 30,000 rubles [R] a month (one must understand that this was by exchanging hard currency for rubles on the black market).

The desire to experience this happiness leads nearly 200 people each day to Aleksandr Chel Bun Street, Building 50. Not all of them immediately buy the blank forms; many waiver for a long time. But still the number of those who have filled out and sent the questionnaires has passed the 8,000 mark as of today.

Let us remind our readers that we are speaking about those same "Contract" forms that were actively advertised on Central Television last fall. But as soon as they appeared in the kiosks of Soyuzpechat [Main Administration for the Dissemination of Printed Material of the USSR Ministry of Communications] in several cities of the USSR, the "denizens of the shadow economy" immediately engaged in the business, raising the nominal price (R5) 15-20-fold—now, naturally, on the black market.

Such unhealthy speculation could not have pleased the initiator of this entire enterprise, the American firm IEA (International Employment Agency—the agency for international hiring of labor force), whose headquarters are in Los Angeles. They began to look for a Soviet partner. Their choice fell to the Moscow firm AMITR—Agency for International Utilization of Labor Resources—and their business started rolling in the summer of 1990. They opened several branches throughout the country. One of them, which was opened in November in Kishinev, operates under the aegis of the city experimental center "Youth Initiative Fund."

"As far as I know, the International Employment Agency appeared on the Soviet labor force market after it had been operating fairly successfully in Eastern Europe, particularly in Poland," says Kishinev bureau director Vladimir Shishov. "So far a total of about a million blank forms have come to the Soviet Union. Our firm is the only one in Moldova. In recent weeks more and more people from the neighboring oblasts of the Ukraine have been coming to us. We sell them the blank forms and give them complete advice on how to fill them out and send them off. Already several dozen residents of Moldova have come to us and said that they had received a registration number. This means that they filled them out correctly and paid their fee, their documents are in the computer, and the search for a job for them has started."

A representative of this American firm has already spoken twice on Central TV and has stated unequivocally that his agency guarantees practically 100 percent positive results to anyone who fills out the blank form correctly. There are grounds for such optimism. The International Employment Agency computer is constantly in a state of "combat patrol," obtaining information from tens of thousands of firms from 140 countries that need workers.

When the computer, conducting its searches of the data banks, encounters the country or group of countries, the occupation, and the time period indicated on your form, it makes a check mark and reports it to Moscow. After that, as they say, it is all technical. A communication is sent immediately to the firm offering the job saying that they have a specialist for it. The future employer studies the application and makes a decision—whether to sign a contract with the individual or not. If a contract is signed, International Employment Agency withholds five percent of the specialist's wages for the first six months of his employment abroad.

"Rumors that the first Soviet citizens have already gone to work abroad have probably spread throughout the entire country," says Shishov. "We know that a group of people from Moscow, Leningrad, Siberia, and other cities has departed. Kishinev residents have recently started coming to our branch—specialists in the area of commercial mountain work (alpinism), who have told us that five of them have received invitations to work in Canada."

In the opinion of V. Shishov, the time of mass departures through this agency has not come yet but this process will gradually gather force and could become like a flood when the Law on Entry and Exit is passed.

"Now each person can select the period of time he wishes to work abroad—a half year, a year, two, or three—by indicating this on the questionnaire. Additionally, you may go for seasonal work, that is, conclude a contract for two or three years, but during all this time you will be dependent on seasonal demands. The questionnaire has columns where, in addition to your basic occupation, you indicate several other specialties in which you are qualified to work. Then, of course, your chances of getting a job are better.

"But many people have questions about their families. Let us clarify: The questionnaires are purely individual. But it is possible to take two paths: Either the husband may fill everything out for himself and go and get settled and then decide what to do with his wife and children, or the couple may buy two blank forms from us and send them in one envelop with a note saying that both would like to work in the same place if possible."

To the question of why the firm has so many clients, the leader expressed the opinion that one of the main reasons was the unstable sociopolitical and economic situation in the country as a whole and in the republic in particular. "Many of them state openly that they want to go somewhere because they are tired of the interethnic tension, the impoverished condition, the endless waiting lines, the degrading card and coupon system, and the awareness that young people full of strength and energy are unable to provide their families with an existence worthy of a civilized human being."

Speaking about the ethnic and occupational composition of the clients of the Contract firm, V. Shishov noted that more than half of them are Moldovans. Approximately

60 percent of those who buy questionnaires are workers, the majority of whom are construction workers and metallurgists. Among the intelligentsia there is a predominance of representatives of technical thought, electronics engineers, and also physicians. "I do not see anything surprising in this. To all of our great distress, our golden hands and brilliant brains are valued considerably less highly here than they are in the West."

To the question of whether or not he considers that the firm is contributing to the drain of brains and working hands from here to abroad, V. Shishov answered: "I do not think this is a brain drain. It is a bad thing that at a time so difficult for the country it must let go of its best workers. But I do not see anything criminal in this situation, either for the country or for its citizens. Because most of these 'brains' and 'hands' will one day return to their homeland. But they will come back enriched with new thoughts and with practical experience of working under the normal conditions of a real market economy. They will undoubtedly apply this experience to their jobs here. Not to mention the hard currency they will bring with them."

We would also like to know the opinions of our readers concerning this problem, which seems to be beginning to affect our republic as well.

Caucasus

Gamsakhurdia on Policies, Recent Events

91US0238A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian
19 Dec 90 pp 1, 3

[Unattributed report on press conference given by Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Georgian Republic Supreme Soviet, on 8 December 1990: "In the Press Center of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia"]

[Text] On 8 December at a press conference held in the press center, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet, answered journalists' questions.

[Question] Mister Zviad, today at 0700 there was a meeting of representatives of the Roundtable and representatives of the congress. What do you have to say about this?

[Gamsakhurdia] We do not recognize the National Congress. The parliament is the official organ and the congress is an unofficial one. For this reason, on an official level the meeting between the congress and the Supreme Soviet did not take place. Today there will be a meeting of Roundtable representatives with representatives of various parties. It was announced on television that there would be a meeting of representatives of the congress and parliament. By saying this they want to make a distinction between the parliament and the congress. These concepts should not be confused.

[Question] Mister Zviad, recently at a rally you stated that all illegal armed formations in Georgia should be disarmed. How do you intend to do this? Do you intend to create an army or armed formation independent of the Soviet Army or militia?

[Gamsakhurdia] We are trying to disarm them peacefully. To this end we are creating groups and commissions and are conducting negotiations with them. We are trying to convince them that armed formations cannot be allowed to exist in a state without any supervision of their activity and that certain of their members are committing legal violations and crimes. We are trying to convince them to turn in their weapons to the state. As for armed forces, one of our main goals is to create a National Guard of Georgia. It will have to be created.

[Question] Will representatives of the armed formations be included in the guard?

[Gamsakhurdia] Worthy people who do not intend to fight or enter into confrontation with the national Government of Georgia will probably be included.

[Question] You noted that you do not recognize the National Congress. Do you consider individual parties and organizations included in it to be the opposition and how are your relations with them?

[Gamsakhurdia] It is possible for various oppositions to exist, and this is one of the oppositions. But recently the goals of these parties have gone beyond politics. Unfortunately, their activity is manifested in their alliance with the criminal mafia and in its protection. They even have a kind of alliance with the criminal world and they are opposing the national movement as a unified front.

[Question] One representative of the congress stated that in America, the most democratic country, the government allows everyone to bear arms. Your comment...

[Gamsakhurdia] We are a long way from being America in any sense, including in the sense of forming democratic institutions and in the sense of awareness. In all segments of the population we are still lacking the kind of civic consciousness that would prevent us from using these arms—acquired from nobody knows where—for evil purposes.

[Question] How do you regard the action conducted at the House of Government, in the public garden of the opera theater?

[Gamsakhurdia] The action next to the House of Government began independently of us. These were disturbed people. Such actions are taking place in other cities besides Tbilisi. For example, in Zestaphon. The people will no longer put up with so many actions, crimes, outbursts, or so many armed bands. It is quite natural for people to express their protests through these actions. [previous two sentences as published] As concerns the action conducted in the public garden of the opera theater, it was fairly curious in the sense that the participants in the action demanded that the formations

be legalized and the slanderous attacks against them be stopped, although they themselves recognized that there could be criminal elements in their ranks. The hunger strike there does not pursue any lofty ideals. There is a great difference between these actions.

[Question] Mister Zviad, how do you regard the action of the NPD [National Democratic Party] in the university garden? The meeting of the professors and teaching staff and the students of the university condemned it, but the action continues.

[Gamsakhurdia] An action has meaning only if it is supported by a large part of society, as was the case with the November, April, and summer actions. An action that is supported by nobody but the members of the party is a crime. Moreover, how moral was the action in Panteon when they pitched tents on sacred graves? These are just plain uninvited guests, nobody wants them to be there, but they are still doing what they want to. They do not respect the people. This is tormenting, and even in the most democratic country this action would have been stopped long ago.

[Question] Mister Zviad, have there been any changes in connection with the new autonomous regions?

[Gamsakhurdia] The situation has been aggravated very much because of the so-called South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast. Things have reached a point where they have proclaimed an independent republic there and they are conducting elections on the basis of a nonexistent constitution of a nonexistent republic. This could lead us to extremely undesirable results, and our position in connection with the so-called South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast can change as well.

[Question] How many days ago did they publish the declaration of the Darbazi of the People's Front in connection with the Ossetian events. What is your opinion...

[Gamsakhurdia] We expressed our opinion the next day in an address to the population of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast, and we called on them not to participate in these illegal elections. Then the declaration of the republic procurator was published. It listed the items envisioned for abusing official positions and exceeding official rights in the event that these illegal elections are conducted. The declaration of the Darbazi of the People's Front is an attempt to present themselves as great patriots. We are taking all possible measures so that these illegal elections are not held, and if they are held anyway, we will take measures to annul their results and, probably, abolish the South Ossetian Autonomous Republic.

[Question] Mister Zviad, harmony has come to Abkhazia. In any case this is what representatives of the Roundtable said. Why have the Georgian-Abkhazian consultations not been covered in the press? On what basis was the agreement reached? It is clear that there

were compromises on both sides. What specific compromises had to be made? Why did they elect Ardzinba anyway, even though he was in Moscow?

[Gamsakhurdia] It is not expedient to cover all negotiations in the press. Sometimes only the results are reported in the press. That happens in all countries: Certain aspects of internal political relations are not published in the press. This has its own particular purpose. It is behind-the-scenes diplomacy. And in this case we are also dealing with this phenomenon. Today the Abkhazian separatists are not inclined to aggression. Possibly this is a temporary change in their tactics. They probably saw that in Abkhazia the scales were tipping more in the direction of Georgia. From our side, we made no concessions. We only gave a guarantee that the rights of the Abkhazians would be observed, but we will not allow the separation of Abkhazia from Georgia and we will not meet the illegal demands they made in connection with the constitutional changes. For example, they demanded a 50 percent quota of positions in the Supreme Soviet, which was refused since Abkhazians comprise only 17 percent of the population. So there was a certain normalization of relations. Ardzinba turned out to be the figure who is not aggravating the situation for the time being. If he throws the situation out of balance it will bring negative results for the Abkhazians themselves. As concerns the attack on the patriarch, we will not forgive anyone for that. The guilty parties will be held responsible under the law.

[Question] Moscow is placing great hopes in the autonomous regions. This was also discussed in the Nishanov statement. What do you have to say about that?

[Gamsakhurdia] It is not clear that Moscow is placing its hopes in Samachablo since its intrigues did not make their way through Abkhazia. The situation is somewhat vague now because of the Committee for State Security of Abkhazia. It is not clear which forces are winning there. But I still believe that in the Committee for State Security too they will appoint cadres who will be accepted by most of the local population. After that the situation in Abkhazia will not be alarming. But Moscow has had great successes in Samachablo, and we are not in control there yet, but this will not last long.

[Question] One question in order to dispel suspicion. At the second session of the National Congress one of the congressmen elected from Abkhazia stated that at the confidential meeting in Terzhola you expressed the idea that Galskiy Rayon should be taken away from Abkhazia. In today's political situation how realistic is it to raise this question?

[Gamsakhurdia] It is simply that I have said repeatedly that the borders of the autonomous area could be reduced since these autonomous areas are illegal. And I presumably said this not only about Galskiy Rayon but also about others. I said that the boundaries of the Abkhazian autonomous area could be reduced but I said

it only in private conversations. No concept was formulated regarding this question. Someone somewhere, just within earshot, overheard it and spread the rumor in Abkhazia. They were even offended there: They said, but what about Ocahmchira and Sukhumi. We will think about these problems in the future.

[Question] Mister Zviad, did you have an opportunity to hear the interview of Dzhaby Ioseliani which was broadcast over Voice of America?

[Gamsakhurdia] I would say that in this interview Mister Dzhaba admitted everything he now denies and against which he is declaring a hunger strike. When we told him that he had criminal elements in his formations he said that was slander, but he admitted the facts that he called slander at the time of the interview. It turns out that Dzhaby Ioseliani is slandering himself. After this he can no longer say that it is not his own voice. For we are telling him what he admitted in the interview himself. In particular: He has criminal elements in "Mkhedrioni" and therefore it should be disbanded so that the Georgian people will not get in trouble. We do not have political differences with them. Only law enforcement organs should be dealing with them but they are Georgians and we sympathize with them and we do not want them to die. Therefore we are sending representatives to them and are trying, so to speak, to "soften them up."

[Question] Mister Zviad, the opinion exists that the majority of the new ministers are incompetent. This is shown if only by the collective's demand for the chairman of the radio and television committee to retire.

[Gamsakhurdia] I can report that nobody has retired. Only one part of the workers there declared a protest. He was simply in too much of a hurry regarding certain issues. He is a sufficiently competent person and will probably be able to do the work very well. And that conflict, which is similar to a personal conflict, will be straightened out. Other ministers are also qualified. I am surprised at how former corrupt and dogmatic members of the Communist Party are being compared with the progressive and remarkably intelligent and active representatives of the national movement and eminent people. Is it really possible to compare representatives of the party apparatus with Mister Nodar Tsuleyskiri? Mistress Liey Andguladze? Mister Feliks Tkevuchava? He is a respected member of academies and universities of the world. You probably heard this conversation among the party "elite."

[Question] Mister Zviad, for 20 days now there has been a procurator in Georgia whose holding of this position contradicts the changes made in the constitution.

[Gamsakhurdia] The Georgian Government can also approve officials and not just appoint them. But the problem is that everything cannot be done in a day.

[Question] Over a short period of time Tengiz Sigua signed many treaties but their texts have not been published in the press.

[Gamsakhurdia] All of these texts will be published.

[Question] Previously the government adopted a decree concerning a ban on imports of citrus fruits from Abkhazia. As far as I know, this caused dissatisfaction among the Georgian and Armenian population, and the Abkhazians have certain methods of their own for shipping products. What is being done in this direction? What steps will be taken at the next session in the sphere of the economy?

[Gamsakhurdia] No other civilized country ships products with so little supervision. Everywhere there are customs inspections and everywhere there are borders. Up until now Georgia has been like a house with a destroyed fence. Everything has been shipped in without the slightest supervision and shipped out in the same way. The control system needs improvement. A customs duty has been imposed on cooperatives that ship citrus fruits. When we have a customs service this problem will be regulated and the dissatisfaction will be eliminated.

We are in the process of studying economic measures. It is impossible to introduce innovations instantaneously here. The main thing today is to conclude a treaty that is profitable for Georgia. We will probably begin to receive credit as well.

[Question] Mister Zviad, what do you have to say about the mafia?

[Gamsakhurdia] Let nobody think that it is easy to win and eliminate the mafia. True, we won in the elections but it continues to exist. Incidentally, we received a letter from Uzbekistan which said that they envied us and were struck by our victory over the communist mafia, that they were still under the dominance of the mafia and could not hold elections.

[Question] Mister Zviad, what do you have to say about the part of the intelligentsia who are always calling on the people for peace and order. They are nowhere to be seen today.

[Gamsakhurdia] This part of the intelligentsia, the pseudo-intelligentsia, is calling on the people to support the criminal bands since this is what the Kremlin orders. At that time the rebels were the opposition, but now the rebels are the mafia. The mafia rebellion suits the Kremlin now. Thus we can see which of the intelligentsia supports which orientation.

[Question] Mister Zviad, recently, in response to a question about what kind of fate awaits the republics who do not sign the new Union treaty, Nishanov answered: They will live under the old treaty, and if they want to secede, let them do it in keeping with the law. We will probably be among the first to apply to secede. What do you have to say about this?

[Gamsakhurdia] In my opinion, there is a legal contradiction in Nishanov's words. For when the new treaty is signed, the old one will lose its force. To leave the old one in place would indicate legal ignorance, arbitrariness,

and violence against international law. But that does not surprise us, we can remember much behavior of this type.

[Question] A couple of days ago on television we heard a resident of Gldan village regarding the incident that occurred in Gldan. The next day he spoke on television again and denied everything he had said... One felt that he had been sincere in the first statement. What was this, moral terror? A vehicle with the inscription "Mkhedrioni" did not play a role in the second statement.

[Gamsakhurdia] I must say that a large group of women came to us from Gldan and expressed a desire to speak on television in order to inform the viewers of the following: "This person was abducted by members of the "Mkhedrioni," was forced to change his testimony, and was forced to make a second statement on television." These women were not shown on the television screen. That is the situation.

[Question] Mister Zviad, the approval of next year's budget has been dragged out somewhat. Does this not mean that we can expect sanctions from the All-Union Government?

[Gamsakhurdia] We already have sanctions; everyone should know this—not only budget sanctions but sanctions on products. They have stopped delivering powdered milk to Georgia and they are cutting financing. Recently, when distributing credit from Spain among the republics, they bypassed the Baltics, Georgia, and Uzbekistan. These republics are the objects of sanctions, that is, we are on the black list.

[Question] When do you expect the elections to the local soviets to be held?

[Gamsakhurdia] There are many problems with the elections to the local soviets. Especially in regions with a non-Georgian population. A form of the Law on Elections suitable for all regions will probably be developed. We will submit a law on municipal elections for discussion at the next session.

[Question] Mister Zviad, does there exist in Russia a force which could be an opponent of the Communist Party?

[Gamsakhurdia] There are opposition forces but they are scattered. There is no unified force at this time. As for the Yeltsin opposition, this is a moral and personal opposition, it is not a political opposition. The individual groups and parties do not present a unified force. So far no political force is in evidence.

[Question] Are you not arranging some contacts with Hungary?

[Gamsakhurdia] We will have intensive and businesslike relations. One might say that Georgia and Hungary have traveled the same path both of battle and of liberation. Soon the imperial troops will leave there. Georgia is not in that stage yet but I think we are following the same

path. And this also conditions the special closeness and sympathy for the Hungarian people.

[Question] After the publication of the election results and after the first steps of the parliament, many officials noted that there is a warm attitude toward the new government in Moscow and that it is impossible to draw an analogy with the Baltic countries.

[Gamsakhurdia] The fact is that Moscow diplomacy has become much more refined and polished. After the age of Gromyko a new era began in diplomacy. What is new is the show of superficial benevolence and good personal relations, when in fact something altogether different is going on—the imposition of economic sanctions. This is the new style of Soviet diplomacy both in relations with foreign countries and with the republics.

I would say that we have the same kind of good relations, but this is not apparent at the present time. In reality the confrontation is more apparent.

[Question] Gorbachev expressed a desire to meet with you. What do you have to say about that?

[Gamsakhurdia] This question has too many facets and we are still studying it.

[Question] Mister Sviad, will there be a change in the attitude of Europe and the countries of the world toward the national liberation movement in the republics in the Soviet Union?

[Gamsakhurdia] In the West so far there is nothing more than discussion of these issues. Bush has an opposition which asks him: Why are you on the side of the oppressors and not on the side of the oppressed peoples? From the moral standpoint they criticize Bush and his position, but he opposes all this with his pragmatic and political considerations. That is the way it is for now.

If the moral factor that prevailed during President Reagan's reign wins out in the politics of the West then possibly the scales will tip in our direction. So far that is not in evidence.

[Question] What influence will the Iraqi-Kuwaiti conflict have on relations between us and the center?

[Gamsakhurdia] Much will depend on how the Iraqi-Kuwaiti conflict develops, but so far it is not clear how all that will work out. There is no doubt that we are displeased by the misfortunes of others and we hold them close to our hearts but if the matter reaches the point of a conflict the countries of the West will come closer together and the Soviet leadership will probably relax its discrimination and pressure on us.

[Question] The Fourth Congress of People's Deputies will begin in Moscow in 10 days. Representatives of the official Government of Georgia will go there (besides Georgian deputies). One of the issues at the congress will be the question of the Union treaty. Do you intend to go there personally?

[Gamsakhurdia] I will probably not be able to. Probably some kind of delegation will go. As for the Union of the Federation [as published—soyuz federatsiy] where the question of the Union treaty will be discussed, we have refused to participate in it. Since Georgia refuses to participate in this treaty, we shall not participate in the discussion of it.

[Question] Mister Zviad, what do you hear from Moscow about changes taking place in the Georgian KGB?

[Gamsakhurdia] Between our leadership and the Moscow KGB there is a discussion that goes approximately like this: The time has come for us to divorce—using their words—and they ask what kind of divorce we should have: Italian-style or American-style? Shall we fight about it or do it peacefully? We told them that civilized people do it peacefully, and now this divorce is proceeding peacefully.

[Question] Mister Zviad, how can the all-Union Committee for State Security part with the system that has been in effect up to this point, whereby a certain intelligence wing has come under the jurisdiction of the Georgian KGB?

[Gamsakhurdia] They have to deal with reality. They can see that the committee here will not obey them any more and will not deliver political information in the old way. Therefore they must find some new form of peaceful relations with us. Reconciliation? When life makes it necessary one must be reconciled. Life has forced them to a point where they have reconciled. They have no other way out, the old times will not come back, the times when they had a faithful slave and information source here. Did you read the interview with O. Khatiashvili? Everything was said there. The previous relations will not exist anymore. There will be some kind of diplomatic relations between them.

[Question] What has brought about the present tense situation in Georgia?

[Gamsakhurdia] This was conditioned by the steps we took toward the independence of Georgia and the multiparty elections, the elections of the national government, that were held. This evoked a strange reaction from the center and everything is taking place in Georgia today with inspiration from the center. All this confusion was inspired by the center, including—the hunger strike. Gorbachev prophetically declared this on the second day of the session. It turned out to be a little early, it should have been done post-facto. But he knew ahead of time that these events would begin in Georgia and he inadvertently let the cat out of the bag and got ahead of the events.

[Question] Mister Zviad, in your opinion, which countries support Georgia in the role of a third state?

[Gamsakhurdia] This is a very difficult question. First there must be a change in the position of the official

West. They coordinate their positions with one another and they are all integrated. As soon as the overall position changes they will all support us.

[Question] It has been noted repeatedly in the Western press that the Baltic countries are expressing dissatisfaction with the Western world because they are not receiving the support they think they deserve. Do you think that the only reason for this is the Iraqi-Kuwaiti conflict?

[Gamsakhurdia] It is not just the Iraqi-Kuwaiti conflict. Related to this issue is the problem of disarmament, and the problems of nuclear weapons have been linked to it from the very beginning. The Iraqi-Kuwaiti conflict has brought the West and the Soviet Union closer together. One must say that our positions have become stronger as well, because in this situation stabilization in the Caucasus is becoming mandatory for both sides. I will not deny that the United States has already raised the question of opening a consulate in Tbilisi. There is discussion of building military hospitals in case they are needed for American casualties.

[Question] Mister Zviad, if the Iraqi-Kuwaiti military situation reaches a culmination will there not be a chance of withdrawing from the USSR more easily? Assigning Georgia the role of a buffer state?

[Gamsakhurdia] No, Georgia is not suited for the role of a buffer. It could become a battlefield. The need for stability in Georgia has produced an equivocal attitude toward us on the part of the empire—they are suffocating us with a blockade and at the same time they are expressing their good disposition. I think it is a cautious policy. The Western countries are also interested in stability in the Caucasus. This is indicated by the secret conference on the Georgian question held a couple of days ago in the State Department.

[Question] Mister Zviad, does Georgia have strategic nuclear weapons?

[Gamsakhurdia] No, of course not.

[Question] Mister Zviad, if Georgia is freed will it need nuclear weapons?

[Gamsakhurdia] That depends on what status Georgia will have in the future and the degree to which it will be protected by the international community and international law, and the extent to which it is included in the common European home and the process of integration. Everything depends on that.

[Question] Mister Zviad, how realistic do you think it is to build a common Caucasian home?

[Gamsakhurdia] I consider this a very vague and unnecessary discussion. Before speaking about a common home we must have our own homes. When homeless people gather and begin to speak about some common home—that is utopia and fantasy. First everyone must

have his own home, let everyone think about his own home for now, and we shall see what comes next.

FROM THE EDITORS: As we know, the press conference at which this conversation with the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia was recorded took place on 8 December. As is typical of today's turbulent sociopolitical life, much has changed since then. Nonetheless we are publishing this conversation with the thought that it will undoubtedly be of interest to our readers for it makes it possible to understand the political course that has been taken by our Supreme Soviet.

Georgians Discuss New Local Administration Organs

91US0335A Tbilisi VESTNIK GRUZII in Russian
6 Feb 91 p 1

[Excerpts from interviews with Vakhtang Khmaladze and Lovard Tukhashvili; "Prefects in Georgia; Opinions on the Topic"; date, place not specified]

[Excerpts] The Georgian republic law: "On Local Government During the Transition Period" has been adopted. Inasmuch as an institution such as prefectures is completely new for us, we considered it necessary to give some explanation and opinions on the new system of government in Georgia.

[Passage omitted] Vakhtang Khmaladze, TGU [Tbilisi State University] senior scientific associate, candidate of physical-mathematical sciences, deputy of the DASI [National Democratic Party] political organization, member of the constitutional commission of the Georgian republic VS [Supreme Court], primary author of the: "GSSR Law on Elections of the Georgian Supreme Soviet":

"Such institutions function in many democratic states, and they function well, since they are conduits for state policy in the provinces. Prefects implement control over the organs of local self-government in order that their activity not go beyond the framework of common state interests, nor contradict the law. Prefects have the right to halt the decisions of local organs of self-government, to return the decisions to their representatives for review. Prefects implement the administration of a given territory within the limits of their competence.

"The chief condition for power to be democratic is the following: It must be separated into legislative power (the Supreme Soviet), executive power (the Council of Ministers) and judicial power (the court, procuracy, and arbitration); everything is clear on the state level. But the representative organ, the Assembly [sobraniye] will be the legislative authority within the limits of competence. The council [uprava] appointed by the Assembly, and the prefecture, which is created by the prefect, will represent the executive power.

"The separation of legislative and executive power depends upon to what extent the empowerments of the

given organs are divided. They are not clearly separated by the given law. But the appropriate law will be adopted by which the rights and responsibilities of each of the aforementioned organs will be determined.

In my opinion, in the present situation, the institution of prefectures is required, since the economy is in shambles, local authority in fact is nonexistent, and the old institutions have been compromised. Economic relations, principles of management must be radically changed during this transition period; the land issue and the privatization issue must be resolved. And a strong authority that will conduct a single state policy is required for the execution of all these reforms. A person who will have the rights and upon there will a demand must be responsible for everything. After all, until now, decisions have been made by collegial organs, and thus the highest officials who actually decided all matters have borne no responsibility.

"Yet despite all these pluses, there is the danger that if the power of the prefect is not counterbalanced by the local representative organ having the corresponding authority, the prefect could become a one-man ruler. And since we have not become accustomed to democracy, this could lead to undesirable consequences. All of this probably must be taken into consideration while working out the regulation of the Assemblies, the statutes on the Councils, and the Law on Prefecture. This will make it possible to avoid the encroachment of a single official in the area of competence of another, and to avoid the conflicts that will be inevitable in the given case."

"The prefect is appointed and released by the consent of the Georgian republic Council of Ministers on the basis of the recommendation of the Supreme Court chairman and the Supreme Soviet Presidium. He is accountable to the Supreme Soviet, its Presidium, and the Georgian republic Council of Ministers. He is appointed for a term of 4 years, and cannot be appointed to more than 2 consecutive terms." ["Law on Local Government During the Transition Period," Article 5.1.3]

"The Georgian Supreme Soviet Presidium, with the consent of the Council of Ministers of the Autonomous Oblast and the Georgian republic Council of Ministers appoints and releases the prefects of rayons and cities of republic subordination (of autonomous republics) at the recommendation of the chairman of the Autonomous Oblast Supreme Soviet." [Article 5.1.4]

Lovard Tukhashvili, senior scientific associate of the Georgian Academy of Sciences Institute of History, Archaeology, and Ethnography imeni I. Dzhavakhishvili, Georgian republic Supreme Soviet deputy:

"The unifying link of central and local government occupies an important place in the political system. If the state resolves the main problem, the redistribution of higher authority with consideration for the interests of the broad strata of the population, then the preservation of democracy is possible, as is the observance of the mobility of unifying political structures.

"This problem was raised back in ancient times. The institution of the prefect emerged in the 1st century B.C., during the reign of Augustus. It first appeared in Egypt; the Roman Empire wanted to place in Egypt a person who would maintain the interests of the empire and provide local self-government. Later, prefects were appointed in all the provinces of the Roman Empire. The prefect was tested by fulfilling a decisive role in increasing the longevity of the integrity of the Roman Empire. The word 'prefect' translates from the Latin as 'head,' 'senior person' [starosta]. Incidentally, an analogous bureaucratic institution existed in Georgia as well, although somewhat differentiated by content. Central and local apparatus were differentiated in medieval Georgian government. In the historically Georgian provinces there were the so-called 'conciliator-administrator': [eristavi-eristavi], the most senior; [eristavi] and [mtsire] (minor) [eristavi]. The tsar appointed them and the consultative Duma confirmed them, but unlike a prefect, in Georgia, the aforementioned duties were handed down by inheritance. And even though each new bureaucrat was appointed by the tsar and the consultative Duma, not one of the feudal houses relinquished the duties received. Thus 'Eristavi' has already become a family name. Incidentally, the names Amiredzhibi, Amilakhvari, Megvinetukhutsesi, Gamgebeli, Otkhmezuri, Dadiani, Guriyeli and so on originated with these duties.

"In the late middle ages, eristavi as rulers of individual provinces were already a rarity. On the other hand, a new term was being introduced—mouravi (steward). The mouravi obtained great importance in Kakheti. Mouravi of the Kakheti realm almost correspond to a prefect, although succession was confirmed here as well. Mouravi were almost always appointed from the same feudal house. For example, in Kizikhi, mouravi were always from the Andronikashvili line; in Akhmeta, of the Cholokashvili line, etc., even though this was not mandatory, simply a tradition.

"...The prefect acquired new content during the great French bourgeois revolution. In 1793, to trample the old feudal tradition, the revolutionary parliament introduced a new division into 83 provinces in place of the historic provinces (Champagne, Burgundy, Dauphin, etc.), and placed prefects at the head of each. After that, the institution remained in France and Italy. It operated in France until 1982, and later, after the decentralization of higher authority, was changed. As you see, the prefect and his office, or the prefecture, were practically reviewed in a country of classic democracy, France, This fact in and of itself already rules out the danger of a political dictatorship. If the prefect promoted the development of democracy in France, why must he represent a danger for the confirmation of democracy in Georgia!

"In our opinion, certain circumstances condition a sort of skepticism toward the institution of a prefect. First of all, this position is reminiscent of the status of the omnipotent local 'tsar'—the raykom first secretary. Secondly, this is conditioned by an incorrect understanding of the essence of democracy. Thirdly, people are simply

not taking into consideration the current situation in Georgia. The analogy with the 'first secretaries' is incorrect for the simple reason that the institution of the 'first secretary' functioned under a totalitarian regime, under the conditions of a one-party dictatorship. The prefect, however, is controlled by parliament. The essence of democracy must also be understood. In Greek, democracy means the 'power of the people.' The 'power of the people' is expressed by a definite order. This does not at all mean that everyone has the right to do everything. If democracy does not develop according to the norm of authority, that is when it turns into anarchy. And anarchy translates as 'powerlessness.'

"Thus state order preserves first and foremost the interests of the people. No totalitarian regime can do as much damage as anarchy. Under anarchy, the individual is not protected, the 'law of the jungle' and tyranny are in effect; a cult of violence is created, and economic upheaval occurs. Unfortunately, it is just such a situation that has been created in Georgia over the last two years. A paralysis of power is openly noted both in the center and in the republics. Today, both in the Union and in Georgia, almost no law, other than the law of might, is functioning. In individual regions, the law enforcement organs are paralyzed; the old party structure has been completely destroyed, or continues to exist through inertia. A new one has not yet been created. In such a situation, the strengthening of local government and adjustment of mutual relations of individual regions with the center (I have in mind the central authority of the republic) is possible only through an effective mechanism such as the prefect and the prefecture. So let no one fear the introduction of this institution. It is necessary and is the single chance to avoid anarchy.

"The Georgian nation must undergo a political school of democratic government, after which it will be possible to raise the issue of the decentralization of sovereignty. This is problem of the future. Today, something else worries us.

"Proceeding from all that was said above, we may boldly bless a new path of power; you have the green light, Mssrs. Prefects! But you must know that to be a prefect today means taking an enormous responsibility upon yourself. I pray to God that you are worthy to bear the load." [passage omitted]

Central Asia

Kolbin Blamed for 1986 Kazakh Riots, Republic Problems

91US0230A Alma-Ata *LENINSHIL ZHAS* in Kazakh
30 Nov 90 pp 1, 3

[Article by Vladislav Yanelis, *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* reviewer, and *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* reporters Zhan Mindubayev, Aleksandr Samoylenko and others, reprinted from 28 Nov 90 *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA*: "Man From the Ranks"]

[Text] *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* reviewer Vladislav Yanelis has been researching the political career of G.V. Kolbin, now chairman of the People's Control Commission. *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* reporters Zhan Mindubayev (Ulyanovsk), Aleksandry Samoylenko (Alma-Ata) and others are also participating in the investigation.

We live in a time when re-evaluation is a frequent occurrence. Those applauded by the people only recently are now passing from the political stage in stupefied silence. Some feel that they have honorably fulfilled their historical duty. Others have departed from the scene with feelings of rancor towards the merciless people, feeling that their honors have been offended.

Still others, in spite of the raging political storm, are still at the helm, wondering in their minds if their strength will be sufficient for them to remain in power.

This being the case, why are we dwelling on Kolbin? Why are we singling him out, and is this not thereby to overlook others. The reason, first of all, is that Gennadiy Kolbin is, in comparison to some others, rather typical. He is a professional politician. He is rather experienced among the ranks of the high party nomenclatura. He is a vanguard, democratically-inclined leader, extremely capable in discussions with those disagreeing with him, and is, in any case, a person having influence as a worker for new thinking. This is the total image he confers, and this is how we know Kolbin from his public speeches and articles in newspapers and interviews. *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* has also written about Kolbin and has, in its time, made its own contribution to the formation of his total image.

It was no accident that at the time of sharp dispute about his candidature as chairman of the USSR People's Control Commission representatives of various political currents made known their approval.

Now I have learned about a Kolbin altogether different than my contemporaries, an imperious, forceful Kolbin, one intolerant of anyone expressing opposition, one utterly attentive to party nomenclatura interests. I have been unbelieving. I have carried out my own researches. If it is not adequate for a complete evaluation, I have carefully checked my facts to prevent any error.

I remember: June 7, 1989, the meeting hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet palaces. There was discussion of candidates advanced for service at decision-making levels of the state.

During the discussions, quite a number of questions were asked Gennadiy Kolbin. One of them was as follows: "We know what kind of incidents took place in Kazakhstan in 1986. Is everything now more or less under control? Is everything back the way it was before? Are you ready to take on a new post?"

G.V. Kolbin: Am I ready for work? A communist must be ready to work wherever he is sent, be the post a major

or a minor one. Now as for the December Incidents of 1986, you may believe that the situation has been stabilized, and that a great deal has been done for me in many areas to bring the people together...

Kolbin gave a long, detail answer to his questioners. Gennadiy Vasilyevich stated as follows about how he, as new chairman of the People's Control Commission, would resolve questions of social justice: "In fact, if one is to test my firmness in social questions, I can say only one thing: that I was involved with this for nine years in Georgia, three years in Ulyanovsk, and now in Kazakhstan."

Let us begin here. We must allow others to speak their minds. Let us begin with Alma-Ata. There is where Kolbin was proposed as first secretary of the Kazakhstan CP in place of Kunayev. However, events taking place in the first weeks Kolbin was in Kazakhstan utterly destroyed all good intentions.

The youth of Alma-Ata took to the streets. They demanded that the great institutes of the republic be controlled not by those from outside, but by Kazakhs, or if not, by their own people. A Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium commission has only recently concerned itself with the situation after this. One of its leaders was USSR People's Deputy Mukhtar Shakhanov.

The results of the commissions' investigations have been published in the local press.

Conversation with USSR People's Deputy Shakhanov

—Mukhtar, I want to talk about you, about your poetry, not just about your everyday life, but also about the many things in your soul. First tell us: where were you during the 1986 December Incidents?

[Shakhanov]—I was in Moscow. I was at the Writers Central House preparing for an evening on my own works. Yevgeniy Yevtushenko was to be master of ceremonies. The literary evening was planned for 19 December. The day before, the leaders of the writers' union were called before the CPSU Central Committee and informed that since there was a nationalism-based movement in Alma-Ata, for that reason there was now no need for Shakhanov to appear before the masses. It was announced that he (that is I, myself) had broken his leg.

Yevtushenko got involved in the matter. He got on the phone to the Central Committee. He said that diplomats had been invited to the evening and that he would take all responsibility himself. Permission was then given.

—Did everything go as planned?

[Shakhanov] It did not. During the evening a young man took the stage and began to read a statement expressing dissatisfaction with the bloody disturbance in Alma-Ata. At that time, I knew that there were no narcotics users and drunks causing any kind of destruction in the city. But I had no proof.

—There must have been proofs later?

[Shakhanov] Indeed tens of persons, hundreds of persons began to complain to me. They told me what the real significance of the whole incident was. They demanded not only that the assignments of actual guilt to persons involved in the December incident be done away with, but likewise that the label nationalist be removed from the people. I gathered together my friends and thus did a great deal of work to investigate everything which happened during the days of the incident.

—In your view, who was primarily guilty in the 1986 December Incidents?

[Shakhanov] It is the totalitarian system. The authoritarianism of the system at that time resided in the group formed by Kolbin, and by those around him, principally representatives of the CPSU Central Committee, Ministry of Internal Affairs, and State Security Committee. As Kazakhstan President, then Chairman of the Council of Ministers Nursultan Nazarbayev, testified in a letter to the commission: "From the beginning of the incident to the end, representatives of the local republic leadership were deprived of all possibilities for exercising influence upon its development. In fact all decisions, including decisions to bring in Ministry of Internal Affairs troops, about the disposition of troops, were taken in the cabinet of Kolbin by the Moscow leaders behind closed doors. The republic government had no role in making these decisions at all."

He also wrote: "I offer the following evidence to prove that the views of local cadres were not taken into consideration at all: members of the Central Committee Buro did not discuss candidacy for first secretary, CP Central Committee. We found out about G.V. Kolbin only when G.P. Razumovskiy, CPSU Central Committee division chief, brought him to Alma-Ata."

Kolbin lacked the capacity to understand that what moved Kazakh young people at that time was not narcotics or alcohol but unfolding human feelings, and the desire to make their voices heard. The young people did not choose to be controlled by a party functionary who was the twenty-first in a row imposed on them to date from the outside. And you must remember that 18 leaders of the Kazakh people have not been Kazakhs.

—But it cannot be denied that Kolbin was forced by circumstances to make the decision on the disposition of troops, or that he had no desire to spill blood.

There is no need to be naive. When some ten thousand troops were collected in Alma-Ata, and when the order was given for them to clear out the square, did he really think that there would be no bloodshed?... And he knew what kinds of troops those troops were, troops belonging to the Ministry to Internal Affairs, to special forces units, units with dogs. They would not hesitate when it came to action. The order was even given to students of the Alma-Ata Military Schools to ready combat engineer shovels for action. All of this was done in accordance

with plans worked out by the Ministry of Internal Affairs against incidents of social disorder. The plans were called "Metel." But that is not everything. The leadership of the Central Committee gave instructions to arm worker policemen. During the night of December 17 to 18, evil weapons—iron shearing blades—were prepared on an emergency basis in several factories, and pieces cut from cables. Those working in the factory were essentially Russian-speaking citizens of the republic. You can imagine what would have happened if the worker policemen had been put to work! This cannot be excused.

—Mukhtar, the sad consequences of those days in December are now well known to you. Will you please talk about this?

—Three people died in clashes in the square and in the city. Another three died from those days. We have reason to think that the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the State Security Committee organs were involved. We have our suspicions that internal affairs organs also buried another 58 persons without any indication or names or even numbers in the year after the December Incidents. It is well known that even unknown corpses are numbered.

Thousands were wounded. Most were severely wounded. Hundreds of students were forced out of their institutes. Persecution of "Decemberists" continued throughout the winter. Some 99 persons were prosecuted. Two of them were sentenced to death, and 83 to 1.5 to 15 years' imprisonment. However, 53 persons have been exonerated to date. For that reason the conclusion can be drawn that prearranged sentences were given out by the courts at that time under pressure from the government. Systematic reports on court deliberations were made to Kolbin.

—Did you try to say something about this before?

Indeed. But I was prevented from saying anything. I was labeled as one stirring up interethnic disunity. Real proof is required for everything. Now we have the proof. However, when I wanted to speak to the First Congress of USSR Deputies about the Alma-Ata Incidents, Kolbin, chief of the republic delegation, would not give permission.

—But did not you speak and discuss the question?

—Indeed, this was what was demanded by a group of deputies. And I was forced to deceive Gorbachev.

—what?...

—He asked me from the congress podium what I wanted to talk about. I said about the environment. Gorbachev nodded his head "yes." He knew I had worked on the Committee to Save the Aral.

—But you began to talk suddenly about the December Incidents, about the initial punishments of democratic forces.

—Indeed. This is what my people expected of me. During the recess Kolbin telephoned me in my room to say: "Mukhtar, what are you doing? You are killing me."

However, as we found out later, he got off with a slight reprimand.

Tell us, did you have conversations with Kolbin about other matters?

Indeed. I once came to see him to ask permission to celebrate an ancient national festival in Kazakhstan, Nawruz. He gave permission. I then thought that the Kazakhs would rejoice at this.

—You will agree that there is very much a natural contradiction here: how can the leader of the republic party organization give permission to the people to celebrate their national festival.

—It was, to be sure, ridiculous. But that was the fact of it. We have to ask permission about everything.

—Let us for the time being leave aside the time that Kolbin spent in Alma-Ata. Let us try to determine what kind of political experience he obtained after his transfer from Georgia to Ulyanovsk.

Ulyanovsk. Conversation with a LITERATURNAYA GAZETA reporter.

—Zhan. How did Kolbin come to be in Ulyanovsk and how did he begin his service there?

—Gennadiy Vasilyevich came to our oblast at the end of 1983. Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev was the one who brought him there, and introduced them. It seems as if they knew one another quite well. The following passage from Kolbin's inaugural speech remains in all our memories: "I worked for eight years in Georgia, land of grapes. But I never got drunk. I think that I am quite forbearing in this." That is the problem. The person who was our first party secretary before Kolbin, judging from various rumors, had a weakness for Bacchus and for that reason had had to be exchanged for Kolbin. However, there is a more recent view we have heard to the effect that the new secretary too wanted to be drunk as often as possible.

The anti-alcoholism campaign became Kolbin's first priority. At his orders, all the factories producing wine were closed and production of beer in practice stopped. For example, wine prepared on an import basis at the Bazar-cyzghan Food Factory was sent out for reprocessing as chunk yeast. "People's officers" formed by the oblast party committee would crawl out of the earth as it were, move through residences on festivals, funerals and joyful occasions and arrest "violators of order." It was suggested that all birthdays be observed under party organization, labor union or Komsomol supervision. Collective responsibility and "mutual confidence" became standard practice. What were called "confidence discussions" were held in all rayon party committees. In

them "corrections" were carried out to see to it that one kept one's own environment irreproachable. To this end, he prevented all nomenclatura officials from obtaining housing and automobiles. If wives were in difficulty that was the way it had to be. This was the way the law was.

—Zhan, are you in agreement that Kolbin was a great organizer since he knew how to regulate housing construction well?

—That is correct. Kolbin not only roused others, but talked people into things. He charged all city industries with the building of 20 residential houses in Sovkhozes and Kholkhozes. Conditions in rural areas were thus to be improved. Whereas it was clear that some places required residential housing, others a bridge and still others palaces of culture, the order was given to build houses. The order was carried out too.

The oblast party committee suggested in his time that all school graduates go to factories. Only after two years would they be given the right to go to the university. In order to make the results of the struggle against alcoholism visible, two years after the arrival of Kolbin all sobriety centers in the oblast were closed since "they were no longer needed." Thus, our first secretary reported to Moscow in a good frame of mind. The sobriety centers have now be re-opened.

—Zhan. You understand that the apparatus is accustomed to a strict order. If some campaign is proclaimed from above, those below must make continual reports about how the campaign is being carried out. To such an end did Kolbin do exactly what the other party leaders were doing?

It was not like that at all. People worked on whatever the current campaign was. Otherwise they would get rid of you. However, while this was the case, one did not stop thinking. And Kolbin tended to overdo campaigns.

—You are saying that he was like a leading student in a class?

—Exactly.

—I have heard that Kolbin did a great deal in order to get the city into order.

He overdid it. During his time, for three years a considerable part of the city budget was expended, as everyone well knew, to spruce up the center near the city oblast committee. You can imagine what efforts were made to rip up the older trees by their roots and to plant spruces and rose bushes in their places. At Kolbin's suggestion park areas (they were beautiful before) were re-done, and monuments were moved from one place to another. One of them, the I. Goncharov Monument, was brought back to its original location. However, we must provide a proper evaluation of Kolbin's actions in another area. At his initiation, we again began to provide shaded areas to the people of the city. People were happy about this. However, what we have been discussing are all labor campaign actions. Should the party have been involved?

—Zhan, if you remember, at that time the party was putting every effort into choosing cadres "capable of solving all problems." What can you say about the actions of Gennadiy Vasilyevich in this regard?

—In three years he removed nearly 900 persons from office, or transferred them. There is no need to explain this. Recently he was unable to answer and could only mumble at the question posed by SIMBIRSKIY KURYER: "Why has everything previously begun by you remained incomplete after your departure?"

In this connection let us present the conclusion of that paper. "If people are not afraid, nothing gets done..." Indeed, what do you think? Is this not an interesting idea? That is to say, someone must be afraid to do something, and only then can something be done.

—We have allowed that to happen. In our history there have also been geniuses threatened by the whip from above. What do you think? Was the Ulyanovsk period in Kolbin's life that important?

—It is hard to answer in a word. However, the feeling remains that in his time so many things were not for the purpose of creating major social changes in the oblast but, on the contrary, were done for the purposes of some sort of political wheeling and dealing. All the papers of our nation have eagerly written about the changes taking place in Lenin City. We, however, felt as if we were participating in a deception during a very great time in our nation's history. During that time all the major campaigns such as "Housing-90" (the people called it humbug and suffering), "land reclamation," and "sobriety" never got off the ground.

Here is something to consider: people have never grown tired of talking about Kolbin's ordinariness. But this did not prevent him from getting a three-room house for his daughter located across the street from himself. During his time the facilities of the CPSU oblast committee were constantly being decorated and beautified: the outside of the building was covered with marble, a three-division chamber (red hall, office hall and "great" hall) was built and equipped. What was below the chamber where buro meetings were carried out was ordinary, but hidden stairs were created with oak-covered walls leading to the snackbar.

Zhan, tell me. What kind of influence did Kolbin leave behind him?

He was full of irresponsible words. He never got tired of giving heaps of orders, of making known one initiative after the other, and of starting campaigns. But it all turned out to be empty words in the end.

When I was with Gennadiy Vasilyevich, he raised objection against some of our research as being against the law and I attempted to protest. This is because it is not possible in fact to prove the existence of orders unknown

to the people, given by himself alone. He can say that everything was decided by the buro or by an oblast executive committee.

—There are transcripts of buro sessions. That is one thing. Secondly, all major measures in the oblast are taken up only at the initiative of the first secretary. This is something certain, which needs no further proof. Anyone denying this would be a subject of mockery.

Alma-Ata. Conversation with Our Own Reporter.

Sasha, it is now your turn. Do you remember the situation when Kolbin came to Kazakhstan.

To tell the truth, there was nothing at all extraordinary. It was for us as if he had dropped from heaven. The people all felt that the republic would have another leader in the near future. This being the case, we were trying to guess the names of those hoping for the post of first secretary, and take their measure. However, no one had the slightest idea that the question of "number one" would be solved in our time by means of import. A person totally unknown to anyone in the republic became head of the Central Committee in a total of just 18 minutes.

—**When did you realize that the new things proposed by Gennadiy Vasilyevich were nothing more than empty promises for the improvement of republic life.**

That is a difficult question... After the December riots only one thing assaulted the minds and poured into ears of us all, Kazakhs, Russians, Germans and Uighurs, swiftly and firmly with the force of a mighty propaganda: everything was the fault of narcotics users, drunks and nationalists...

The final element in this propaganda campaign was the famous resolution made by the CPSU Central Committee during June of 1987. The supposition of nationalism was repeated in it. A half a year was too little to appreciate that this was all groundless. The pressure from Kolbin was immense. On any given day he was giving seminars, plenums and press conferences. Various kinds of commissions and working councils formed by Gennadiy Vasilyevich began working up a storm. These commissions were formed to deal with food questions, the struggle against crime and housing. The made the heads of the people whirl and created a general euphoria.

—**That is fine, but later?**

—Later things were different. Things began to clear up. All the campaigns turned out to be buzz words, influential announcements and, on the outside, attractive initiatives. All of us began to perceive clearly, and see with our own eyes the inadequateness of things changing in our real life. Food supplies were not increasing, crime was by and large on the rise, the lines of those waiting for housing were not reduced, the authoritarianism of the system remained as before. However, only those who have looked into these

matters understand. Among the people, traditional belief in a beneficent ruler has long persisted. In addition, promises made have never been fulfilled.

What kind of promises are you talking about?

All of them were empty promises. He said to the Kazakhs: "I will be speaking your language in a year." He patted the Russians on the back. We will pull aside the curtain of nationalism. We will overcome the encroachment of Kazakhs in establishments of higher education. Thus he went on. He boasted to all the people ambitiously that during the period between February 1987 and 1991, all people of the republic would receive housing, that within one and a half to two years the shelves of the stores would be crammed with meat, and that we would destroy the roots of crime. Innovations undertaken were connected with the question of internationalism: "You must do everything possible not to divide the people and to unite them!" he said. However, no one understood how these things were to be achieved. Also the order was given that "every Kazakh leader in place must show concern for Russians, and every Russian leader in place for Kazakhs." These were slogans pleasant to the ear. However, the question of who was to care for Germans, Uighurs or Koreans, or for "our young relatives," and who among the leaders was the one caring for us loomed.

In forming the image of our democracy-loving leader let me add a few anecdotes which come to mind. It was asserted that he went to the stores himself, stood in line, bought his own milk, went home to an average house and reduced his personal service. As you can see from the recent conversation with the former business manager of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee, Statenin, Statenin has stated clearly what is legend and what is the truth. Listening to this, I began to inquire carefully about the truth of assertions of democracy made of first secretaries from the time of Andrey Grigoryevich. This is because the business manager was required by his office to solve the domestic problems of the secretary.

—He had no need at all to go to the stores. The head of the Kolbin family was guaranteed access to special stores. All in all, his appetite to solve his domestic problems in special ways was quite powerful.

I worked with Kunayev. We know that he received food from Moscow in zinc-lined containers via courier. There were such things for Kolbin too. But however much a bigwig he was, we must not think that Kolbin kept 20 hens at his home and ate only their eggs.

Is that so, did he keep chickens at home?

No, he certainly did not. He had a special chicken coop established near his residence.

Where did Kolbin live?

—I showed him Kunayev's old country house. It was in the suburbs of the city. It had 11 rooms, a movie

REPUBLIC PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

theater, a swimming pool, and special communications, billiards and servants' facilities. He went to see it and said that it was fine. The only thing was that he had us consider building a heated dog kennel. He also discussed some little things.

A short time later he called me in and said that the Enterprise Administration of the Council of Ministers had turned over a house, and that I should turn it into a city apartment for the First Secretary. The house in question was made into a five room apartment. The useful space within it was close to 170 square meters. He re-equipped one room as a bath, and asked that lights of another color be installed in it. The lower floor of the apartment was given over to servants, a nurse and a kitchen. Across the street his daughter and her children received an apartment. The apartment was not bad, 130 square meters. There were disagreements between Gennadiy Vasilyevich and myself about this apartment.

—Were you against giving Marina Gennadiyevna an apartment?

I was against giving her that apartment. In addition, he demanded that orders be written for his daughter that were unprecedented.

Statenin explained to me in some detail, during the time of Kunayev, how such things were to be done. If he provided housing to someone out of turn, he was not afraid of taking the responsibility upon himself. Instructions were drawn up at his request, and they were signed. However, the soviet executive committee wrote the order. In Kolbin's case he was unwilling to have his daughter make any kind of request whatever. Be that as it may, he refused to issue instructions in an unprecedented situation, or to sign them. Even Statenin was opposed. If instructions are issued the order can be given. "If there are no instructions, I am sorry," said Statenin, and continued to say so. Kolbin sent his chief servant twice to the business manager and demanded the order. Statenin refused. But, in the end, everything was, to be sure, settled as Kolbin wanted it.

Relations between them were gradually destroyed after the airplane incident. I asked with a certain interest, "Does Kolbin have his own airplane?"

—No, answered Statenin.

—Only members of the politburo are entitled to private airplanes. And Kolbin came to us only as a member of the Central Committee. However, his requests bore great weight. He once summoned me and expressed the need to receive certain things he needed by air. When he told me the facts, he made a request that we receive his worldly goods, unload them and deliver them to the appropriate place. After coming to an understanding with the commander of the border troops okrug, I requested that a platoon of students be sent to unload the airplane (that was how much there was). I went off to meet the airplane taking 12 trucks with me. After a while an Il-76T came in to land. It

was the largest cargo plane. We were able to unload and reload the cargo within two hours. During the evening of that day, Kolbin's wife, Sofya Ivanovna Kolbina flew in with her daughter, three grandchildren and two dogs. However, they came by a special flight of a Tu-134 airliner.

Let us come back to the country house. Everything was ready there. The evening meal and the flowers were ready. The servants stood ready to greet the new arrivals. A new house was being built rapidly for the servants. During Kolbin's time, the number of servants was increased to four. There was also the need for a rest area for the servants.

Later various requests and bills began to come to the Central Committee: the first secretary demanded 29,000 rubles to transport his things, he needed 7,000 rubles to go and get his family. And this request had to be fulfilled in three days. I went to Kolbin: "Gennadiy Vasilyevich, from which account should we pay the money?" I said. He said to me: "This is not my problem. I have spoken with Ligachev himself. Everything is all right." I called Kruchina, CPSU Central Committee business manager. "We have spent 33,000 rubles to repair and decorate Kolbin's apartment. Now we must pay 36,000 for the aircraft. How can we do this?" Kruchina said: "I do not know. You figure it out."

Kolbin called me in again: "I have told you, Ligachev himself has issued the orders....," he said. Thereupon he paid a total of 150 rubles in all for moving his furniture. It turned out to amount to some five tons of freight.

After all these incidents I begin to understand how Kolbin felt about you.

A few days later I was arrested. An old incident from 1981 was recalled. At that time the head of the republic took possession of some furniture from an exhibit in Yugoslavia. I also took certain things. In spite of the fact that I had completely paid for the furniture, I did not get off the hook. I was accused in addition of keeping unregistered hunting knives, and of giving a gun to my driver. The chauffeur was also put into prison.

However, what was surprising was that the prosecutor responsible for the case did not demand that I confess to what I was accused of, but that I discuss, on the other hand, the connections of Kunayev with Brezhnev, about gifts of Kunayev to Brezhnev and about certain bribes. A flunky was seated besides me in the court. He also tried to get me to "admit something." But they could not pin anything on me. I took the furniture. I admitted it. I was guilty. But that was what people did at that time. You must understand. The times were like that. For that crime I was sentenced to eight years in jail and my property was confiscated. A short time after the trial my wife killed herself. No matter how much I asked, I was not allowed to bid her farewell.

However, after half a year, because of the disapproval of the USSR chief procurator, the republic Supreme Court

overturned the conviction for theft. However, instead of receiving an acquittal, I was pardoned. I think that this was an injustice.

Alma-Ata. Continuation of the Conversation with Our Own Reporter

Sasha, How did Kolbin behave in general with regard to the struggle against crime?

Struggle against crime is, to be sure, necessary. However, it is itself criminal to call individuals criminal in reports and articles, before their trials, mostly before they have even been accused. This was the case with Statenin, and with others. Kolbin tried them publicly long before they were brought to court.

The struggle against alcoholism was also like this. The slogan was raised: "Let us remove alcoholics from the city." Government organs began to arrest people whether they were guilty or not. For the slightest cause they were taken from work and sent to treatment facilities and their expulsions were required. Think how many persons had their lives ruined by this campaign alone. I talked with republic procurator Yelemesov. There was no limit to his dissatisfaction with the whole anti-alcoholism campaign.

Now let us look at Kolbin's efforts to get back things stolen from the state. He would go himself to the cotton-producing rayon and there would personally agitate to make people return stolen property. The people did it. However, in some cases they were not the ones who had stolen state property. The ones who paid were persons who had connection with them, or with those who had encouraged them to steal state property. Or the money was collected from the people in their villages. After that certain persons were freed from criminal responsibility.

—Indeed, I cannot forget that this kind of thing remained in people's memories when Gennadiy Vasilyevich had his appointment confirmed as chairman of the People's Control Commission by the Supreme Soviet. This is an example of meaningless chaos in the area of law. The 12 million rubles he collected in this manner is regarded as one of his accomplishments.

—This was an active voluntarism. Let us look at another case. As you can well realize, he was always having such flashes. It was said that all the ducks flying over Kazakhstan were to be shot so that the people would to have enough duck meat. Thanks to the "Greens" this idea was laid to rest and was never carried out. However, no one was hesitant about destroying the ducks.

To try to understand what Gennadiy Vasilyevich intended by suggesting such things has always been of interest to me. It is a large republic. There are 16 million people, there are seas, virgin lands, great factories, coal basins and 19 oblasts. What thing is being "agitated for" that he should take upon himself this very heavy and

very difficult load. I understand, it might be answered: "The party ordered it!" "We are soldiers of the Party." We have heard this before. But taken from a human point of view?... Is it not something very frightening?

—What kind of feelings did you have when you knew that Kolbin was being moved to Moscow?

—To be sure, I did not weep about this. But no one asked as to whether we wanted to send him to Moscow or not.

Nursultan Nazarbayev was chosen as first secretary. The Kazakhs were not overjoyed or happy about this. However, he had not done anything to the Russians, and had not thought to go out into the square. It was the same old thing. The decision was completely understandable to the people. The people can now say they should have chosen this person to begin with. There would have been no riots if this had been the case.

At a June 7, 1989, USSR Supreme Soviet Session, Boris Yeltsin was suggested as a candidate for the post of chairman of the People's Control Commission. When Gorbachev supported this the opinion of the parliament began to swing in Yeltsin's direction.

Yeltsin's supporting Kolbin decided the matter. Kolbin was elected chairman of the USSR People's Control Commission by an overwhelming majority.

After this even I was with Gennadiy Vasilyevich as we went down the felt-covered steps together. The person beside me was completely worn-out, the fire in his eyes had begun to go out and he was bent and white-headed. And one surprising thing is that he was not happy. However, he understood at that very time the difficulty of a party soldier in taking up a heavy burden for his whole life.

...When I think of this scene, I would like to ask: why were we unable during these six or so years to get ourselves out of a magic circle of boundless good intentions? Is the reason for this not that people have gotten used to standing like stones within this circle, holding hands, unable to attain the happy life? However, I do not want now to believe in the ghost of some deceiver. When the same old people control the government there will be no change, and no new life will be created. We have been unable to pull back from the life which has existed in the past, and still exists.

I want the people to understand me properly. A whole page of a newspaper has been devoted to discussion of what kind of life he has led. I am not accusing him of tending toward totalitarianism, or of other criminality. He, like many others, has been formed as he is by a harsh system for the selection and assignment of cadres. Others cannot accept or get used to this system, or under any circumstances ascend to its highest ranks.

The reason for the obtuseness of our time lies therein. It is just Kolbin and his like who must make the revolutionary changes. However, they must to the best of their

ability destroy the structure of their government authority. In the hope that such a principle is possible, are we not remaining childishly deceived!?

Let us get to the crux of the matter. A new policy, if it is really that and is not just set up as a fraud, must be brought into being through the efforts of new men with new ideas, and with new initiative. This is because I think that you believe that it is unreasonable to demand supersonic speed from a "cossack."

Kazakh Writers' Union Secretary on Writer Activism in New Social Environment

91US0274A *Alma-Ata LENINSHIL ZHAS in Kazakh*
25 Dec 90 p 3

[Editorial Report]

[Text] Alma-Ata LENINSHIL ZHAS in Kazakh carries on 25 December 1990 on page 3 a 2200-word interview with Sayyn Muratbekov, second secretary of the Kazakhstan Writers' Union Administration, recorded by Abdilghazy Qyyrbekov. The interview, entitled "Deeply Held Convictions," focuses on the role of the writer and

the Writers' Union in a new era of perestroyka and glasnost, and an open questioning of many of the assumptions of the past (including the past oppressions of Kazakh history in the Soviet period). Asked about this, Muratbekov emphasizes the great responsibility of the writer, for whom there are now no taboo subjects, and the need for a higher order activism. In this connection he praises individuals such as Olzhas Suleymenov and Mukhtar Shakhanov for what they, and movements led by them, have accomplished, and the intense interest in writing for the press exhibited by most leading Kazakh writers. However, while seeing the unofficial organizations (and movements) as a sign of the time, which only the future can judge, Muratbekov also seems to sound a note of caution as well, stressing both his ultimate optimism about the future (Kazakhstan, he makes clear, while it has many problems, has many resources for solving them as well) and confidence in the leadership of the party. Also touched on in the interview are the difficulty being created for writers by paper shortage and the increasing cost of newsprint, and the furor created by the nationalist pronouncements of Solzhenitsyn and others. Pronouncements like Solzhenitsyn's, he makes clear, are just what we must guard against.

SOYUZ Ethnographic Dictionary: Lak

91UN1014A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 1,
Jan 91 p 19

["Ethnographic Dictionary" series edited by Doctor of Historical Sciences M.N. Guboglo and Doctor of Historical Sciences Yu.B. Simchenko]

[Text] Self-designation: Laq. The Avar name for them is **Tumal**; the Dargin call them **Bulugun**; the Lezgi call them **Yakhulvi**.

According to the 1989 population census, 118,000 Lak live in the Soviet Union.

The Lak language belongs to the Dagestan branch of Caucasian languages. It is divided into five dialects: Vitskh, Kumukh, Vikhli, Ashtikuli, and Balkhar.

Most Lak inhabit the Lakskiy, Kulinskiy, Novolakskiy, Levashinskiy, Akushinskiy, and Rutulskiy Rayons, Dagestan ASSR. The Lak inhabit the mountainous and extremely rugged areas.

The Lak are the descendants of the aboriginal population of Dagestan. A number of studies have linked the **Legi**, mentioned by ancient authors, to the ancestors of the Lak.

We may confidently mention the existence of ties between the Lak and the **Gumiki**, noted by ninth-10th century Arab historians. Those people lived on the territory inhabited today by their descendants, the Lak. Until their unification with Russia, they were part of the **Kazikumukh Khannate**.

In 1859 the khannate was abolished and the Lak were incorporate in **Kazikukhum Okrug**, Dagestan Oblast.

The Dagestan ASSR was founded in 1922 and included said okrug which was subsequently divided into rayons.

Agriculture among the Lak was developed essentially in **Novolakskiy Rayon**, where they grow wheat, corn, and other grain crops.

The mountain Lak are engaged essentially in cattle breeding. Their summer pastures are located in the mountains. In the winter the cattle are kept on **Kalmyk**

land. The Lak breed sheep of a local coarse wool strain, cattle, horses, donkeys, and mules.

Seasonal work was extensively practiced by the Lak. Of all the peoples of the Caucasus the highest number of seasonal workers was that of the Lak, for the scarcity of land made it impossible to feed the entire population.

A characteristic feature of Lak culture was a certain specialization of communities in one craft or another. Thus, the most skilled jewelers and copper workers came from **Kumukh Village**.

As a rule, people from **Kaya Village** were merchants.

Unchukatl Village specialized in harness making. **Urba Village** was noted for its stonemasons and tinsmiths. **Kuma Village** was known for its highly-skilled pastry cooks. **Shovkra Village** was noted for shoemakers. **Tsovkra Village** was the homeland of noted acrobats. **Bolshoye Lakskeye Village** was famous for its potters, women exclusively, who made outstanding ceramic items.

The Lak seasonal workers traveled far from their native areas and worked not only throughout the Northern Caucasus but also in Moscow, Constantinople, Paris, and many cities ranging from Ethiopia to Central Asia.

The traditional food of the Lak was a milk soup with corn dumplings, oat flour, feta, dried mutton, sour milk with flour, and tea.

The men wore quilted, Circassian, or felt cloaks, Circassian fur caps, and a distinct type of knitted shoes.

Among the women, traditional clothing was made of white silk with lace; they wore a great deal of decorative jewelry which could weigh several kilograms.

The Lak settlements in the mountains were large but with narrow twisting streets. They consisted of several districts, each one of which had a mosque. The homes were made of stone and ponds were dug around the settlements to water the cattle.

In the past the Lak were ruled by beks or feudal lords. However, there also were free communities, serfs, and even totally rightless slaves. There also was a clan division and communities who shared the custom of mutual aid and blood revenge.

The official religion of the Lak was **Sunni Islam**.

Statistics on Capital Punishment in USSR From 1985-1989

91UN0979A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 26 Feb 91 p 1

[Article by V. Gubarev, USSR deputy minister of justice:
"Shall the Sword Not Cut Off the Guilty Head?"]

[Text] The discussion surrounding the correctness of imposing the most severe penalty—capital punishment—is being conducted today on a very wide scale, and not just in our country. Opinions on this subject are far from unanimous in many countries around the world. There are countries where capital punishment has been abolished altogether, or where it is imposed only for very limited types of crimes.

Even Karl Marx was categorically opposed to it, stating: it is very difficult and perhaps completely impossible to

find any principles by means of which to establish the justice or appropriateness of capital punishment in any society which prides itself on its civilization.

However, it is not so easy to achieve abolition of this form of punishment. It is as well-known fact that twice in the history of our country such attempts have been made (in 1917, when the Second Congress of Soviets repealed capital punishment, and in 1947, on the basis of a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium ukase). Both times society has returned to capital punishment as a necessary instrument of protection against particularly serious crimes. Furthermore, the list of such crimes has lengthened over time.

Under current legislation this exceptional penalty may be imposed for 14 types of crime. I will not list all of them—they may be found in republic criminal codes. I assume that the actual use of all these articles is of the greatest interest. The following is a table covering the 1985-89 period.

Year	Convicted of Capital Crimes			Sentenced to Capital Punishment*			
	Total	Absolute Number		In Percent Relative to:			Pardoned by Union Republic and USSR Supreme Organs of Authority
		Number Convicted of Pre-meditated Murder With Aggravating Circumstances	Total	Number Sentenced for Pre-meditated Murder With Aggravating Circumstances	Total Number of Persons Convicted of Capital Crimes	Total Number of Persons Convicted of Crimes	
1985	13,081	5,543	770	729	5.9	0.1	20
1986	11,744	4,236	526	481	4.5	0.04	41
1987	7,592	2,941	344	307	4.5	0.04	47
1988	5,827	2,595	271	259	4.7	0.04	72
1989	5,387	2,822	276	258	5.1	0.04	23

* based on legally valid sentences, including decisions by judicial appeal bodies

Between 1962 and 1989 a total of 24,422 people were sentenced to death, or six percent of all those convicted of crimes for which this penalty could be imposed. According to statistics, 2,355 of them were pardoned. Upon appeal a total of 1,042 death sentences were reduced to prison sentences during the same period. Thus, roughly one in every six or seven capital sentences was reduced to a prison sentence in corrective labor facilities.

The same statistical data indicate that over the past five years capital punishment for the most dangerous crimes has begun to be employed less frequently, even for crimes like premeditated murder with aggravating circumstances. Thus, whereas in the 1962-66 period 23.5 percent of those convicted of this crime were sentenced to death by firing squad, in 1987-89 this figure was 10 percent. Furthermore, if we consider the entire research period of 1962-89 it becomes clear that approximately 95 percent of those sentenced to capital punishment were individuals convicted of premeditated murder with aggravating circumstances.

At present capital punishment remains a part of the arsenal of criminal legislation in over 100 states of the world. In 1976 the U.S. Supreme Court reintroduced the use of capital punishment. Presently it is legal in, I believe, 37 states in that country. We do not yet have the latest figures, but according to data as of 31 December 1988 there are 2,124 prisoners on death row, and all but one of them was sentenced to capital punishment for murder. In 1988 a total of 11 prisoners were executed in six states. The total number of capital sentences carried out since 1976 was 104. Prior to execution each prisoner spent an average of over six years on death row.

Throughout the world today (and in our country as well) a widespread campaign to abolish capital punishment is underway. Incidentally, one of the Ten Commandments says: "Thou shalt not kill." Not kill anyone, either the just or the unjust. Therefore in our country today there exist two views: one favors total repeal of capital punishment, while the other favors a sharp reduction in its use and a minimal number of articles in the criminal code which make provision for capital punishment. A proposal has been made to accomplish this in two stages,

first retaining capital punishment in two or three articles, and later, as the crime situation in our country improves, abolishing it altogether.

Incidentally, the United Nations intends to discuss once again a proposal to repeal capital punishment in every country in the world. If the world community so decides, then the Soviet Union will definitely comply with its decision.

Rising Crime Figures in 1990 Detailed

*91UN1035A Moscow GLASNOST in Russian No 7,
14 Feb 91 p 4*

[Article by B. Mikhaylov, head of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs press center: "Crime on the Rise"]

[Text] *What was the crime situation like during the past year?*

Last year there were 2.286 million reported incidents of crime in our country. In the last two years, the crime rate has increased from 862 to 969 per 100,000 population. The number of murders and attempted murders reached 24,900—an increase of 15.9 percent in the past year. The number of aggravated assaults grew by 12.2 percent (57,800), the number of rapes increased by 2.7 percent (22,400).

Our operations situation has been complicated by the weakened constitutional guarantees for the protection of state interests in many areas of our country. It has also been affected by the worsened public discipline and by warped morals. The deterioration of ethnic relations has become a threat to personal safety. It caused mass disorders which resulted in 795 people killed and 3,660 injured. The decrease in domestic murders has become a criminological peculiarity. In the last three years the percentage of such crimes went down from 60 to 40. Instead we see an increase in crimes committed for money-related reasons. There are more and more cases of extreme brutality, use of torture, use of explosives with further incineration or dismembering of the corpses. There are instances of people being killed by murderers who were hired to do it for money; sometimes people are kidnapped in order to get a ransom.

The proportion of violent crimes committed by criminal gangs involving arms is also on the rise. Last year, as a result of operations and investigations conducted together with the KGB, 1,600 criminal groups were rendered harmless—25.3 percent more than in 1989. These people were responsible for over 7,000 violent crimes including 129 murders and 940 cases of assault and battery. The criminals still have a lot of arms in their possession. A search has been declared for 12,300 firearms.

The situation on our streets has deteriorated as street crime grew by almost six percent. One in eight murders, one in nine rapes, one in four assaults, one in three cases of robbery, and every second theft are committed on the

streets. But at the same time the situation is such that the density of militia patrols is two to three times lower than it is in other countries. For that reason, apart from intensifying our patrol service and improving the efficiency of militia work, we think it necessary to take such a measure as introducing joint militia and military patrols which should help improve enforcement of public order and ensure prevention or interruption of crimes.

Great concern has been caused by the increase in unsolved crime. In 1990, 3,321 murder investigations remained unsolved as well as 60,000 aggravated assault cases. Considering the unfavorable operational situation, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, together with the USSR Procuracy, are taking corresponding measures. We have set up large operations and investigations groups to settle the consequences of interethnic conflicts and to solve complicated crimes. We intend to strengthen the investigations units of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Administration for Internal Affairs by increasing their personnel. We are expanding our special service for fighting organized crime. We are taking additional measures to restrain the activity of armed groups which have not been provided for in our laws.

Statistics on Suicide in Estonia 1985-1989

*91UN1010A Tallinn VECHERNIY TALLINN
in Russian 2 Feb 91 p 2*

[Article by Airi Varnik: "Suicide in Estonia"]

[Excerpt] There is no information on the Soviet Union, to say nothing of Estonia, in the table of countries ranking highest in the world in the number of suicides.

Such information used to be kept secret. Sometimes the press referred to vestiges of capitalism in discussing the phenomenon of suicide. In special literature, a short paragraph on the danger of suicide associated with certain mental illnesses could be found. There was nothing else.

Nonetheless, 81,417 people took their lives themselves in 1984, for example, that is, a number comparable to the population of the city of Narva.

During the period of stagnation, the number of suicides in Estonia amounted to between 400 and 500 a year, which was four to five times more than the number of murders, and two times more than the number of fatalities in traffic accidents (these ratios have changed somewhat by now).

It is known that the incidence of suicide is a very sensitive indicator of social relations and public life. We may now say that the curve of suicides makes it possible to read history. Thus, in the time of the Republic of Estonia there were relatively few suicides; the incidence of suicide increased considerably in the era of economic crisis in the 1930's, and subsequently it declined. During

the time of stagnation, suicide in the republic was at a stable, high level of more than 30 per 1,000 population. Between 1985 and 1990, the number of suicides declined both in the USSR (35 percent) and all Union republics (in Estonia—25 percent). All developed countries, which work out costly projects involving the research of suicide, dream of such hard-to-achieve results.

What has happened? We may consider two causes as hypotheses.

Strict constraints on the sale and use of alcohol imposed in June 1985 are one of the causes. Alcoholics are prone to the danger of suicide at the end of hard drinking bouts, when their mental and physical condition is impaired, and their energy is at an end. However, even one-time intoxication may affect one's psychological status so that one's eagerness to become involved in conflicts increases, and even minor insults and wrongs may have a snowballing effect on a psychological trauma. A person may make a fateful decision while intoxicated. Alcohol is sometimes used to give a person contemplating suicide the courage to go through with it.

Increasing faith in democratization, freedom, and self-determination may definitely be considered the second cause of the decline in the number of suicides in chronological order. This faith was manifested in the events of August 1987 in Hirve Park and in heated meetings following one another in 1988, which erupted with the yearning for freedom. This year of the singing revolution was the year of the lowest suicide risk (24.5 per 1,000 populace).

By now, the number of suicides has increased again.

The alcohol shock has been overcome by producing moonshine and using surrogates. In addition, the pertinent laws are no longer as harsh (super-harsh restrictions cannot result in a lasting success). Democratization has turned into a cruel farce. [passages omitted]

Abortive 'Provocation' at Riga OMON Base Reported

PM0703165591 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 26 Feb 91 p 4

[A. Vladimirov report: "Provocation Did Not Spoil the Holiday"]

[Text] During the recent days off the Special-Purpose Militia Detachment [OMON] base in Vecmilgravis was under veritable siege. By Friday, the events unfolding here had forced the OMON command to interrupt a training course, as those who usually greeted the guests were on this occasion clearly unable to cope with welcoming the people who had come to congratulate the guys on Soviet Army and Navy Day.

"There were several hundred people at the base during those three days," a detachment officer recounted. "From morning through evening there was a continuous

flow of veterans and young people, representatives from labor collectives and academic institutes. A quick enumeration of the cities and inhabited localities speaks for itself. Riga and Jelgava, Ventspils and Kuldiga, Cesis and Liepaja... To be honest, we only just managed to register them all."

"The list of well wishers is long—the Riga Electrical Machinery Plant, the Riga State Electrical Engineering Factory, the Riga Autobus Plant, the republic Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, around 20 secondary schools, labor and armed forces veterans, dozens of postcards, telegrams, declarations of support. Especially touching were the unpretentious drawings and posters from children.

"Of course, everybody is interested in the detachment's current living conditions and future prospects. Therefore, practically every fighter who was not otherwise engaged became an unofficial guide for a few hours."

Indeed, this unexpectedly powerful support for the OMON showed once again that certain circles' plans to create a vacuum around the detachment and impart an enemy image to it have come to nothing. They have failed to fool the people. That is why Letts and Russians, Jews and Ukrainians, and representatives of other nationalities also came here during these days. It is also comforting to note that there were many rural inhabitants among the guests.

Unfortunately, it is this which probably displeased the extremist forces. On one of the days, shots rang out in the vicinity of the base: automatic gunfire, a single volley which in an instant compelled the detachment fighters to institute a perimeter defense, having first instructed the people—among whom were women and children—to take cover. But the troublemakers did not risk going any further. Although the OMON suggest that the shooting sought primarily to provoke the detachment into retaliating. But once again the OMON showed restraint.

The militia were called: They searched the adjacent areas but could not find the extremists...

However, this irresponsible sortie by the militants did not spoil the holiday mood. Furthermore, there is one essential postscript: On the very eve of the holiday, the Vilnius OMON leaders were here. Henceforth, both detachments will coordinate their actions.

I would like to conclude these notes with the words of Detachment Commander Ch. Mlynnik, who asked that I convey his warmest, most sincere thanks to all who found time to congratulate the OMON on this holiday for all Soviet people.

Turkestan Military District KGB Chief on Tasks, Goals

91UF0518A Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
4 Jan 91 p 4

[Interview with Major General Nikolay Kuzmich Demik, KGB chief, Turkestan Military District, people's deputy of the Uzbek SSR, by Lev Savelyev, journalist: "Special Tasks of a Special Section"]

[Text] One-sixth of the USSR's territory, as outlined by the borders of five republics—Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Turkmenia, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan—(and on a world-wide scale this is one-thirty sixth of the Earth's surface) comprises the expansive area of the Turkestan Military District.

Since it is a military district, it also has a Special Section of the USSR KGB. This one is headed up by Major General Nikolay Kuzmich Demik.

The general is 52 years old. He was born in the Poltava region, took his military oath 33 years ago, and has served in the KGB organs for 26 years.

Nikolay Kuzmich's wife is an educator. They have two daughters in the family. The elder one is employed in a laboratory at the Moscow State University, while the younger one is attending school in Tashkent.

N.K. Demik arrived in the Tashkent area for the first time in the spring of 1966. He was assigned the task of maintaining law and order in the city, which had suffered from an earthquake. A year ago he obtained a permanent Tashkent registration visa in connection with his transfer to this Uzbek capital for subsequent service.

It was the first time that he had received a journalist from a civilian newspaper in his own office. Moreover, it was for the first time that he revealed in such detail secrets which it would have been unthinkable for our colleague, Lev Savelyev, to bring up even two or three years ago.

[Savelyev] Comrade Major General, let us agree on the framework of this interview from the outset. Please outline the range of matters which fall within the competence of the KGB Special Section for the Turkestan Military District; and then our conversation will be objective and purposeful.

[Demik] In concentrated form, the assignment and tasks of the special sections of the USSR KGB are expressed in their second title—Military Counterintelligence. It engages in activity which is directed, first and foremost, at guaranteeing the security of the USSR's Armed Forces.

Nowadays the conviction has become very widespread that nobody and nothing is threatening the Soviet Union. And the attempts to state a different viewpoint are presented by certain informal organizations as the

self-interest of apparatchik "hawks" and "reactionaries" in preserving the "figure of the foe" among Soviet people.

In this regard, frequent attempts are made to cast blame as well on the USSR KGB, the structure of which includes the special sections. However, the fact of the matter is that the foreign special services are not merely continuing their subversive activity against our country, but are even increasing it. Sufficiently eloquent testimony to this effect, for example, has been provided by such declarations as the following from the leading officials of the American intelligence community: "The CIA intends not only to maintain the presently operational and effective mechanisms of intelligence activity vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, but also to upgrade the quality and objectivity of the analytical output pertaining to the USSR and its Armed Forces." Or the following: "The Soviet Union will remain the principal focus of our intelligence-gathering activity during the 1990's as well." Moreover, the words have been reinforced by specific deeds. For the present Fiscal Year the CIA has allocated double the former funds for conducting agent-type intelligence activity.

Please note that the principal object of this intelligence activity has been designated as our country's Armed Forces. Therefore, the main task of the special sections is to reveal and interdict espionage and other intelligence-type, subversive activity directed by foreign services at the sphere of our country's defensive capability. And the counterintelligence officers of the Turkestan Military District are contributing their own bit to accomplishing this task or mission. Just during the last few years they have exposed about ten agents of the foreign special services from among foreigners.

This is the basic task, but not the only one, which our military counterintelligence officers are carrying out. Considerable attention is being paid to effectively safeguarding the secrecy of the most important measures being taken among the troops to upgrade military preparedness, to facilitating the prevention at military facilities of accidents connected with explosions, fires, as well as the theft of arms and ammunition.

The military Chekists received a particularly good schooling during the course of their counterintelligence protection of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. With their help on the main routes of the troop movement, about 20 diversionary actions were prevented; a number of disinformation measures were promulgated, and as a result, our losses in personnel and equipment were reduced to a minimum. The changed situation in this region has also specified new directions for our activity.

Nowadays military counterintelligence officers are confronted with tasks which would have been difficult to even predict previously. In 1990, for example, many operatives of the Special Section, together with combat subunits [podrazdeleniya] were in Fergana, Dushanbe,

and Osh oblasts, where they literally had to tear human lives from the arms of maddened, certainly not foreign, bandits and terrorists.

[Savelyev] Nikolay Kuzmich, you emphasized the particular interest in the Soviet Armed Forces on the part of the United States intelligence services. But they are a long way away from us. Are they the cause of the disturbances in the military and political situation within the countries bordering on us?

[Demik] As you know, the Turkestan Military District encompasses the territories of five Union republics (the Kazakh, Uzbek, Turkmen, Kirghiz, and Tajik SSR's). It has a common border with the PRC [People's Republic of China], Iran, and Afghanistan. In connection with the normalization of state relations between the USSR and China, we assume that nowadays the situation there does not pose any direct military danger for us.

As to Iran, our country's security services have at their disposal data concerning the conduct by Iranian special organs of intelligence-gathering, subversive activities against the USSR, including the use of Afghan opposition formations.

The stability of the military and political situation in Afghanistan is extremely important for us. Nowadays, when a civil war is taking place in the RA [Republic of Afghanistan], information is being received by us to the effect that the intelligence services of Iran and Pakistan are actively utilizing its territory for subversion of the USSR.

[Savelyev] Well now, we have encountered the "Afghan" topic again. And so even now military counterintelligence officers are exhibiting an interest in the situation in the Republic of Afghanistan. And when our troops were put in there, was the information from intelligence and counterintelligence taken into account? And let me ask you an even more specific question: Did the opinion of our district's separatists play a role in this matter?

[Demik] It seems to me that they must have been taken into account, although I have no reliable information on that matter. We know from the official press that the decision to introduce troops there was taken at this country's highest level of political and state leadership. Did the opinion of the Turkestan Military District's Special Section play a certain role concerning the introduction of troops into Afghanistan? It is difficult to state with certainty from our present-day viewpoint.

However, the Chekists also had a considerable mess to disentangle. There was enough work for all of us during that period. But perhaps more for the investigators than the others.

[Savelyev] Why so?

[Demik] The tasks confronted by the small staff of our section's investigative subunit change depending upon the circumstances evolving among the troops and the surrounding conditions. During the period when the

limited contingent [force] of Soviet troops was in the Republic of Afghanistan, one of the principal tasks was to investigate criminal cases involving smuggling narcotics, currencies, and closely related crimes (embezzlement of state property, speculation, the marketing and sale of narcotics, arms, forging documents, and service-type crimes). An investigation was conducted with regard to the military servicemen who voluntarily went to Afghanistan on the side of the mujahidin and who participated directly in combat actions against Soviet subunits and government troops of the Republic of Afghanistan.

During the time of the Afghan War more than 300 multi-episode criminal cases were investigated. In some of them dozens of persons were found guilty. Solely in the criminal case with regard to the staff associates of the trade and requisition center of the Turkestan Military District's Trade Administration, money and jewelry items worth a total of 1.5 million rubles were confiscated and put into circulation as state income in accordance with the court's sentence.

[Savelyev] I do not want to close down the "Afghan" topic on that note. My conscience will simply not allow me to remain silent about those Soviet kids who have remained as prisoners. Are the military Chekists doing something to bring about their return to the Motherland?

[Demik] Prior to the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops from Afghanistan the military counterintelligence officers were actively engaged in freeing our soldiers who had been captured by the armed Afghan opposition. Operating within the 40th Army was a special subunit which carried out this work.

Interacting and cooperating with the command centers of our units and the security organs of the Republic of Afghanistan, relying on aid from the tribal elders and chiefs, and even making direct contacts with the heads of armed bands, our Chekists freed more than 80 persons from captivity. This work was fraught with great difficulties and frequently even a risk to life itself.

After Soviet troops left Afghanistan, many cares and concerns connected with liberating Soviet persons from captivity fell onto the shoulders of the Afghan leaders and the staff members of the Soviet Embassy in that country. For the purpose of carrying out investigative measures, they were left lists with photographs, autobiographical data, and superficial token items without any knowledge of the fallen military servicemen.

Included on these lists and records, together with those men who had become prisoners, were also the names of those military servicemen whose bodies had not been discovered at the sites of the military actions. Data collected by military counterintelligence officers regarding the circumstances of the disappearance of military servicemen, as well as the places and conditions of their being held in captivity are, at the present time, the basis for organizing the investigation and removal of these men from the bandit-type formations.

Let me state my personal opinion. All of us know what a bleeding wound this is for many hundreds of Soviet families. In all periods what is due has been rendered to soldiers. It cannot be that the search for men missing in action or held prisoner will be "farmed out" to the public.

[Savelyev] The same passions that boil in the society itself are also boiling in the army. To what extent, for example, are the troops affected and influenced by organized crime? Are the military Chekists taking part in the struggle against such crime?

[Demik] In accordance with a decision by the KGB Collegium, counterintelligence has also been assigned the task of fighting organized crime. The danger of certain officials and other categories of military service personnel, workers and office employees of the Soviet Army interlocking or joining together with the world of crime has proven to be real. An essential element increasing the criminogenic situation has been the stepping up of self-supporting economic activity by military units and institutions, their going out and making direct contacts with cooperatives for the purpose of solving problems connected with construction, the delivery of supplies, etc. These contacts or ties allow them to convert nonliquid assets into liquid ones, i.e., cash, by the shortest possible route.

Thus, for example, one of our district's military units sold 16 sets of very expensive radio units to a Moscow cooperative. The price of all this equipment was specially reduced by one of the officials in order to enrich himself. If this deal had been successfully completed for the persons involved, the state would have suffered damages exceeding a million rubles.

We should note that a particular interest of organized crime in troops stems from its observable trend toward politicization, its efforts to find stable, reliable channels for "running" and receiving arms, ammunition, and explosives. During the years 1989-1990 there were instances directly attesting to the actions of organized criminal groups from the environs of troops. They were engaged in obtaining arms at spare-parts depots, attacking sentries, and making direct propositions to military servicemen about rendering them assistance in obtaining such items.

In one of our district's garrisons staff associates of military counterintelligence, working in cooperation with the KGB Administration for Samarkand Oblast, interdicted the activity of a group of arms dealers. In addition to civilians with a criminal past, this group included two military service persons—the chief of an artillery supply depot and the chief of a GSM [fuel and lubricating materials] storage dump, who were engaged in stealing grenades and other military property. The grenades were being sold to the members of an armed band for 50 rubles apiece. The group was arrested, and the investigation is ongoing.

In another military unit at the beginning of 1990 a criminal, armed group, led by one of the "authorities" in the world of crime, in an attempt to obtain a large batch of arms, established contacts with several military men who were draftees, i.e., serving compulsory terms of service. In order to reinforce the ties with these men, narcotics were utilized; they were sold to the soldiers at an accessible price. Measures were taken in time to prevent the loss of arms. This group was subsequently studied by the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

During the years 1989-1990 alone 51 persons attempting to gain possession of arms were neutralized. In Tashkent, Dushanbe, Alma-Ata, and Karshi direct attacks were made upon sentries for this criminal purpose. As a result, two military servicemen died, and one received bodily harm.

One of the attacks was marked by particular ferocity on the part of the criminals. It was reported in the press, including PRAVDA VOSTOKA. This happened on an evening in August 1989. Using "cold steel," the unknown assailants attacked two sentries from one of the units of the Tashkent garrison, killed them, and then seized two automatic weapons along with 90 rounds of ammunition. An intensive search for the criminals, which lasted seven days, was crowned with success. The military counterintelligence officers, working in conjunction with the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs caught the following inhabitants of Tashkent red-handed: D. Dzhakhangirov, I. Chemerisov, and D. Luzanovskiy. The investigation established the fact that the criminal group had intended to use the arms which it obtained for a series of robberies or bandit attacks.

Until recently a significant place in the activities of the staff members of this district's Special Section was occupied by the struggle against smuggling. The presence of the contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan until February 1989 and the large goods turnover across the border constantly attracted the attention of criminal groups by the possibility of shipping across contraband goods. One of the last examples was the following. In a refrigerator car delivering products to a military unit the customs officials discovered a secret hiding-place. The carcass of a chicken had been "stuffed" with a cellophane packet containing 980 grams of opium.

An investigation revealed the complete criminal group, including military personnel as well as civilians. Confiscated from them were large sums of Soviet money and hard, i.e., foreign, currency, along with narcotics which had been stored in special, secret hiding-places.

In recent years alone this district's military counterintelligence organs have exposed and brought to the bar of criminal justice hundreds of smugglers. Some of them were operating in league with well-organized and conspiratorial groups which had buyers, i.e., "fences," and "associates" in many of this country's cities. More than seven million rubles in money and valuables were confiscated from these criminals, along with about 20,000

US dollars; the entire amount was put back into circulation as state income. Also seized were dozens of kilograms of narcotics, quite a few firearms and "cold steel."

Now in the "works" of this district's Special Section is a batch of materials on organized crime; but it is still too early to speak about them because of certain procedural factors.

[Savelyev] How are relations set up between the Special Section and the district's Military Procuracy, which oversees the activity of your organization?

[Demik] The Turkestan Military District's Military Procuracy has a section which exercises monitoring controls on the legality of actions within the KGB organs. This section is headed up by Lieutenant Colonel of Justice D.N. Geleverya. There they monitor absolutely all the criminal cases handled by us, from the time of their initiation. The Military Procuracy exercises extremely care in studying the evidence and proofs which have been gathered. It keeps within its field of vision matters pertaining to civil rights and liberties, and it strictly observes the criminal and criminal-procedural norms.

Such relations with the Military Procuracy, plus the conscientiousness of our investigators have provided good results. Not a single criminal case handled by the military Chekists has been returned for additional investigation. Nor have any violations of socialist legality been noted.

[Savelyev] I would like to pose an unusual question: Who awards officers' ranks to the military Chekists up to the rank of captain? And what about up to the rank of colonel?

[Demik] In the military counterintelligence organs all the officers' ranks up to colonel are awarded by the chairman of the USSR KGB.

[Savelyev] Nikolay Kuzmich, you have convinced me of the high degree of professionalism possessed by your staff associates. And just how does a person get to be a military Chekist?

[Demik] The nature of the profession of a military counterintelligence officer requires us to pay exceptional attention to the matter of selecting personnel. The KGB's special sections are recruited basically from among officers who have a higher education and experience in working with personnel. The requirements for a candidate's health and psychological stability are high, especially at the present time.

When selecting personnel, we pay attention to one obligatory condition—taking into account public opinion toward the service—and that is moral qualities. Future staff associates of the Special Section undergo special and legal training; then they are channeled into practical work. Compulsory-service military personnel may also become military Chekists provided that they have served

at least one year and have passed the entrance exams for the educational institutions of the USSR KGB.

Would everybody be able to serve in our organization? No. Not everybody is endowed with the fine touch to explore sources of information. Not everybody can resist the temptation to poke into the personal life of a general, an officer, or a warrant officer. Suppose it is a case of the immoral conduct of a commanding officer who has a mistress; but this must remain outside the purview of our interests. Not everyone has the talent to be a good psychologist. And a sense of propriety—such a quality for a military counterintelligence officer is like a sense of smell for a professional tester of perfumes.

Sometimes we find that a person is just not "cut out" for service in the KGB organs, and he has to return to the army.

[Savelyev] And is it obligatory for a counterintelligence officer to be a member of the party?

[Demik] No longer. Nowadays we recruit candidates for service in our organs without paying attention to membership in the CPSU.

[Savelyev] And so Chekists can advocate non-party membership in the KGB organs? Or do they welcome the multi-party system?

[Demik] Various kinds of attacks by the "informals" on interrelations between the CPSU and the law-enforcement organs, including the KGB, have pursued the goal of prohibiting military service personnel and staff members of the KGB organs from being members of the party. In fact, this would mean expelling Communists from the above-mentioned organs.

Most of the military counterintelligence officers of the USSR KGB Special Section for the Turkestan Military District know full well that all manner of calls for "neutrality" in the army, KGB, troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Procuracy, and the police in the state are nothing else but an attempt by certain persons, parties, and movements to clear away a path for the purpose of introducing their own policies.

A recent anonymous poll has shown that the overwhelming majority of our Special Section are opposed to "departicizing" the KGB organs.

[Savelyev] And now, perhaps, a cleaning lady who is registered on the party rolls in another organization will finally be accepted into her own.... I understand that in a secret organization there are secrets even from one's own staff members. How close are your contacts with the territorial organs of the KGB?

[Demik] Interaction and cooperation with the territorial organs of the KGB are becoming more and more important. A significant number of military units are stationed in the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan. They all

have steady, ongoing ties with national-economic facilities. Serving in the subunits are military service personnel who have been called up from all the Union republics. They bring into our life the characteristic traits of each region with all their positive and negative tendencies.

This began to be felt or sensed particularly in the interrelationships between military service personnel in connection with the gravely serious events in Transcaucasia, Fergana, Dushanbe, and Osh, where the district's troops took part in localizing interethnic conflicts.

In such lines of our activity as protecting secrets, search out enemy agents around our troops, defending the Soviet constitutional system, fighting organized crime, smuggling, and illegal currency operations, we simply could not manage to get along without contacts with the territorial organs of the KGB.

[Savelyev] Comrade Major General, if I am not mistaken, in the one-sixth of the USSR which is under your jurisdiction you have been most often in the city of Chirchik. Is that the case?

[Demik] Yes, it certainly is! I have been elected by the citizens of Chirchik to be a people's deputy of the Uzbek SSR, and I have promised to honorably serve the interests of my constituents.

[Savelyev] But how did you introduce yourself at the pre-election meetings? I hope that this question does not seem awkward or inappropriate. For, indeed, a military censor who was on the ballot for election to the Tashkent City Soviet slyly thought as follows: As a senior press officer on the staff of the Turkestan Military District, I would be better off by not naming my real service position. He understood that a censor during the period of glasnost is nonsense.

[Demik] But I introduced myself as the chief of the USSR KGB Special Section for the Turkestan Military District. And I did this despite the fact that in this electoral district our department is not to everyone's liking.

It was, perhaps, for this reason that at one party level I was advised to withdraw my candidacy. But this caused me to want to fight even more for my seat as a deputy. There were four of us on the ballot. My name was left on 72 percent of the ballots. That means that my 38 meetings with the voters had not been in vain; it means that my answers to almost a thousand questions had satisfied people. Although I did not promise them "rivers of milk and honey."

During the course of our pre-election meetings we succeeded in understanding each other, something for which I am grateful to my constituents.

Having received my seat as a deputy, I actively joined in the work of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Legislative, Legality, and Law and Order Affairs. Nor do I have less matters to handle at present, since I have switched over to the newly created Committee on Matters of Defense, State Security, and Social Protection of Military Service Personnel.

However, I also have to concern myself with many things which, at first glance, seem to be petty, day-to-day matters of my constituents—to obtain pipes for a heating line and poles for a telephone line, to listen to complaints from people who have been discriminated against, and to "push through" a water-supply system. Nevertheless, I consider that these problems seem petty only to those persons who are indifferent to other people's cares and concerns. And a person who has been given the people's trust must not be indifferent to other people's problems. I also spoke about this at a recent meeting with my constituents on the last Wednesday of the year just past.

Armenian Refugee Resettlement Problems

91US0321A Yerevan GOLOS ARMENII in Russian
23 Jan 91 p 2

[Article by V. Asriyan and G. Dolukhanov: "Lost Souls"]

[Text] We are living in wartime. Its subject is the daily alarming summary reports about the deaths of people, tanks on the streets in many cities, ration cards and food tokens, and foreign aid that makes us think of the times of lend-lease. The democrats are threatening the people with dictatorship, while the conservatives are intimidating them with chaos and civil war. And it is already war, for the events of recent years in Azerbaijan, the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Okrug, Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, and Moldavia, which have been bashfully called interethnic conflicts, are nothing other than real fratricidal war. One of its most typical features is the refugees. Colonel Alksnis talked about them with a winning directness and frankness at the Fourth USSR Congress of People's Deputies. He, who lost his own father in the years of the Stalinist repressions and so knows about them first hand, rightly compared the present tragedy of the refugees to Stalin's deportation of peoples. "And what of the 600 people killed in interethnic conflicts, whose blood is this? Is it not our own? And what about the 600,000 refugees who are wandering round the country like lost souls? What are they, the price of perestroika?" This was the angry reproach hurled by the deputy at the government. But the government remains silent. It remains silent, even though everyone is expecting from it an admission of its own responsibility for what has happened and what is happening.

"All wars start with a dream

"And they all end with a prayer."

Today it is appropriate to remember these lines of the poet Mikhail Dudin. For the concepts of "prayer" and "repentance" are kindred. And without repentance and admission of one's own faults in the gross political errors made during the course of perestroika, leading to tragedy involving hundreds of the thousands of people, it is impossible to set to rights what has been done or really to help those who through no fault of their own have become wanderers.

About 300,000 refugees from Azerbaijan have found shelter in Armenia. The overwhelming majority of them are to this day living in boarding houses and hostels, and even in some clubs and schools that have been adapted to provide accommodation. The authors of these lines have themselves drunk the bitter cup to the dregs when they became refugees, and perhaps it is precisely for this reason that they understand what lies in the hearts of these refugees; for them it is a double bitterness. We have already tried more than once to draw the attention of the authorities to the calamitous position of our fellow countrymen but essentially the matter has been left to

the fates. We have written about these difficult problems on the pages of our newspaper and have talked about them in broadcasts by Armenian television and radio. Unfortunately, we write and we talk but the situation remains the same. And more than a year has passed since the terrible pogroms in January in Baku that produced a third wave of refugees that dashed the last hopes of a possible return to the hot spots they had left. Yes, hopes for any return (if anyone had entertained them before the "black" January of 1990) are gone. But what has been gained?

The Fog of Multiple Paragraphs

Let us start not with the paragraphs and clauses of the resolutions but with the letter we recently received from a well-known journalist in Moscow on the subject of one of our pieces about the refugees. The author of the letter, while not sharing our viewpoint on the totally unsatisfactory nature of the USSR Council of Ministers resolution: "On Measures To Provide Assistance for Citizens Who Have Temporarily Left Azerbaijan and Armenia," first and foremost the part where it talks about procedure for making compensation payments, attempts in this long-range discussion to justify his own position. In particular, he writes this: "You point out the weak parts of this resolution. And you take under your wing those few families who used to live in luxury (what he has in mind is the place where refugees lived formerly—author's note), the small family with the large living area, but the resolution provides for compensation for victims who had less than 16 square meters per person. So it turns out that you are outraged that if one person lived in an apartment with a floor area of 100 square meters he can receive compensation only for 16 square meters. Against the backdrop of the calamities that have befallen the republic is it really worth fighting for a person who lived all alone in an apartment of 100 square meters? The government resolution proceeds on the premise that in the circumstances actually existing, beggars can't be choosers, as they say. Is it right that a single person should live in an apartment of 100 square meters?..."

We have great respect for our eminent colleague and opponent, but we cannot agree with him. We would like to remind him of the popular movie by Eldar Ryazanov: "Take Care of the Motor Car." The hero of that movie, Yuriy Detochkin, also fought for justice in his own way. It was for justice that he stole cars from people who were in his opinion dishonest, and then sold them and gave the money to a children's home.

Detochkin's noble motives did not prevent his appearance in court as the defendant, because the law stands above all. But even if we are all sympathetic toward Detochkin's actions, the judges find no justification, and the same can be said of the method used to "re-establish" the social justice that was taken by armed pogromists in Baku and Sumgait. But according to the strange logic of our opponent in Moscow it turns out that those who forcibly drove out people living alone in apartments with 100 square meters of floor space were champions of

social justice. Following the same logic, it also turns out that a government that does not want to provide full compensation for damages sustained by the refugees is also right. But the difficult situation in which our republic, and indeed the entire country, finds itself, can in no way serve as justification for the thesis of "beggars can't be choosers." For the Union government itself is in no way guided by this principle with respect to itself, and it is not giving up the many-roomed apartments in the capital or the splendid dachas, but the refugees are called upon, with help from certain of our colleagues, to tighten their belts a little more and be patient. But for how long, and for what? Have we not all been patient—for what?...

Let us, however, return to the above-mentioned resolution. Neither it nor subsequent documents have revealed the mechanism whereby compensation will be paid. The fog of multiple paragraphs are as if designed to hide the main thing, namely, who will pay compensation to the refugees, and when? Despairing of understanding any of the resolutions, we turned to V. Krivnoy, the representative of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems who is dealing with matters related to refugees.

"Resolution of the question of compensation," he explained, "depends on the success of direct talks between Azerbaijan and Armenia. They have already started, but it is difficult to say when they will succeed in reaching full agreement."

It turns out that all the resolutions adopted on the refugees obligate no one to do anything if as a result everything depends on success in talks between the parties in dispute. And giving due consideration to the complex nature of their present mutual relations, this does not generate any optimism about the fate of the refugees. So why was it necessary to pass these non-binding resolutions? It seems that Famusov's principle—"it has all been written down so we can forget about it"—with which we condemn the bureaucracy of the period of stagnation, has also found its apologists in the age of perestroika.

Neither the Union resolutions nor the republic resolutions on the refugees are working. For example, since our unfortunate fellow countrymen in the cities and rayons have not been registered by actual place of residence, despite all the government documents they are not being registered. Since the refugees working in the disaster zone have not been listed in the apartment books, they have not been listed at all. So in this case, what has the paper produced?

Or consider this. Resolution No. 302 of the Republic of Armenia Council of Ministers dated 20 July 1990 makes provision, along with other measures to help the refugees, for payment of money grants equal to up to three months of their wages at their new permanent place of work. Fine? Of course. But have many received this help? For the resolution **does not oblige** but only **recommends** that enterprise administrations together with the

labor collectives decide whether to pay the grants. And now this vagueness in the formulation has created an unhealthy hullabaloo. Some have received money, others have not. And those who have been refused perceive this as a negative attitude toward the refugees on the part of particular managers. Hence the idle talk and the conjecture and the suspicion and the unnecessary generalizations...

Officials often reproach many of us who write about the problems of the refugees, saying that we are idealizing them. Well, first we are very far from idealizing ourselves, for we are ourselves refugees. Second, we are perfectly well aware that among the 300,000-strong army of refugees there are different people and different characters, and they can be approached in different ways. But the sympathy or antipathy of their neighbors and colleagues, and even more of leaders at all levels, should not be reflected in the fate of these people. For constitutional rights apply not only to people who are good and exemplary and obliging. This is why we believe that if a refugee speaks out persistently against the decisions thrust on him (no matter who makes those decisions) and tries to achieve freedom of choice, then he is right. He is right because he is a refugee and is fighting for living conditions that are acceptable for himself.

Too Many Cooks...

There are indeed too many cooks among the refugees. In addition to the two chief cooks—the State Committee for Refugee Affairs and the special commission set up by the Republic of Armenia Supreme Soviet—there are another five public organizations formed at the initiative of the refugees themselves. Let us for the moment leave aside the public organizations (we shall come back to them), and talk first about the two main "cooks" charged with dealing with the refugees at the state level. The state committee and the parliamentary commission are quite enough to ensure that the "broth is not spoiled." But this can be only if both "cooks" are distinguished by their conscientiousness, competence, sense of duty, and a recognition of their own responsibility for the fate of those under their wardship. Alas! we do not see all these qualities, either in the work of the state committee or in the actions of the parliamentary commission. However, it would be incorrect to evaluate their work in the same way. The Supreme Soviet commission, led by Kh. Stamboltsyan, which has now been in existence for several months, has done virtually nothing of note for the refugees. In the interests of fairness it must be said that the commission and its chairman have resolved some private matters of individual refugees who have approached the commission with various kinds of requests. But the commission was not set up deal with private matters. It is designed to develop a state program to solve the refugee problem in Armenia, and in order to do this its members should have objective information about the position of the refugees, be meeting with people, and be studying proposals submitted from the local level and generalizing them and using them in their practical work. None of this is being done.

For example, M. Martirosyan, the former chairman of the Soviet of People's Deputies Executive Committee in Razdanskiy Rayon, where almost 10,000 refugees are concentrated, has repeatedly complained to us that no attention has been paid to his entire package of proposals to improve the position of the refugees in the rayon, sent to the parliamentary commission. And requests from the former mayor of the rayon to the commission chairman to travel out to the locality and familiarize himself on the spot with the life of the refugees and their problems have remained unanswered.

As far as the state committee charged with receiving returning Armenians and re-establishing them is concerned, it has managed to do something in two years. It is a matter not only of registering refugees and failure to register refugees, their temporary disposition, entering them on lists for cooperative housing and involving them in private home building, and paying out grants. Although somewhat belatedly, the committee has nevertheless set about conducting sociological studies of refugees, setting itself here the task of producing a generalized sociological picture of the refugees, and this is creating the prerequisites for a differentiated approach to problem solving. It is another matter that the committee has failed to make use of its opportunities with respect to the refugees since it does not have a clear-cut strategy nor enjoy the support it should from the state organs of power.

And now, the public organizations for the refugees. It is our opinion that there are too many of them. They are operating in isolation. Each of them has its own program, its own charter, its own missions. Whereas in the initial stage, when it was required only that they cooperate with the state organs in placing refugees, collecting information about people's situations, and similar activity, these isolated, small organizations did not interfere with the overall effort, the situation has now changed radically. Life and the rapidly changing reality and the complexity of the socioeconomic problems require that the refugees themselves should unite their efforts to solve refugee problems. No, it is not a question of "drowning men themselves having to save the drowning." The existing state organs should be engaged in finding solutions to the refugees' numerous problems. But now, as at no other time, the urgent task is to consolidate the refugees and merge their public organizations into a single powerful association with its own structure, monetary assets, and press organ. This association should represent the interests of refugees at all levels of state power in Armenia, from the local level to the republic Supreme Soviet. It goes without saying that it would operate in contact with the parliamentary commission for refugees, and with the state committee, helping to draw up a state refugee program giving due consideration to the interests of the refugees themselves. Incidentally, our position is also shared by a number of the leaders in the refugee public organizations.

... We have before us the slender volume of Antoine de Saint-Exupery, "Planet of People." It contains these

familiar lines that now, suddenly, have new import: "We breathe freely only when we are connected with our brothers and we have a common goal... Only those who are linked together like alpinists can climb together to the same summit; they have the blessing of each other."

If all of us who live in the land of Armenia realize that we have a common goal, that we are linked together, then we will find a way to the summit toward which we strive. And then there will be no lost souls among us.

Creation of 'Islamic Party' Seen as Unnecessary

91US0349A Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
1 Feb 91 p 3

[Reader's letter and unattributed response: "Who Needs the Creation of an 'Islamic Party' and Why?"]

[Text] I heard about the creation of something like an "Islamic Party." What kind of party is this, what tasks has it set for itself, and what interests is it guided by?

[Signed] D. Kasimov. Tashkent.

The times of persecution of people and religious traditions have passed. New mosques are being built, and old ones are being restored. The religious-social journal SVET ISLAMA [LIGHT OF ISLAM] is being published. The USSR law: "On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations" has been adopted. The first translation of the Koran in the Uzbek language has been printed, and a record has come out with a recording of readings from the holy book. The changes, as the saying goes, are striking.

But someone clearly does not like the course of the changes. Taking advantage of the difficulties of the transition period, these people are trying to split society to achieve their own selfish aims: They are sowing interethnic and religious strife, hiding behind formal slogans that in fact are far from the true values of Islam. The issue concerns the leaders of informal organizations who are fighting for the creation of a religious "Islamic Party."

On 17 December 1990 and 12 January 1991 the members of an association who call themselves the "Islamic Revival Party" requested permission from the Tashkent City Executive Committee to hold a republic constituent assembly of this party. Based on a resolution of the Presidium of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet dated 19 August 1988 and 21 February 1990, and also on a Tashkent City Soviet resolution of 1 April 1989, the request was denied.

About 300 persons gathered on 26 January of this year to conduct an unauthorized action at the Palace of Textile Workers in the Frunzenskiy Rayon of the capital. After the illegality of the action was explained to those assembled, they dispersed peacefully.

In fact, a fine was levied on organizers D. Dzhabbarov, A. Utayev, A. Karimov, A. Pulatov, and A. Yusupov, who misled those who had assembled.

It is known that the profession of a faith is adherence to the requirements of a specific religion and belief in its basic principles. A faithful Muslim cannot belong to any party or political organization. The division of service to Allah into competing political groups that use religious ideas only as a cover contradicts Islam. In countries of the contemporary East, for example, there were and continue to be attempts to create such parties; however, the clergy, the believers, and the states in these countries are fighting against them.

An obvious example of this is the "Muslim brotherhood" party, which has caused a lot of political difficulties and tension in many countries of the East.

What aims are the creators of the "Islamic Party" pursuing among us? They are the overthrow of the socialist system and the establishment of a theocratic regime. And here it is necessary to point out the obvious relationship of religious extremism with other "radical" forces. An example of this is the recent registration of the "Islamic Party" in the Oktyabrskiy Rayon Executive Committee of Moscow (under the chairmanship of Zaslavskiy). It is interesting, since when has Zaslavskiy become a supporter and defender of orthodox Muslims? Who gave him the right, and also the chairman of the latter-day party of Aktayev and his assistant Gadoyev, to infringe the law of our sovereign republic? For they must know that the USSR law: "On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations" prohibits the participation of religious organizations in the activities of political parties.

Thus, why are the creators of these parties sowing discord in the human family, and what good have they done for it? And who—here in Moscow or abroad—does not like the fight we are waging for the revival of our society?

Are the creators of the "Islamic Party" fulfilling their real responsibilities to the people in pursuing narrow political interests? Does the creation of such a party in general agree with Islam?

Mufti Muhammad-Sadyk Muhammad-Yusuf assessed the idea of the creation of an "Islamic Party" as illogical, inasmuch as Islam itself is a party, and the Koran is its statute. And the truly faithful Muslims of Central Asia and Kazakhstan wholly support this position.

Kazakh Muslim Leader on Growth of Islam

91US0323A Moscow EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN
in Russian No 4, Jan 91 p 13

[Interview with Ratbek Hajji Nysanbay-Uly, mufti of the Spiritual Administration of Muslims of Kazakhstan, by EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN correspondent B. Kuzmenko; place and date not given: "We Are All Brothers"]

[Text] I took off my sneakers and left them at the doorstep, then stepped under the chilly arches of the mosque. This is where our meeting was to take place. I had met the subject of my interview in the reception room of the secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee and we had seen one another again at sessions of the republic Supreme Soviet. He is Ratbek Hajji Nysanbay-Uly, mufti of the Spiritual Administration of Muslims of Kazakhstan and their spiritual leader.

[Kuzmenko] Esteemed Ratbek Hajji, tell us briefly about the path your life has taken.

[Nysanbay-Uly] In the name of God the All-Gracious and All-Merciful! I come from Chimkent Oblast, was born in a peasant family. My parents were true members of the faithful, imbuing the foundations of religious belief into my soul, especially my mother. After finishing my 10-year school I went to the spiritual institution and medrese in Bukhara. At the same time I completed studies with the history department of the local teachers college. Then I continued my education in Libya, at the Islamic University in the Faculty of Sharia and Law.

After completing my training in 1975, I served in a variety of religious positions. At that time Muslims of the republics were subordinate to the Spiritual Administration of Muslims of Central Asia, a situation clearly abnormal for such a major republic as Kazakhstan. Then on 12 January of last year, by decision of the Council for Religious Affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers, the Spiritual Administration of Muslims of Kazakhstan was established. I was elected mufti.

[Kuzmenko] I too studied in Kazakhstan, completed school and university here. I studied the history of the republic. And something I paid attention to was the fact that textbook authors and lecturers tried stubbornly to convince us that Kazakhs were never an especially religious people—in any case they were never Islamic fanatics. What is your opinion of this?

[Nysanbay-Uly] I can agree with your point on fanatics, but as for the rest... Of course, antireligious propaganda could not help but have an effect. But Islam is too deeply rooted in the consciousness of the people. Last year alone, 87 mosques were opened in the republic. Now there are 150. Providing imams for the temples has become a critical problem. To this end, we opened the Higher Islamic Institute in Alma-Ata with a two-year course of study. More than 200 individuals have taken competitive examinations for 30 positions. And these are young people.

[Kuzmenko] How do you explain the interest young people have in Islam?

[Nysanbay-Uly] There are many reasons for this. Enumerating them all would make no sense. But I would like to speak about one of them, that is—the definite sense of disappointment people feel in the past practice of

building our society, when certain ideals were proclaimed and entirely different ones were implemented. Today perestroika is attempting to block the path of such practices but the disappointment is still too strong. And so a person turns to Allah and to moral values, which religion has always professed and continues to profess. These are simple and unshakeable. They solidify in people a faith in goodness, peace, accord, loyalty, respect, and tolerance of one another. We recall what is stated in the Sacred Koran: "After Allah created the world, one must not violate peace on Earth." You will agree that these words might blaze a path into the soul of everyone!

[Kuzmenko] They might, but far from all the time. This is confirmed by the events that have taken place in Fergana, Osh, Namangan, and other places.

[Nysanbay-Uly] Sad events, and I too grieve deeply over them. All people are brothers, regardless of their nationality or the faith they profess. I am deeply convinced there are no serious reasons for confrontation. We must strive to attain peaceful resolution of all our problems, and the moral health of peoples will only grow stronger as a result.

I have never grown tired of repeating these truths—whether in conversations with the faithful or at meetings with voters. And the fact of my election to the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet confirms that this word has reached them.

[Kuzmenko] What was the program you espoused as you moved toward elections?

[Nysanbay-Uly] As a religious figure, I raised primarily questions that took into consideration the interests of the faithful. For example, building a new mosque in Alma-Ata (whose design is already completed, incidentally) and translating the Koran into the Kazakh language. I myself have undertaken the effort to translate this Sacred Book.

Perestroika, the democratization of our lives, and the growing interest of society in traditions and customs of our ancestors have led to a heightened demand on the part of the population for religious literature. In Russia such a spark of interest led to editions of the Bible and its renderings by unqualified people. Our republic has not managed to avoid a similar process—there have been increased attempts at translating and publishing sacred books of Islam by people who, in the main, do not even have the moral right to do so. This task requires not only extensive knowledge of the Arabic and Kazakh languages but a deep faith as well, and special delicacy.

It was not just Muslims who voted for me. I could not fail to take this into account, and so a significant portion of my program was devoted to worldly matters. I ran for election in Chimkent Oblast, where a new district was formed centered in the settlement of Tamerlanovka. Understandably, a great many requests related directly

to this—most often requests for assistance in the construction of various social facilities. One such request is already being implemented—a 240-bed hospital is being erected in Tamerlanovka.

But I understand that all the problems of overall improvement of the life of the rural laborer are not going to be resolved through such measures. The village in our republic is extremely neglected. As a former village resident, I feel this especially sharply. An all-encompassing program for its transformation is needed. We need new economic ties based on different principles from those we have seen before. When we discussed the draft Law on Land and Law on Ownership in the republic Supreme Soviet, I noted with satisfaction how many individuals here shared my views. I am certain that together we will be able to find the most sensible paths for solving our chronic problems. And we will solve them together as well—both believers and nonbelievers.

Religious Leaders Call for Unity, Dialog

*91UN1114A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Mar 91 Union Edition pp 1-2*

["Statement of Action Group" of religious figures in the USSR]

[Text] On 13 March a meeting took place in Moscow's St. Daniel Monastery of an action group of the heads and representatives of churches and religious associations of the Soviet Union. The meeting was at the initiative of representatives of various religious organizations and upon the invitation of His Holiness Patriarch of Moscow and All-Russia Aleksy II.

The text of the statement of the action group of heads and representatives of churches and religious associations of the Soviet Union reads as follows:

Prompted by the consciousness of responsibility of our churches and religious associations for the future of our country, we have gathered together today in Moscow to discuss means and methods of serving the faithful for the good of our peoples.

We find ourselves participants today in a painful but unavoidable cardinal restructuring of the life of our Union state. The unity that bound the country together only in outward, administrative appearances, equalizing the peoples which inhabit it only in their lack of rights, is giving way to a unity of sovereign republics. Under such conditions we consider ourselves obliged to more actively seek not an outward union, but rather an internal, spiritual, and cultural union of our peoples. In our combined reflections on their future, we proceed from a recognition of the fact that for us the state is a natural community with historically formed spiritual, cultural, social, and economic ties that must be utilized appropriately for the good of all peoples inhabiting it. In the history of these relations spanning many centuries, the events of 1917 constitute neither a beginning nor an

end, but comprise rather a definite stage of the historical existence of our country. We are convinced, however, that the political and ideological tenor which guided our state in the post-revolutionary period is exhausted and incapable of providing a fitting historical perspective for our society.

Lying at the foundation of the dialogue we are presently continuing is an understanding that the source of the tragedies and misfortune that have beset us and continue to beset us is hidden not so much in external circumstances and forces, but rather resides more within ourselves, in our egoism, faintheartedness, lack of faith, lack of love, and insufficient reverence for the sacred gift of life, and that without a renewal from inside we will not attain the life style and social peace for all, which mankind deserves.

Without interfering in matters of politics, we state nonetheless that we are deeply disturbed over the fate of the country. We see how defects in today's political, economic, and social activity violate the normal nature of people's lives, often provoking in them the spark of unwarranted passions, feelings, and actions. In particular, insofar as the existing state system has not taken into account the ethnic interests of our peoples and the rights of citizens, it has prompted many to undertake actions which, as we see, cannot be justified proceeding from the spiritual essence of our religious traditions.

As a result, we consider it necessary to combine efforts to effect the internal, penitent alteration of man with efforts to transform the social environment into which our lives have lapsed.

We are placing our hopes in a most swift renewal of the political, social, and economic system of our society, so that no one will be able to structure his own well-being upon the sorrow, misfortune, or deprivations of others, and so that no one people will enjoy advantages over other peoples or bind them to its will.

The dialogue we are conducting invites us to engage in thoughtful cooperation. In years gone by we also gathered together at meetings of heads of churches and religious associations of our country. These meetings, each in its own historical setting, afforded us their experience of mutual understanding and cooperation. At the same time we must acknowledge with some bitterness that these were not always conducted under conditions of freedom.

But today the grave situation in the country and unscrupulous attempts to disguise interethnic strife using religious concepts enjoin us to renew our meetings—meetings of the religious leaders of our peoples.

Our present meeting has an action orientation. We are convinced that, in spite of all the discord and dissension in the world, we, the representatives of the spiritual traditions of our peoples, are able not just to carry on dialogue among ourselves, but can develop combined and—we hope—united positions with respect to the

realities of social and state life. We propose to meet again in the near future, as a larger group, to discuss zealously and comprehensively all those things that grieve us in the essence of society.

We hope that in the political life of the country, in the confrontation with forces advocating its break-up and movements desiring to maintain the previous political system practically unchanged, new forces and movements will more actively come to the fore that advocate preservation of our unity. The coming referendum should determine the future of our state structure based on the free will of our citizens. We hope that the traditionally pacifying orientation of the faithful will assist in renewing the life of our society and our state.

We hope that many of our fellow citizens will become the nucleus of these constructive forces. Our own position consists of supporting the preservation of our country's communal totality, but in such a way that it is built on respect of human rights for all its citizens, and on an acknowledgment of the right of peoples to self-determination and the guarantees of freedom which Heaven has imbued into the nature of man.

We appeal to you, all the faithful of our country, calling for your energetic participation in the establishment of a state worthy of our future. We appeal to you to help eradicate the spirit of intolerance and hatred in our lives through words of reconciliation to friends and neighbors near and far.

We trust that our united efforts will enable us to facilitate an affirmation of peace, accord, and goodwill cooperation in our common democratic rule-of-law state, upon which the entire world community of nations will gaze with respect.

May peace and the blessing of the Most High reside ever with you, dear brothers and sisters, in this genuinely social and genuinely religious service of reconciliation.

[Signed] M.P. Kulakov, chairman of the All-Union Council of the Church of Seventh Day Adventists, on behalf of the All-Union Council.

G.I. Komendant, chairman of the Council of the Union of Evangelical Christian-Baptists, on behalf of the Council of the Union.

Lama Bazarsad, on behalf of the Central Spiritual Administration of USSR Buddhists.

A.S. Shayevich, chief rabbi of the Moscow Choral Synagogue, on behalf of the All-Union Council of Jewish Religious Organizations.

Mufti Talgat Tadzhuddin, on behalf of the Spiritual Administration of Muslims of the European Regions of the USSR and Siberia.

Mufti Mukhammad-Sadik Mukhammad-Yusuf, on behalf of the Spiritual Administration of Muslims of Central Asia.

Aleksy II, patriarch of Moscow and All-Russia.

Filaret, metropolitan of Kiev and All-Ukraine, on behalf of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Alimpy, metropolitan of Moscow and All-Russia, on behalf of the Russian Orthodox Old Believer Church.

Gennady, archbishop of Novozybkov, Moscow, and All-Russia, on behalf of Old Believer Old Orthodox Christians of the Archbishopric of Novozybkov, Moscow, and All-Russia.

NTIS
ATTN: PROCESS 103
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, military, economic, environmental, 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 sources. 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. Except for excluding certain diacritics, FBIS renders personal and place-names in accordance with the romanization systems approved for U.S. Government publications by the U.S. Board of Geographic Names.

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.