

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/9597

11 March 1981

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

(FOUO 6/81)



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

COPYRIGHT LAWS AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING OWNERSHIP OF MATERIALS REPRODUCED HEREIN REQUIRE THAT DISSEMINATION OF THIS PUBLICATION BE RESTRICTED FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/9597

11 March 1981

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS
(FOUO 6/81)

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

Azerbaijani Scholar on Impact of Paniranism on Iranian Azerbaijan
(Editorial Report)..... 1

NATIONAL

Central Asian Republics in Period of Developed Socialism
(A.N. Mikhaylov; RESPUBLIKI SREDNEY AZII V PERIOD RAZVITOGO
SOTSIALIALIZMA, 1980)..... 3

Western Research on Nationalities Issue Attacked
(Mykola Solomatin; VSESVIT, Jan 81)..... 7

REGIONAL

Nationality Policy in Central Asia Defended
(KRIZIS ANTIMARKSISTSKIKH KONSEPTSIY SOTSIALIZMA NA
SOVREMENNOM ETAPE SOVREVNIVANIYA DVUKH SISTEM. SEKTSIYA
II. KRITIKA BURZHUAZNIKH, REFORMISTSKIKH I REVIZIONISTKIKH
TRAKTOVOK SOTSIAL'NO-EKONOMICHESKIKH PROBLEM RAZVITOGO
SOTSIALIZMA, 1979)..... 17

- a -

[III - USSR - 35 FOUO]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTERNATIONAL

AZERBAIJANI SCHOLAR ON IMPACT OF PANIRANISM ON IRANIAN AZERBAIJAN

[Editorial Report] Baku PROTIV BURZHUAZNYKH FAL'SIFIKATOROV ISTORII I KUL'TURY AZERBAJDZHANA in Azeri 1980, pp 205-211 discusses in an article by M. M. Aliyev the questions of the Azerbaijani people and their origin as it appears in the pages of some Iranian press organs.

"Claims submitted by Iranian bourgeois ideologists about the origin of Azerbaijan and the Azerbaijani people generally serve the nationalistic-chauvinistic policy of the ruling class...Iran, which is a multi-national country with regard to the composition of the population, has been unable to find a solution to the national question and the policy of assimilation which the ruling class have been carrying out for many years under the veil of the 'One nation' theory has been turned against minority peoples."

There are two basic trends among the Iranian ideologists: the "most reactionary ruling nationalists" gather around AYANDA magazine which has advocated moving the Azerbaijanis to Khuzistan and compelling the entire population of Iran to speak in Farsi; the second trend, represented by H. Taghyzada and his group, "has claimed it would gradually eliminate the languages of the non-Farsi peoples, especially the Azerbaijanis, through education."

Some Iranian writers maintain that the Azerbaijanis are an ancient people speaking such Iranian dialects as Pahlavi, Dari and Azeri, and "note that the language of the contemporary Azerbaijanis was created after the Tatar invasions."

The most disturbing aspect of the problem to Iranian writers is "not the past history and culture of the Azerbaijanis, but their national liberation movement." The journalist Rzazada Shafag wrote that "the reason that Iranian Azerbaijan was invaded by outsiders was the Turk language. After inventing a history and a literature for Azerbaijan, they created a new nation. With this, they wanted Azerbaijan to separate from Iran" in 1946. "At this time, the reactionary front was spreading the theory of the Aryan race, a pure race with pure blood," and rallied around the concept of "national unity." "In reference to the ruling circles wishing to falsify the 'ethnogenesis' of the Azerbaijani and other peoples of Iran...the organ of the democratic intellectuals of Iran PEYKE SOLH wrote: "There is neither a pure race nor a pure language. Only the fascists have invented a myth about a pure race...."

"In the 1950s Iranian bourgeois ideologists distorted the national liberation movement occurring in the country and slandered the...Azerbaijanis actively

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

participating in the movement." In those same years the newspaper BABAK... "put forth the slogan 'Free our language, the language of 5 million Azerbaijanis!'" under the influence of the poem "Dilima dayma" by Peoples Poet Suleyman Rustam.

"At the end of the 1950s and beginning of the 1960s the economic and political crisis taking place in Iran strengthened the nationalist mentality of the ruling circles." In the 1970s the concept of "one nation" was again widely disseminated, and some writers "put forth the idea of farsifying the Azerbaijanis...by force." Aliyev observed that "...a solution to the national question in contemporary Iran on a democratic foundation is seen as the most important question of the future national liberation of the Iranian peoples," and "a people can only be said to be free when they attain national independence. They have to be able to read and write in the mother tongue. Language is the key to history and culture."

"As shown in the last program of the Iran Peoples Party, after a national and democratic republic is created in modern Iran, its most important duty is that 'the right of all peoples living in Iran to define its own fate completely must be expedited, and the right of national minorities living in Iran to make use of all national, social and cultural rights must be recognized.' "

9676
CSO: 1810

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NATIONAL

CENTRAL ASIAN REPUBLICS IN PERIOD OF DEVELOPED SOCIALISM

Moscow RESPUBLIKI SREDNEY AZII V PERIOD RAZVITOGO SOTSIALIALIZMA in Russian 1980
(signed to press 1 Feb 80) pp 1, 3-5

[Table of contents and foreword from book by A. N. Mikhaylov, et al, eds, Izdatel'-
stvo "Mysl'", 8,500 copies, 288 pages]

[Excerpts] Table of Contents	Page
Foreword	3
Chapter 1	
Building a Developed Socialist Society in the Central Asian Republics	6
1.1. Prerequisites for building developed socialism	--
1.2. The General and the particular in building socialism in the Central Asian Republics	15
Chapter 2	
The Communist Parties of the Central Asian Republics as Militant Detachments of the CPSU	28
2.1. Advance detachments of the republics' working people	--
2.2. Personnel staffs--the key links of Party leadership	39
2.3. Ideological guarantees for carrying out economic and political tasks	50
2.4. Improving Party leadership by development of the economy and culture	59
Chapter 3	
Increasing the Role Played by the Organs of State Power and Administration during the Period of Developed Socialism	72
3.1. Higher organs of state power	74
3.2. Higher and central organs of state administration	88
3.3. Local organs of state power and administration	107
Chapter 4	
Scientific and Technical Progress in the Development of Industry in the Central Asian Republics	119
4.1. Industry of the Central Asian republics as a component part of the integrated national economic complex of the USSR	---
4.2. Most important traits and characteristics of industrial development	132
4.3. Principal trends of development in the industry of Central Asia during the 10th Five-Year Plan and for the long-range future	141

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

	Page
Chapter 5	
Development of Agriculture in the Central Asian Republics	148
5.1. Intensification of agriculture	---
5.2. Intensification of the sectors of crop-raising agriculture	152
5.3. Development of the livestock-raising sectors	167
Chapter 6	
Increasing the Well-Being of the Central Asian Peoples	179
6.1. Increasing the well-being of the working people conforms to the principles of a socialist society	---
6.2. Principal trends in raising the living standards of the population	185
Chapter 7	
Development of National Relations during the Period of Mature Socialism	205
7.1. Peoples of Central Asia in the fraternal family of Soviet socialist nations	---
7.2. Drawing nations and nationality groups closer together. The role of the Russian language in international communication	218
Chapter 8	
Development of the Spiritual Culture of the Central Asian Peoples during the Period of Mature Socialism	236
8.1. Integration of the national and the international in the spiritual life of the Soviet peoples	---
8.2. The flourishing, drawing close together, and mutual enrichment of socialist national cultures	246
Chapter 9	
Central Asian Republics in the International Arena	263
9.1. Soviet Central Asian republics as subjects with equal rights under international law	---
9.2. Forms of participation by Central Asian republics in international relations	268
Conclusion	283

Foreword

The Great October Socialist Revolution as the outstanding historical event in the lives of the peoples of the Land of the Soviets also marked a radical turning-point in the destinies of the peoples of Central Asia. Having carried out a socialist revolution, the workers of Central Asia, with the fraternal help of the Russian proletariat, abolished the exploitative system so that they could, by-passing capitalism, make the transition from feudalism directly to socialism.

The formation of the Central Asian republics and their voluntary merger with other fraternal Union republics into the multi-national Soviet socialist state--the USSR--immeasurably multiplied the strength and the opportunities of the working people of the Central Asian republics in building a new society.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The policy of the CPSU in the area of national relations consists of the universal strengthening of the Soviet Federation--the USSR--, the multi-faceted development of each Union republic, and the drawing closer together of our country's nations and nationality groups. Under the leadership of the Communist Party the peoples of the Soviet Union have carried out profound socioeconomic changes, defended the gains made by socialism, and built a developed socialist society.

During the last few years a number of works have appeared which are devoted to the problems of developed socialism and which elucidate in a multi-faceted way the socio-philosophical and general sociological aspects of a mature socialist society. However, our literature still contains no special studies which reveal the characteristics of building a developed socialism in the Soviet Union republics, in particular, in the Central Asian republics.

The present collective work constitutes the continuation of the monograph entitled "Istoricheskiy opyt stroitel'stva sotsializma v respublikakh Sredney Azii" [Historical Experience of Building Socialism in the Central Asian Republics], as published by the "Mysl'" Publishing House in 1968. An attempt has been made here at a comprehensive summing up of the experience of economic and social development of the Central Asian republics during the period of developed socialism.

The peoples of Central Asia, like the other peoples of the USSR, are living today in accordance with the laws of a developed socialist society and are successfully building communism. Moreover, they are demonstrating to the entire world that any people, at no matter what low level of historical development its socialist revolution occurs, has the opportunity, with the fraternal aid and cooperation of other peoples who have entered upon the path of socialism, of overcoming within very brief periods of time all types of social backwardness and during the lifetime of a single generation to attain the heights of modern social progress. It is fully understandable that an analysis of this historical phenomenon is of enormous scientific and practical interest both for those who themselves have accomplished this unexampled ascent and for those for whom such an ascent still lies ahead.

This work examines the principal traits of the developed socialist society in the Central Asian republics along with the characteristics of its emergence; it elucidates the activities of the Communist Parties of Uzbekistan, Kirgizia, Tajikistan, and Turkmenia in providing guidance with regard to economic and cultural construction, as well as a communist education of the working people. Specific materials are utilized to reveal the purposeful activities of the CPSU and the Communist Parties of the Central Asian republics in the universal raising of the people's well-being.

Considerable attention is paid in the book to the problems of the state building of the Central Asian republics; there is a summing up and a disclosure of the multi-faceted activities of the higher and local organs of state power and administration.

This monograph demonstrates the role played by scientific and technical progress in industrial and agricultural production. Also studied are the trends for further economic development of the economy of the Central Asian republics as a component part of the integrated national economic complex of the USSR.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

A great deal of space in the work is occupied by the problems of developing national relations and a national culture under the conditions of mature socialism, when substantial shifts take place in the relations between nations, and the process of their drawing closer together is intensified, based on a further flourishing in all spheres of life--economic, sociopolitical, and cultural. It reveals the dialectic of the development of national relations in the Central Asian republics under present-day conditions.

Considered here in detail is the question of the international legal subjectivity of the Soviet Central Asian republics; their economic and cultural ties with foreign states are analyzed. This book also exposes the views of the apologists for the bourgeoisie--the present-day anti-communists--, who distort the Leninist nationality policy of the Communist Party on the questions of the economic, social, cultural, and political development of the Central Asian republics; this assumes particular importance in the light of the requirements of the decree of the CPSU Central Committee, "On Further Improving Ideological and Political-Educational Work."

Taking part in the writing of this monograph was the following group of authors from the Tashkent Higher Party School: Academician of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences, Doctor of History, Professor K. Ye. Zhitov, and Candidate in Philosophy, Dotsent /Assistant Professor/ F. P. Kim--Chapter 1; Doctor of History, Professor A. G. Abdunabiyev--Chapter 2; Doctor of Jurisprudence, Professor A. N. Mikhaylov--Chapters 3 and 9; Candidate in Economics, Dotsent D. N. Yun--Chapter 4; Doctor of Economics, Professor B. M. Minbayev--Chapter 5; Candidate in Economics, Dotsent L. G. Panteleyeva--Chapter 6; Candidate in History, Dotsent I. I. Isamiddinov--Chapter 7; Candidate in Philosophy, Dotsent K. B. Buranov--Chapter 8.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Mysl'", 1980

2384
CSO: 1800

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NATIONAL

WESTERN RESEARCH ON NATIONALITIES ISSUE ATTACKED

Kiev VSESVIT in Ukrainian Jan 81 pp 222-229

[Article by Mykola Solomatin: "Anticommunism in Nationalist Garb"]

[Text] Time and time again they gather--professors and lecturers, doctors of philosophy and political science and along with them also their yes-men from among the bourgeois-nationalist emigres to discuss for the nth time the so-called "nationality problem" in the Soviet Union. They name the meetings seriously symposia or conferences, and publish whole volumes of reports and speeches full of belligerent anti-Sovietism and falsification. Such symposia and conferences take place in the United States, Canada, West Germany and other capitalist countries.

One of such "united symposiums" 3 years ago was financed by the Center for Strategic and International Research at Georgetown University and the Institute for Research in Chinese-Soviet Relations at the Washington University. On the eve of the 60th anniversary of the Great October material from this symposium appeared under the title "Nationalities and Nationalism in the USSR: Soviet Dilemma."

The symposium goal was clear--to work out a "rational and effective strategy toward Kremlin." The participants hesitated at first: should they open an all-out attack on Soviet Union nationality politics or, for the time being, "confine themselves to the role of interested observers." But symposium membership alone testified to the fact that they did not intend to observe passively. The tone was set by the well known Western "expert on the nationality problem in the USSR" Harvard University professor R. Pipes. As an extreme anticommunist and enemy of Soviet power, he insisted here also on "a rise of nationalism" in our country and the country's "instability." His theses were so odious that they were unacceptable even to some symposium participants. Prof H. Hennekh from Radcliffe wondered how a government which survived civil and world wars could be called unstable. In the meantime, Pipes continued to stress the "inevitable breakup of the Soviet Union" because of the "insolubility" of the nationality problem.

R. Pipes found himself in a rather peculiar situation. Even he could not deny the economic and spiritual growth of the Soviet republics. One of his adherents, professor at Carlton University in Canada, T. Rakovs'ka-Harmstone, was forced to admit that "most of the Soviet nationalities have their own infrastructure, their

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

own culture, personnel, economic basis." Another follower, D. Sayms, also denied the "oppression" of nations in the Soviet Union, even more, he noted that it is natural for the Soviet citizen to be a patriot both of his own republic and of the whole country. Pipes himself was forced to acknowledge unenthusiastically the growth in economic and cultural levels of ethnic groups in the Soviet Union.

How were the Washington symposium participants able to agree to such contradictions? A new turn in anticommunist literature may be seen here. How much paper was used up in writing about "Russification," "assimilation," even "colonization," how much talk there was in regard to the so-called "destruction" of original cultures and customs! Yet it is apparent that national cultures do exist in the Ukraine, in Belorussia, Caucasus, Pre-Baltic area and Central Asia, as well as highly qualified cadres and a developed economy. On the contrary, now anti-communists see a "threat to Russians" on the part of other nationalities tying in their attempts to break up the Soviet Union especially to upheavals in the "national borderlands."

At this symposium and in many publications there were numerous comments on the demographic processes in our country. The paper NEW YORK TIMES, for example, printed an article by the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist R. Shporlyuk, who estimated that in the year 2000 Russians will be a minority in the USSR, will comprise only 44.3 percent of the country's population, and this supposedly conceals far-reaching political results.

The same topic was also covered by the WASHINGTON POST and the magazines FORTUNE and U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT. V. Zorza expresses hopes for "a growth of nationalism in the Soviet Union." American sovietologists R. Knight and G. Wallace talk about "the striking difference between Russians and non-Russians" and comment on the population increase in Central Asia and the Transcaucasus as "one of the most difficult problems for the USSR during the life of the coming generations."

Replying to questions by the paper LE MONDE as to whether such demographic changes can cause specific structural changes, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted in particular: "As to the population increase in these or other republics of our country, we are not disturbed by this phenomenon. On the contrary, it makes us happy because it reflects first of all a strong increase in the economic level of our republics, including a large increase in population prosperity in the former borderlands of Czarist Russia, the huge progress which they achieved on the road of socialist changes. In the final analysis, all this strengthens the single raft which we call the new historical community--the Soviet nation."

It is noteworthy that only in 1972, when our country celebrated the 50th anniversary of the USSR, anticommunists discussed nationality problems in the Soviet Union at almost 10 symposia in the United States and Western European countries. A new outburst of activity was observed toward the end of 1978--when the third "World Congress of Free Ukrainians (SKVU)" was convened in New York. Attempting to hinder the detente process special services of some imperialist countries released into the proscenium fierce enemies of the Ukrainian nation, guilty of serious crimes against humanity. At the congress there was also a lot of talk about the "insolubility" of the nationality problem

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

in the Soviet Union, about the "captive" nations and nationalities, and calls were heard for the breaking up of the USSR. However, this action by anti-Soviets also met with failure. Returning to their homes after the toasts and banquets nationalists again began squabbling with each other, each defending his own version of the future "independent Ukraine."

Trying to withstand our ideology, imperialist reaction resorts to various falsifications in the Marxist-Leninist theory of the nationality issue, CPSU nationality politics, principles of proletarian socialist internationalism and is counting on bourgeois nationalism--politics, ideology, psychology and outlook of the capitalist class called on to defend the foundations of bourgeois society, to obstruct the road of social progress. V. I. Lenin foresaw an increased activation of nationalist tendencies on the part of our class opponents in the course of the invincible revolutionary renewal of the world.

The greater the success of world socialism and the national-liberation movement against social and national oppression, for peace in the world--the more active and perfidious are the attempts by the reaction to break up the united anti-imperialist front, setting off international interests against national and in this way spreading hostility among the nations. It has become especially fashionable for anticommunists and anti-Soviets to mask their true goals with the words "defense of national interests," "preservation of national identity," "national models of Marxism and socialism," "national sovereignty" the realization of which is supposedly impossible in conditions of a multi-national state.

Typical characteristics of present-day anti-Soviets, including Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, are attempts to dress in scholarly robes and resort to so-called "objective studies" and "prognoses for the future." Even more, nationalists are almost willing to give up the word nationalism. Thus, for example, the Chicago paper UKRAYINS'KE ZHYTTYA [Ukrainian Life] feels that modern nationalism has nothing in common with the bankrupt slogans "hatred of the enemy," "nation above everything," and "authoritarian system." "Would it not be better for us," writes the paper, "to stop using this confusing and controversial word 'nationalism' which gives us nothing." Quite obviously we are dealing here only with an attempt to be rid of a very odious term, preserving intact the criminal character of the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist activity.

Some authors use even more modern concepts--"pluralism," "pluralist Marxism," "pluralist society," "pluralist ideology," etc. The single international Marxism-Leninism doctrine is opposed by "plurality (principally according to nationality) of its variations" under the general definition of "national communism." In this case also by utilizing the terminology and individual positions and conclusions of scholarly communism, its revolutionary nature and international character are thus crossed out.

"Realistic encouragement of pluralism, that is nationalism and separatism," declare contemporary Soviet experts "may be our better reply to the Soviet call on the ideological front." Only the word pluralism is new here. At one time Marx provided a deadly rebuff to any efforts "to spread out the teachings of scholarly communism throughout national quarters."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The span of "interests" of contemporary sovietologists is reflected in the doctoral dissertations being prepared at the leading institutions of higher learning in capitalist countries. In 1976 G. Dossik, a New York University professor, put out an original reference work: "Doctoral Research About Russia and the Soviet Union, 1960-1975." There are 3,150 dissertations listed prepared in the United States, Canada and England, on the average 210 dissertations per year. The author provides statistical data in the introduction. There were more dissertations written in 15 years than in the previous six decades. There has been at least one dissertation written about Russia or the Soviet Union in almost each higher educational institution in the United States. Yet, more than a third come from six universities: Columbia, Harvard, Indiana, New York, Washington and California. Most dissertation writers research problems in history, politics, international relations and economics of the last 60 years.

Almost the same is true in Canada. If prior to 1960, 10 dissertations were written on these topics, then in the following decade and a half there were 75. In England 200 dissertations were written in this period.

Along with the general principles of Soviet internal and external politics, CPSU history, basic stages of socialist and communism building, the nationality issue occupies a special place. Dossik counted more than 50 dissertations on Soviet Union republics (of those 15 were about Ukraine) with various presentations of prerevolutionary bourgeois-nationalist parties and groups, antipopular activity of the Tsentral'na Rada, falsified data on events which led to the establishment of Soviet power in the Ukraine, the history of socialist and communism building in our republic, its activity in the United Nations and other international organizations.

Ukrainian nationalists, the most irreconcilable adversaries of everything Soviet, are navigating the channel of bourgeois "sovietology." Rather transparent thoughts are expressed on the pages of the already mentioned paper UKRAYINS'KE ZHYTTYA by A. Bilyns'kyy, a "moderate" nationalist, who at times, in the heat of polemics, sharply criticizes emigres with Bandera's nationalist views. He tries to figure out what "sovietology" is. Mentioning philosophy, dermatology, astrology through association Bilyns'kyy remarks ironically: "The addition 'ology' means that we are concerned with a specific science."

He attempts to differentiate sovietology and "sovietology"--the first supposedly aiming toward scholarly goals, the second in quotes has a strictly propaganda character "to turn the Soviet system into the devil." We cannot agree to this classification, of course. The goal of both is the same--anti-Soviet.

As the periodical AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW admitted at one time, one of the tasks of Western sovietologists lies in "refuting Soviet statements that Leninist nationality politics created something new in history--a multinational society in which hostility is absent." Fulfilling this task bourgeois historians and political scientists are making all kinds of attempts to deny the friendship of Soviet brotherly nations, and the achievements of socialist nations. One of the directors of Columbia University, E. Allvort considers himself an expert in the problems of Central Asia. In 1973 the book "Nationality Issues in Soviet Central Asia" was written under his editorship, based on materials from two seminars

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

which took place in New York before. Allvort indicated that although the CPSU declared "political equality between Russians and other nationalities in the USSR" this was supposedly "an abstract and formal equality." In reality, "economic and political discrimination" is applied against non-Russian nations.

The most odious of Allvort's statements must sometimes be denied even by bourgeois authors. Even T. Rakovs'ka-Harmstone who deliberately distorts nationality relations in Soviet Tajikistan was forced to acknowledge: "A comparatively brief period of Soviet power brought considerable changes to Tajikistan--from feudal stagnation to modernized statehood. Tajikistan personifies the dynamics of Soviet political and economic transformations." Another American sovietologist M. Hindus speaks similarly about a different Central Asian republic: "Uzbekistan," he writes, "is an example of a poorly developed Asian country whose industry, science and technology was raised by Moscow to a contemporary level within a short time... Tourists from Asian, African and other poorly developed countries having spent time in Tashkent, can only compare the poverty of their own country with the achievements of Uzbekistan in health care, living standard, education, technology, industry, science... This provides the Kremlin development formula with global meaning."

Statistics are the best rebuttal for Allvort. In the 50 years of USSR existence industrial production output increased in Kazakhstan by 558 times, in Tajikistan 500 times, in Armenia 483 times, in Kirghiziya 381 times. The rapid economic development in the once backward outlying areas contributed to the fact that the gap in levels of economic potential between them and traditionally developed regions amounts now only to 1.7:1.

However, this type of levelling should not be accepted in a simplified manner as is done by the bourgeois and bourgeois-nationalist authors: that supposedly all republics should have the same economic potential otherwise there will be discrimination. Our country had to liquidate a critical backwardness of national borderlands of former Russia. This task was fulfilled successfully by the party, even the concept "national borderlands" was left in the past forever. Distribution of production forces and capital investment politics are determined primarily by the interests of a rapid economic progress for the whole country. Our country is not the sum total of separate parts, but a single national-economic complex, where each republic plays a special role in the process of general union specialization and cooperation.

As to Ukraine, the accent is placed primarily upon legal and language aspects. It is most inconvenient for Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists to discuss the republic's economy, figures speak for themselves, therefore they select a non-material branch which does not lend itself easily to calculation. The nationalist periodical UKRAINIAN REVIEW, for example, was recently forced to admit: "Compared to 1917 contemporary Ukraine is a highly developed country with huge natural and industrial resources, with expert staff in all branches... It is a country with complete literacy." There is a lot of testimony like this.

The story is different when there is talk about the place of the UkrSSR in the Soviet Union, and also the sovereignty of individual republics. For example, the bourgeois nationalist K. Savchuk attempts to compare the union and

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

republican constitutions. According to his logic, Ukraine, which is a member of the United Nations and therefore subject to international law and a sovereign state, is in fact a state "with a very restricted sovereignty and independence." Savchuk sees this as a judicial paradox although everything falls into place when appropriate articles of the USSR and UkrSSR constitutions are objectively analyzed. Article 76 of the USSR Constitution states: "The union republic is a sovereign Soviet socialist state, which united with other Soviet republics in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Outside the limits noted in article 73 of the USSR Constitution, the union republic fulfills state authority independently on its own territory. The union republic has its own constitution which corresponds to the USSR Constitution and takes into account the republic's specifics." All of this is also confirmed by the UkrSSR Constitution, especially article 63 in which it is stated: "The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is a sovereign Soviet socialist state." Further articles reveal the contents of this sovereignty including various spheres of economic, political and state-judicial order. Article 74 notes: "The Ukrainian SSR has the right to enter into relations with foreign countries, to conclude agreements with them and exchange diplomatic and consular representatives, take part in the activities of international organizations."

Bourgeois nationalists, the irreconcilable enemies of the brotherhood of Russian and Ukrainian nations, oppose the Russian language as the language of international association in the multinational Soviet state. What do they propose in exchange? Nothing. There is no need for either a multinational state or international association, or the Russian language. This position is absolutely absurd. Nationalists should be directed at least to their anticommunist colleagues especially those who are concerned with "problems of Soviet nationalities" at Columbia University. In 1976 the first of a three volume edition of "Changes in Population and Nationality Composition in Russia and USSR" was published here. Its authors write: "We do not consider the predominance of the Russian language a negative occurrence; one language as a means of communication in a multinational state is an effective and natural occurrence. At the same time the Soviet power promotes the intensive development of non-Russian languages." Commentaries are unnecessary.

"The insolubility of the nationality problem" in the USSR is, in fact, imperialist propaganda and belligerent Zionist circles are the first to see it also in the so-called "Jewish problem." The American Jewish Congress, the Zionist Organization of America, American Zionist Federation and other groups, utilizing the Zionist lobby in American Congress and also their numerous means of mass communication, are attempting to hinder the progress of detente, the settlement of business and mutually convenient cooperation between socialist and capitalist countries, directing external United States politics into an anti-Soviet channel. With this the often repeated thesis about "the oppressed" Soviet Jews, the "discrimination" and "forced assimilation" is set in motion. P. Hollander, an American professor sees the reason for the Soviet Union's negative approach to Israel's expansionist politics in "Russian and Ukrainian antisemitism." According to this "logic" the United Nations General Assembly should also be accused of antisemitism since it recognized Zionism as a form of racism and racial discrimination.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Zionist U. Kori sets forth his concept. In his opinion Soviet Jews are a part of "the spiritually rich and culturally fruitful Jewish community in Western Europe." Deliberately keeping silent about the role of working Jews in the revolutionary transformations in the Soviet country, he would like to present them as a foreign, even more, hostile to socialist order national group. This revealed the traditional Zionist method--to declare all Jews Zionist and since Zionism is hostile to socialism, all Jews must be enemies of socialism. At the 17th Communist Party of Israel Congress it was stressed that in exposing Zionism the "Jewish national mask" must be torn away from it, its true face must be shown--that of a tool of imperialist reaction in a struggle against social progress and peace in the world.

The "Reference Book of Basic Soviet Nationalities" falsifies the situation of Jews in the USSR. The author of one of the chapters, Zionist L. Katz, contrasting Jews with various of our fellow countrymen, became lost in obvious contradictions. He speaks of "official and unofficial discrimination" which supposedly shows in "restricting admission to institutions of higher learning," but at the same time names Jews as "the most educated and professionally prepared ethnic group in the USSR." He must finally admit, however, that many Jews fully believe in Soviet ideology and have achieved "a good career and professional satisfaction."

Rebuffing such Zionist "grievers," the chairman of the Nationality Soviet of the USSR Supreme Soviet V. P. Ruben stressed: "They do not want to hear that in our country books by Jewish authors both in Yiddish and translated into languages of other USSR nations are published widely, that works by the classic Jewish literature writer Sholem Aleichem are printed in millions; that a monthly literary-artistic periodical is published entitled SOVETISH HEYMLAND printing novels, stories and poems by more than 100 Jewish writers; that Jewish dramatic and musical ensembles appear regularly singing Jewish folk songs; that every year almost a half million people attend shows and concerts in the Jewish language."

The "great love" ideology and politics of Maoism are also filled with bourgeois nationalism masked by socialist phraseology. From these positions the Beijing press stages mass propaganda against the Soviet Union, the countries of socialist friendship, against Leninist friendship of nations, attempting to drive in a wedge, pitting the Soviets one against another. The yellow-blue press, in turn, is full of reprints of information from the XINHUA agency, the magazine BEIJING REVIEW in which nationality relations in the USSR are presented in a completely disfigured state.

In their external political doctrines under the appearance of the latest achievements of theoretical thought Maoists and their followers defend the so-called "revolutions of the colored" in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Such nationalist "revolutions" are directed against the national-liberation movement, its union with the socialist system and with the international proletariat. This is a direct revision of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the nationality issue. At one time, speaking of the attitude of the working class in the West to the national-liberation movement in the East, V. I. Lenin inquired whether this did not signify that the materialistic West was rotting and the light shines only

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

from the mystic, religious East! He replied that on the contrary the East had finally stepped on the road of the West, and new hundreds and hundreds of millions of people from now on will take part in the struggle for ideals developed by the West.

In discussing national relations inside China itself leftist statements are circulated about the nation as "a revitalized community," about an outside nationality "planetary consolidation" of workers, etc. Maoists speak out against the right of nations to self-determination since that slogan supposedly breaks up the proletariat and unites it with the bourgeois. These are not mere words. In the actual national making of China the idea of "great love" chauvinism is consistently put into life. The 1954 CNR (Chinese National Republic) Constitution in fact declared a unitary state denying the right of minorities to self-determination, to the establishment of their own states. The constitution denies the decisions of a number of CPC Congresses, the second (1922) and fourth (1928) for example, and also the CPC Statute approved in 1945 in which it is stated that the party is fighting for the establishment of the Chinese National Federative Republic. Thus a departure from Marxist-Leninist principles of national state formation may be observed even in internal politics. Inner Mongolia, Xintiang-Uygur and Ningxia (Hui) autonomous regions established during the first years of the CNR were later changed to so-called "border rayons" with forced assimilation and national-cultural genocide.

Some American political scientists and propagandists, analyzing Mao's ideology and politics in the 1970's, predicted further drawing together between Beijing and the imperialist states. The editor of NATIONAL CATHOLIC REGISTER D. Lyons noted, for example: "The next Beijing government will probably sever ties with communism and unite with the United States." The traitorous politics of the Beijing clique allied with the most reactionary circles of imperialism were most clearly evident in the aggressive war against socialist Vietnam. This aggression was severely condemned by the world community and revealed the falsehood of the hegemonious idle talk about "colored revolution," Beijing's "support" of national-liberation movements.

Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists are striving to establish contacts both with Maoists and Zionists on a common anti-Soviet platform, and also with reactionary emigres from other Soviet republics and socialist countries. The newspaper SVOBODA wrote openly about efforts to play with "the Chinese card": "May it be with the devil, but against Moscow." (21 November 1978) Through cruel internal dissension nationalists expose each other in their readiness to sell and resell Ukraine. The paper UKRAYINS'KE ZHYTTYA writes as follows about Bandera's followers: "Once they were in the service of the Polish defensive, later cooperated with Hitler's invaders in various abwehrs and vinets (sic) and finally found new patrons in the "free world" and with their aid became "presidents," senators, secretaries, leaders and managers of various offices, etc." (1 October 1978)

Today an open stake is placed on Beijing. After Mao's death the CNR representative visited the headquarters of the ill-fated Anti-Communist Bloc of Nations (ABN) and had a talk with its "president" Stets'ko. As reported by the papers an agreement was reached about the activation of the struggle against socialist

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

countries and detente. Nationalist press approved the anti-Soviet direction of Deng Xiaoping's visit to the United States in 1979 as well as China's aggression in Vietnam.

Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists have long ago entered into a union with Zionism; they support Israel's aggression against the Arab nations, Sadat's traitorous politics, endlessly repeating the fabrications about "discrimination" of Jews in the Soviet Union. When the United Nations General Assembly condemned Zionism, nationalists through the lips of the former servant of Hitler's fascism Z. Pelens'kyi stated: "Actually Zionism is no more than a form of state creating nationalism. Zionism is no better and no worse than whatever form of Ukrainian state creating nationalism." (KHYSTIYANS'KYI HOLOS, 25 January 1976) At the beginning of 1978 the reactionary press wrote about the establishment of the so-called Society for the Study of Problems of Ukrainian Judaism [sic--Public Committee for Jewish-Ukrainian Cooperation], whose membership consists of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists and Zionists, especially I. Kleyner who left USSR for Israel, but soon found himself in the Ukrainian section of Radio Liberty. He is often printed in nationalist newspapers, has published several books disfiguring national relations in the Soviet country.

Leadership circles in Israel pay no particular attention to this alliance realizing how weak and useless the Ukrainian reactionary emigres are. But the nationalists are trying to overcome this inertia through their well-wisher. Addressing himself to Zionists, I. Kleyner wrote in one Israeli paper: "Even a hint of sympathy and understanding on our part, even a nod with the head--a nod which will cost us nothing." This article was reprinted in the periodical SUCHASNIST' (No 1, 1978).

This pointed out once more the miserable state of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism which never did maintain its own image, serving the international reaction diligently. It enters into contact with reactionary emigre circles from Eastern European countries and together with them acts against revolutionary changes, the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, the complex program of socialist integration. They see "Russification" in all this, a destruction of "national identity." Also in the same issue [SUCHASNIST'] the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist M. Prokop carries on about the "sovietization" of Eastern Europe distorting the well-known 25th CPSU Congress statement on the regularity of gradual friendship of socialist countries.

Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists pay particular attention to the Polish emigres, however, as SUCHASNIST' noted regretfully "there is no real friendship and cooperation between Ukrainians and Poles, or perhaps more accurately, it exists in minimal proportions." As to relations between the Polish National Republic and the Soviet Ukraine they are, even according to nationalists, unusually close and fruitful. This is the basic reason for the activation of reactionary emigres to create a single "Polish-Ukrainian anti-Soviet front." In their joint appearances, Ukrainian and Polish nationalists call on each other to forget the bloody pages of history. "We are ashamed," writes a Polish emigre under the pen name L'vivyanyn, "for the terrible pacifications ("strangling"--M.S.) of Ukrainian villages, the imprisonment of Ukrainian patriots, destruction of churches, the hindering of Ukrainian cultural development, for the fact that the Ukrainian

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

University which should have become a forge of our friendship had to exist underground or abroad. We are ashamed and are anxious to be forgiven as we too forgive our wounds which the Ukrainians inflicted upon us through Hitler's instigation." (SUCHASNIST', 1976, No 1)

The activation of bourgeois nationalism in recent years may be explained first of all as an attempt by the imperialist reaction to counteract detente which is gaining more support in the world. The natural desire of nations to live in friendship, the objective internationalization process of all social life are opposed by national estrangement and hostility, revisionist concepts of "stakes in own strength" and the inevitability of world wars. Anticommunism appearing today under the guise of Zionism, Maoism, Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism and other ideological forms of the grand and petty bourgeoisie, is directing its efforts against the international character of Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the developed socialist society, and the Soviet experience in the nationality problem. But anticommunism is doomed. The future is for internationalism--the most humane principle which unites all nations and peoples of the world.

COPYRIGHT: "Vsesvit", 1981

9443
CSO: 8055/ 0550

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

REGIONAL

NATIONALITY POLICY IN CENTRAL ASIA DEFENDED

Kiev KRIZIS ANTIMARKSISTSKIKH KONSEPTSIY SOTSIALIZMA NA SOVREMENNOM ETAPE SOVRENOVANIYA DVUKH SISTEM. SEKTSIYA II. KRITIKA BURZHUAZNIKH, REFORMISTSKIKH I REVIZIONISTKIKH TRAKTOVOK SOTSIAL'NO-EKONOMICHESKIKH PROBLEM RAZVITOGO SOTSIALIZMA in Russian 1979 signed to press 7 Dec 79 pp 245-251

[Excerpt from book containing summaries of reports and addresses at an all-union scientific conference on 18-20 Dec 79; published under auspices of the Institute of Economics of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, 500 copies]

[Text] The basic component of anti-communism is anti-sovietism--an aggregate of ideological positions and actions directed at discrediting the theoretical foundations of the Soviet state and the practice of building socialism and communism in our country.

One of the links of anti-communism and anti-sovietism has become the falsification of socialist construction in the republics of the Soviet East. Bourgeois "specialists" on the republics of the Soviet East have developed their own anti-communist treatment of the socioeconomic development of the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan. It should be noted that we are speaking now not about the uncoordinated utterances of individual authors but about a system of views and concepts which are based upon an anti-scientific methodology, denying the dependence of socioeconomic development on the nature of the mode of production.

Studies distorting the experience of socialist construction in the republics of the Soviet East are being conducted with increasing scope. And their geography is being broadened.

Books containing attacks on the nationality policy of the CPSU and the Soviet government in Central Asia and Kazakhstan began to appear in the West soon after the victory of the Great October Revolution. The first two appeared in 1925. Their author was the Frenchman Joseph Castenier [?], who had been an active participant in the Tashkent counter-revolutionary underground in 1918. Within three years a book was published in Paris entitled "The Soviets in Central Asia," by Mustafa Chakayev, the former head of government of the so-called "Kokand Autonomy," who had fled from the people's wrath in 1918. Since those times the ideologists of anti-communism, fugitive traitors, bourgeois nationalists, political renegades, betrayers of the Motherland, and various "Sovietologists" have written about a hundred such books.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The anti-communists have falsified the experience of socialist construction in the national republics of the Soviet East and the nationality policy of the CPSU in the following ways:

--idealization of the Pre-Revolutionary past of the peoples of Central Asia;

--rejection of the objective prerequisites and the necessity of socialist development in the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan.

Despite logic and the historical facts (the ideologists of anti-communism even now assert that the revolutionary transformation of pre-capitalist relations into socialist ones is even impossible from the viewpoint of Marxist theory: so to speak, in accordance with the Marxist position on the sequential system of formations) a feudal culture must pass through a period of capitalism before a socialist revolution is undertaken, while a clan culture must pass through feudalism (see, for example, A. Park, "Bolshevism in Turkestan," 1917--1927). Not stopping at direct falsification of Marxism, the bourgeois theoreticians declare that by the time of the October Revolution there existed no "Marxist doctrine" of the economic and social progress of previously backward countries. And the victory of socialism in the Central Asian republics supposedly does not proceed from "historical principles."

The revolutionary transformation which economically embodies the principles of the transition to socialism, such as the nationalization of the basic means of production, industrialization, and the cooperation of small-scale producers is regarded by the bourgeois ideologists through the prism of the concept of "Soviet colonialism." The formula of "Soviet colonialism" has become a leitmotif in the present-day slander directed against the nationality policy of the CPSU and the Soviet government. It has become a solid part of the arsenal of anti-communism. Moreover, vain attempts have been made to set up a parallel between the solution of the nationality problem in our country and colonialism as such. This found reflection even in the above-mentioned series of books. Serving as examples are K. Stal's book, "British and Soviet Colonial Systems," W. Kolarz's "Russia and Its Colonies," "Communism and Colonialism," and many others.

These works distort the Marxist-Leninist theory of the nationality question, as well as the principle of proletarian internationalism; they emasculate its social and class contents, and they openly preach petit-bourgeois nationalism.

The newest modification of the distortion by the bourgeois ideologists of the right to self-determination as applied to the peoples of Central Asia is the propaganda of a split by the republics of Central Asia from the Soviet Union under the slogan of "the unification of the Muslim peoples." They link the economic and social progress of the Central Asian peoples not with the nature of the productive relations, economic structure, nor the advantages of socialism, but with the "universal law of economic growth," the changes in any society which probably "occur under the influence of industrialization and universal education."*

* SREDNEAZIATSKOYE OBOZRENIYE, 1963, No 3, p 114.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

It was not so long ago that the bourgeois ideologists were entirely denying the economic achievements of Soviet Central Asia. With regard to the present-day stage of this society's development the forms and methods of bourgeois criticism have been changed. Some 15 or 20 years ago criticism of socioeconomic progress in the Central Asian republics was conducted exclusively by the methods of crude falsification and slander. Now the ideologists of anti-communism have been compelled to acknowledge the economic and cultural development of the Central Asian republics.

At the present time, when the ideologists of anti-communism have been compelled to acknowledge that the economic and cultural development, as well as the standard of living, of the Central Asian republics is "much higher than it is in the other Muslim countries not in Soviet Asia, except for one or two of them," the denial of economic progress has been replaced by a "scholarly" appraisal of its causes, methods, nature, and results. Proceeding from the "independence" of economic progress from the social structure, the bourgeois ideologists assert the inevitability of these achievements by virtue of universal technical progress.

The sharpness of bourgeois criticism at the present time is aimed not at the economic results of the development of the Central Asian republics but at the methods and ways of achieving them.

At the present time the republics of the Soviet East comprise one of the most important links in the integrated and well-planned organizational national-economic complex of the Land of the Soviets.

This creates the most favorable conditions for the development of each nation and national group, for evening out the levels of development of the various peoples in the sphere of the economy, in utilizing the achievements of science, culture, etc.

The internationalization of the economy of the peoples of the Soviet Union is an inextricable part, a component element in the internationalization of the economy on a worldwide scale. It should be noted that the categories "internationalization of the economy," the "internationalization of social life," the communality of economic life, and "economic integration" are not identical.

The common element in the internationalization of the economy of the Soviet peoples consists of the fact that the socialist economy in our country came into being as an integrated economy of all the republics and all the peoples in the USSR, based on a communal ownership of property, on a single type of production relations, and a planned development, directed by the CPSU in accordance with recognized, objective economic laws, in the interests of the toiling masses.

The affirmation of socialism in a multinational country, no matter what was the point of departure of the level of economic development of this or that nation, presupposes the rise of international relations of production.

Under the conditions of the Soviet Union the development of the process of internationalizing and integrating the economy has its own characteristics. However, as V. I. Lenin noted, they may affect only the most important thing. And the most important thing consists in the fact that the road to socialism and the socialist structure itself is characterized by a number of fundamental principles

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

which are inherent to a socialist society in any country.

But these fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism have been distorted by right-wing and "left-wing" opportunists.

Right-wing revisionists deny the general and exaggerate the particular, including what is nationally unique, and thereby they justify the "national models" of socialism. This was done by the revisionists in Czechoslovakia, R. Garaudy [?] in France, E. Fischer in Austria. Under the guise of defending the national characteristics they proposed a particular model of socialism for each country. This "democratic," "human" socialism ignores the Soviet experience of building in a multinational country, it provides for the introduction of private entrepreneurial activity into the economy, and it denies the leading role of the CPSU and the class approach in solving the nationality problem, etc.

If previously the anti-soviet propagandists had utterly denied the possibility of the progressive development of the Central Asian peoples under socialism, now they have been compelled to acknowledge, albeit with stipulations, their great achievements. And in an official UN report, compiled by experts in this organization, the achievements of the Central Asian peoples in the field of education and health care are recognized as "astounding."

In their economic and cultural development the Central Asian republics have left far behind the countries of the non-Soviet East, which at the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution's victory were at an incomparably higher level of development.

If with regard to the level of its economic development Central Asia was no different from the neighboring countries of the foreign East or was even behind some of them, at the present time the situation has changed radically. For example, even by 1965 the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, with a population of 30 million, were producing three times as much electric power as Indonesia, Iran, Pakistan, and Turkey, taken together, with their combined population of 260 million. At the present time the Central Asian republics are producing almost 20 times as much electric power as was produced throughout all of Russia in 1913 and more than triple the amount outlined for the entire country by the time the GOELRO plan had been carried out.

At the present time the industry of the Soviet Eastern republics includes 200 sectors, represented by thousands of enterprises. With respect to their equipment, each of them is at the level of present-day technical progress. High levels of development have been reached by the mining industry, non-ferrous metallurgy, the gas and petrochemical complex, machine building and instrument manufacture, electric-power engineering, the building-materials industry, the light and food industries.

The republics of the Soviet East participate in strengthening the foreign economic ties of the USSR. They export their industrial output to more than 100 of the world's foreign countries. In 1976 the per capita production of electric power amounted to the following: in the Uzbek SSR--2,459 kw-hrs, Kirgiz SSR--1,410, Tajik--1,480, Turkmen--2,000 while in India the figure was 156 kw-hrs, Pakistan--94, Afghanistan--26 (1975), Indonesia--24, Bangladesh--21, Iran--394 (1975),

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Turkey--449, China--63 (1959). Now Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Iran, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Turkey, with a combined population of about 380 million, produce 42.6 billion kw-hrs, while the republics of the Soviet East, with a population of 38,656,000, produce 85.9 billion kw-hrs, or twice as much as in all the above-mentioned countries combined.

Such is the truth about the solution of the nationality question in Central Asia.

The experience of the Leninist solution of the nationality problem in the republics of the Soviet East, the rapid progress of the productive forces and the relations of production are being attentively studied in countries which are struggling for their own liberation and which have entered upon the path of socialist orientation.

The indisputable successes of economic and cultural construction in the republics of Central Asia have shown the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America who have won their national independence the supremacy and advantages of a socialist economy.

COPYRIGHT: INSTITUT EKONOMIKI AN UkSSR, 1979

2384
CSO: 1800

END

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY