

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/10173

9 December 1981

# USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

(FOUO 29/81)

**FBIS** 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.

JPRS L/10173

9 December 1981

USSR REPORT  
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS  
(FOUO 29/81)

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

Nationalism: Tool of Imperialist Ideological Diversion  
(O.S. Redzhepova; IZVESTIYA AKADEMII NAUK TURKMENSKOY SSR, SERIYA  
OBSHCHESTVENNYKH NAUK, Apr 81) ..... 1

Soviet Experience Applied to Nationality Problems in Developing Countries  
(I. Khalmuradov; IZVESTIYA AKADEMII NAUK TURKMENSKOY SSR, SERIYA  
OBSHCHESTVENNYKH NAUK, Apr 81) ..... 10

Book on South Yemen's Social, Economic Development  
(NARODNAYA DEMOKRATICHESKAYA RESPUBLIKA YEMENA: EKONOMIKA I  
TORGVOEKOONOMICHIYE OTNOSHENIYA, 1981) ..... 16

Book on Domestic Factors Affecting U.S. Foreign Policy Reviewed  
(V. F. Petrovskiy; VOPROSY ISTORII, Sep 81) ..... 18

NATIONAL

Western Views on Soviet Economic Development Attacked  
(Yevgeniy Sergeevich Troitskiy; VOPROSY EKONOMIKI, Oct 81)..... 21

Soviet Ethnographic Theories Outlined  
(G. E. Markov; SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA, Jul-Aug 81) ..... 34

REGIONAL

Lack of Armenian Literature in Central Press Deplored  
(Karen Simonyan; LITERATURNAYA ARMENIYA, Jul 81) ..... 40

- a -

[III - USSR - 35 FOUO]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTERNATIONAL

NATIONALISM: TOOL OF IMPERIALIST IDEOLOGICAL DIVERSION

Ashkhabad IZVESTIYA AKADEMII NAUK TURKMENSKOY SSR, SERIYA OBSHCHESTVENNYKH NAUK  
No 4, Apr 81 pp 10-16

[Article by O. S. Redzhepova, Department of Philosophy and Law, Turkmen SSR Academy of Sciences; "Nationalism--Tool of Imperialist Ideological Diversion"]

[Text] Nationalism has always been a tested and universal weapon of imperialism in the struggle against the forces of peace and progress. It could not be otherwise, inasmuch as the bourgeois class essence as the contents of imperialist policy is inextricably bound up with nationalism as its form. It is not by chance that every major social conflict or exacerbation of the struggle between the two opposing systems provokes a flare-up of bourgeois nationalism in one or another of its varieties. This is testified to by historical practice, in particular, that of the periods of World War I and World War II, as well as by the present-day situation in the world, when the incitement of chauvinism is directed at justifying the unprecedented scope of the West's military preparations. Under the cover of demagogical declarations about "defending national interests," the following actions are being carried out: the US intervention into the internal affairs of El Salvador and Iran, the occupation of Northern Ireland by British troops, Israeli aggression against the Arab countries and a course aimed at annexing their lands, as well as the imperialist support of terrorist and racist regimes. We must recall today the words of V. I. Lenin: "Wars are favored by nationalist prejudices, which are systematically cultivated in civilized countries in the interests of the ruling classes for the purpose of distracting the proletarian masses from their own class problems and to make them forget their debt to international class solidarity" [1, p 188].

In the struggle against modern-day socialism present-day anti-communism places special hopes on nationalism. "It is precisely on nationalist tendencies and, in particular, on those of them which take the form of anti-Sovietism which the bourgeois ideologists and bourgeois propaganda most willingly place their bets in the struggle against socialism and the communist movement" [2, p 339]. Everything is taken into consideration: the growth of the peoples' national consciousness in the present-day period, especially in the young, developing countries, as well as the easily vulnerable and mass nature of the national feelings at which the nationalist propaganda is directed, and the possibility of a multi-purpose utilization of nationalism. The latter is expressed in the fact that, in the first place, nationalism serves as a basic means for splitting up the international communist and labor movement and also the national-liberation struggle of peoples and breaking

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

them apart from each other. In declaring the 20th century to be the "century of nationalism," the anti-communists hasten to proclaim themselves as its advocates, and socialism as the most malicious foe of the national, which the bourgeois ideologists consider as a synonym of the nationalistic.

In the second place, nationalism is used to undermine the unity of the socialist community. On more than one occasion the imperialist strategists have openly declared that the "explosive substance which threatens the unity of the communist bloc is nationalism." In appealing to the national feelings of the peoples of the socialist countries, the bourgeois ideologists are exploiting in their subversive propaganda the concepts of national independence, national interests, and national culture, which are treated in a nationalistic spirit. They utilize any problems or difficulties which arise between individual socialist countries or in any one of them. Thus, the West's "psychological warfare" services reacted operationally to the events in Poland; during the period from 19 through 25 August 1980 they devoted, on an average, as many as 25 commentaries a day in broadcasts in Russian alone.

Finally, the third significance of nationalism in the West's ideological diversions--undermining the monolithic unity of the peoples of the USSR. Tens of radio stations broadcast round the clock in the more than 23 languages of the Soviet peoples. The task of the bourgeois propagandists is to transform national characteristics into national barriers, with the aid of nationally colored phenomena to turn national feelings into nationalistic passions. Concerning what kinds of devices and methods are being utilized in this, an idea is provided by the following excerpt from Washington's official instruction entitled "How to Compose Propaganda Broadcasts": "Use the device of setting one people against another, one group of the population against another, if possible--a majority against a minority--this is very important.... Always find and take a position on the side of those whom you can best use to carry out your purpose. If there is no one for you to support, create such a group yourself" [as quoted from 4, p 44]. As practical experience has shown, the anti-communists have followed the letter and the spirit of this instruction. Let us illustrate this by using the example of Soviet Central Asia.

The foreign centers of lies and disinformation pay a great deal of attention to the Central Asian region of the USSR, and in the immediate future their subversive activity will undoubtedly be activated even more. Testifying in favor of such a forecast is an analysis of the works of the Sovietologists, who have developed for the propaganda services a strategy and methods of ideological diversions, as well as the plans based on their recommendations for these services themselves during the 1980's.

Thus, on p 8 of the report of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, prepared in 1979, the following is stated: "...We must pay more attention than in previous years to preparing programs for the Soviet peoples of Central Asia...", i. e., the Central Asian peoples. In this same report it is noted on p 17 that "...funds have been allocated to further enlist the cooperation of the most experienced consultants and researchers on Russian questions and questions of the nationality groups within the Soviet Union."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

In the disinformation which is being disseminated by the ideological diversionists about the Turkmen SSR there are distortions of our republic's genuine achievements in the socioeconomic, political, and cultural spheres; the socialistic transformations in the life of the Turkmen people are evaluated from a nationalistic point of view. The goal of such hostile propaganda, as was noted at the 18th Plenum of the CPT CC (July 1979), is to form within the republic "an internal opposition with a nationalistic hue," which our foes are trying to create themselves in accordance with the above-mentioned instruction. For this purpose they are trying year after year to instill in the peoples of Central Asia the idea that they are without rights and the objects of discrimination by the colonialist, chauvinistic policy of the Russians, that their national spiritual values are being destroyed, and that in the future they can anticipate ethnic, cultural, and linguistic assimilation by the Russians. The myths of "Soviet colonialism," "Russification," and "assimilation," as fabricated by Western and Beijing propaganda, are calculated to affect the national feelings and national dignity of the Central Asian peoples, to arouse in them a national egoism and a striving toward national self-limitation and isolation.

The desire to discover nationalism and a nationalistic opposition within the USSR is so great that the bourgeois ideologists frequently accept the desirable instead of the reality. During the last few years the myth of the "nationalism" of the non-Russian peoples has become fundamental in the works of Sovietologists. The word "nationalism" already figures in the very titles of these works, such as H. Seton-Watson, "Nationalism and Communism" /11/; E. Allworth, "Central Asian Publishing and the Rise of Nationalism" /6/; T. Rakowska-Harmstone, "Russia and Nationalism in Central Asia: The Case of Tadzhikistan" /10/; L. Snyder, "The New Nationalism" /14/; G. Zimon, "Nationalism and National Policy in the USSR after Stalin" /13/, and others, as well as an enormous number of articles.

Familiarity with these works shows that what is meant by nationalism here, as a rule, is everything which has a national coloration and testifies to the multifaceted flourishing of our country's nations and national groups. The creation of national staffs in the republics, a careful attitude toward the monuments of antiquity and the spiritual heritage in general, the development of the national languages and literatures, the growth of the population, and other phenomena are interpreted in a nationalistic vein.

And it is not just a matter of distinguishing the methodology of bourgeois sociology, which quite often mixes up the concepts of "national" and "nationalistic," from the scientific methodology, according to which these concepts are polar. The nationalistic is an egotistical, one-sided, false reflection of the national, carrying the latter to its extreme and distorting it, leading to an opposition between the national and the international interests. The socialistic flourishing of the national has nothing at all in common with the growth of nationalism, inasmuch as it originates on the basis of and by means of the rapprochement of nations under the conditions of their growing international unity.

Here too there is an obvious manifestation of something which has been inherent to anti-communism since the time of its emergence--a conscious attempt to present what is desired as what is the reality; this has been expressed in a thousand and one attempts to depict socialism as "not of long duration," "incapable of adapting to life," Marxism-Leninism as "obsolete," and the USSR as a "disintegrating empire."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The arguments of history have proved to be more substantial; they have overturned these appraisals and forecasts of the bourgeois ideologists, who are now compelled to make adaptations, to twist and turn in order to extricate themselves from the obstructions of their own lies and slander. Year after year the anti-communists have expounded on the "assimilation" and "Russification" of the non-Russian peoples of the USSR, on the destruction of their cultures, national languages, and traditions. They have passed over in silence or have distorted the truth about the well-targeted work of the party with regard to creating national statehood, the preservation and development of the cultural values of each Soviet people, developing a written literature, scholarship on the national languages and literatures, training personnel of the national intelligentsia, a national press, creating a system of education and health care in the national republics, and overcoming any sorts of evidence of mistrust or enmity among the peoples with regard to their consolidation into a unified, friendly family. Now, when the fruits of this titanic activity are at hand and cannot be denied, there remains nothing left for the anti-communists to do but proclaim these fruits not to be the result of the CPSU's nationality policy but, on the contrary, manifestations of nationalism which are in contradiction to this policy. But there is a substantial flaw in the given class logic of our ideological opponents--the derived supposition concerning the "assimilating," "anti-national" nature of the party's policy is false, and, therefore, the conclusion concerning the nationalism of the Soviet, in particular, the Central Asian peoples is invalid. In order to provide support for the myth of the "nationalism" of the non-Russian peoples, use is also made of our press's critical materials concerning individual manifestations of localism, national limitedness, and the struggle against nationalistic vestiges. The role of these phenomena in the life of Soviet society is so distorted and exaggerated that the most zealous Sovietologists, such as the West German, G. Simon, reach the point of uttering such absurdities as the following: that "opposition nationalist movements exist today in the Soviet Union on a large scale" [12, p 48], and that "the demands of the nationalist dissidents have become more radical, as compared with the 1960's" [12, p 49].

In order to refute such imaginings, it is sufficient to refer to those bourgeois scholars themselves who (in contrast to G. Simon) have visited the Land of the Soviets and had opportunities to convince themselves with their own eyes of the actual state of affairs. Thus, Professor D. Montgomery, who spent six months in Tashkent, did not discover any sort of manifestations whatsoever of tension or enmity in the interpersonal relations of members of various nationality groups, not to mention any mythical "nationalistic movements." Here is what he writes: "In my meetings with Uzbeks and members of the other Central Asian peoples in Tashkent I did not hear any sort of expression of enmity or negative attitude toward the Russians or other Soviet Europeans" [15, p 301]; "in Uzbekistan there exists a high degree of harmony among the ethnic groups" [15, p 299]; "in Tashkent I never encountered anything that could be interpreted as an anti-Soviet attitude or dissatisfaction with the general system of political and economic organization" [15, p 292]. It should be noted that the statements by the professor quoted above are far from being dictated by any sympathies for socialism or for the Land of the Soviets, inasmuch as he devotes much greater attention to our difficulties and, in certain instances, patently exaggerates them.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Another American professor, who also visited the USSR in the summer of 1976, writes as follows: "The dissident movement in the USSR has received extensive coverage in the Western press. Alas, most of what the mass media are talking about is not so much actual as desirable" [8, p 161]. Further on this author emphasizes that there are very few Soviet dissidents, that these elements do not express the interests of wide circles of the population, nor do they constitute an organized movement with common goals and interests.

And even if one has not visited the USSR but has a sober head on one's shoulders, one can more or less objectively judge the Soviet reality.

As an example, let us refer to such an experienced political scientist, well-known in Sovietological circles of the West as a specialist on Asian problems, as G. Wheeler, who, despite his anti-Soviet bent, has been compelled to remark on the "absence of any evidence at all of an organized dissident movement" in Central Asia. "Under present conditions there are no prospects for a Muslim nationalistic movement similar to the nationalistic movements of the Muslim peoples of the Middle East and South Asia," G. Wheeler emphasizes in his article entitled "Islam and the Soviet Union." "It is undoubtedly true, however, that despite Soviet efforts, or even as a result of them, there has been a growth of national awareness in recent years among Soviet Muslims" [15, p 250].

These last few words must be particularly emphasized, for it is on the sophistic substitution of the concept of national awareness for the polar concept of nationalism that most of the anti-communist constructs rest. If the socialist system is, in principle, undermining the foundations of nationalism and eliminating the social class soil which nourishes it, then it opens up broad possibilities for the growth of national awareness. The creation of national statehood for previously oppressed peoples, the free development of national languages, cultures, traditions, the enormous socioeconomic successes, achieved in international unity with fraternal peoples and other factors of this flowering have facilitated the development of national pride and socialist national awareness among the peoples of the USSR. The anti-communists are also attempting to direct this healthy growth of national awareness into the distorted riverbed of nationalism.

Sovietologists seeking nationalist or racial disturbances and dissatisfaction in the Land of the Soviets would do better to pay attention to the situation in their own countries. It would not cost American Sovietologists any efforts at all to discover such phenomena in their own country. Suffice it to say that, according to American sources, approximately 330 instances of racial conflicts to one degree of severity or the other were ascertained in the United States from November 1979 through April 1980. The mass outbreaks among Miami's blacks in May 1980, which were drowned in a sea of blood, reverberated widely within the country and abroad.

History has confirmed time and time again imperialism's fidelity to the traditions of racism and colonialism, which manifest themselves in segregation, apartheid, racial and national discrimination, as well as other forms of oppressing and demeaning minority peoples. An authoritative international commission of jurists, working in the United States from 3 through 20 August 1979 in its report presented to the UN found the United States guilty of criminal genocide against the country's indigenous population--the Indians. The planned physical extermination of

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the Indians on reservations, where poverty and diseases are rampant, the sterilization of Indian women, the murder of activists from the movement for the rights of red-skinned Americans--all this is a sad tradition of American reality [5]. As a result, the number of American Indians has been reduced from 12 million to 800,000.

The events in Iran and Afghanistan revived the hopes of our opponents for galvanizing the nationalistic moods in the Soviet republics bordering on these countries. However, acquaintanceship with the life of the peoples of these republics after the Iranian and Afghan revolutions disillusioned the bourgeois ideologists, who were compelled to state the following: "In the basic Muslim regions (i. e., the republics of Central Asia and Transcaucasia--O. R.) there is no visible anti-Russian nationalist movement" [16, p 55]. At the same time, it should be noted that the events in Iran and Afghanistan, along with the national-liberation movement in other countries, inspired the bourgeois Sovietologists to revive the concept of the so-called "Muslim national communism."

The gist of this concept, which is based on the idea of combining Marxism, nationalism, and Islam, amounts to an emasculation of the class contents of Marxism as a unified international theory and to the exaggeration of national specifics to the detriment of the international interests of the peoples. Sultan-Galiyev in his own time developed similar ideas, and historical practice has confirmed their erroneousness and reactionary nature. The failure of the idea of "national communism" has also been very clearly demonstrated by present-day China, in which a correct Marxist position on taking national characteristics into consideration in solving international problems, exaggerated and brought to the point of absurdity, has led to a serious deformation of the foundations of the socialist structure. Evidently just such a result is being counted on by our ideological adversaries, who are attempting to reanimate in our own days the ideas of Sultan-Galiyevism [9]. For example, it is to the memory of this nationalist that a book published in 1979 has been dedicated. It is by A. A. Benningsen and S. E. Wimbush and is entitled "Muslim National Communism in the Soviet Union," with the provocative sub-title "A Revolutionary Strategy for the Colonial World" [7].

The concept of "Muslim national communism" is one of the variants of a more general theory of the bourgeois political scientists and sociologists on nationalism as an all-encompassing ideology, capable of swallowing up even Marxism.

Large armies of ideological diversionists, instructed and equipped with the latest techniques, have been thrown into the fronts of the propaganda "cold war" which imperialism has now developed against the USSR. In no way should we underestimate this reactionary force nor its potentials for exerting an influence on the minds and hearts of people. A particular responsibility in the struggle against hostile ideology and propaganda rests on the intelligentsia. And not only because the exposure of the lying, slanderous nature of bourgeois propaganda is its direct duty to the people and the party, but also because the intelligentsia itself is one of the principal objects of ideological treatment by imperialism. It is precisely among the intelligentsia that our opponents seek out potential dissidents, attempting to play upon such strings as the intellectual's striving for a critical understanding of social and cultural life. The role of the intelligentsia as the creator, guardian, and transmitter of the nation's spiritual values conditions the receptivity of individual members of this social stratum to nationalist propaganda.

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Especially important under the given conditions is the high moral position of the intellectual, his communist world-view, his ability to correctly determine what answers to and what is harmful to the genuine national interests of his people.

It is said that shortcomings are essentially an extension of our merits. The meaning here is to emphasize how fine and difficult to catch is that borderline beyond which, for example, a legitimate national pride in the successes achieved becomes nationalist conceit and arrogance, while concern for the development of one's own people becomes narrow-minded nationalist egoism. In true internationalism the general and the particular always act in an indivisible unity within which the international is of determining importance for the development of the national. Moreover, practical experience has shown that even in our own times one encounters both underestimation and overestimation of the national factor, which is a basic cause of nationalistic manifestations under conditions of socialism.

Socialism guarantees the de jure and de facto equality of nations and nationality groups, thereby depriving of any meaning of the past division of peoples into large and small according to the criteria of quality and contents. Within the unified international family each Soviet people, regardless of its numbers, size of its territory, etc. has equal rights and equal opportunities for its own development; this has been established by law in the Constitution of the USSR. In an ethno-demographic sense, however, nations are not equal, and this objective fact has its own definite importance. This is manifested in the fact that that individual members of numerically large nations have an inherent tendency to underestimate the national factor, when they see the prospect for social development outside of the national framework and national forms, as a result of which the development of national relations seems to be something secondary and extra. At the same time certain members of the minority peoples are inclined to view the development of national relations outside the social changes of the community, and, to their way of thinking, the present and the future of the small nations may be described as a process of the unjustified and traceless annihilation of the national community with all the richness of its culture and potentials. Hence, the striving, no matter what, to preserve inviolate the various attributes of the national life, to halt the development of its customs and habits, and to maintain it in a state of unchangeability.

The psychological basis for the underestimation or overestimation of the national factor is the different degree of national sensitivity among the members of the large and small nations, its relative muffling among the former and exacerbation among the latter.

Thus, in the characteristics of the reactions of individual members of large and small nations to the process of internationalization there is manifested not only a relative independence of a lagging awareness but also, in a limited measure, differences in the ethno-demographic potentials of the nations [see 3].

The characteristics enumerated above must be considered in daily activities, in our work regarding the internationalist education of working people. The effectiveness of this method for overcoming nationalist vestiges increases if the educational work is approached in a differentiated manner, i. e., precisely as follows: among the working people of the large nations the accent must be placed on showing the dependence of the rapprochement of the nations on their prosperity, while among the working people of the small nations the emphasis ought to be made

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

on disclosing the reverse dependence--that of the development and prosperity of nations and nationality groups on their mutual cooperation and rapprochement. The exclusion of a one-sided approach to the solution of nationality problems, the correct combination of the general and the particular, the international and national in social development, the skillful and flexible regulation of national relations --this is what serves as a pledge for the successful struggle against individual manifestations of nationalism and its vestiges under conditions of socialism, as a guarantee against their reproduction in our society.

## FOOTNOTES

1. V. I. Lenin, "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" [Complete Works], Vol 17.
2. L. I. Brezhnev, "O vneshney politike KPSS i Sovetskogo gosudarstva. Rechi i stat'ii" [On the Foreign Policy of the CPSU and the Soviet State: Speeches and Articles], Moscow, 1973.
3. M. V. Iordan, "Internatsionalizma protiv natsionalizma" [Internationalism versus Nationalism], Moscow, 1980.
4. L. V. Metelitsa, "Nationalizm v sovremennoy ideologicheskoy bor'be" [Internationalism in the Present-Day Ideological Struggle], Moscow, 1971.
5. PRAVDA, 19 May 1980.
6. E. Allworth, "Central Asian Publishing and the Rise of Nationalism," New York, 1965.
7. A. A. Benningsen and S. E. Wimbush, "Muslim National Communism in the Soviet Union: A Revolutionary Strategy for the Colonial World," Chicago--London, 1979.
8. Leo Hecht, "The USSR Today: Facts and Interpretations", Springfield, 1978.
9. "Marxism and the Muslim World", Zed Press, London, 1979.
10. Rakowska-Harmstone, "Russia and Nationalism in Central Asia. The Case of Tadzhikistan [sic]", London, 1970.
11. Seton-Watson, "Nationalism and Communism", London, 1964.
12. Simon Gerhard, "Die Nichtrussischen Volker in Gesellschaft und Innenpolitik der UdSSR [The Non-Russian Peoples in Society and Domestic Policy of the USSR]", Cologne, 1979.
13. Simon Gerhard, "Nationalismus und Nationalitatenpolitik in der Sowjetunion seit Stalin [Nationalism and Nationality Policy in the Soviet Union since Stalin]", Cologne, 1979.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

14. I. Snyder, "The New Nationalism", Ithaca, New York, 1965.
15. ASIAN AFFAIRS, 1979, Vol X, part 3.
16. ECONOMIST, 1979, Vol 272, No 7097, 8 Sep.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "ylym", 1981

2384  
CSO: 1830/28

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTERNATIONAL

SOVIET EXPERIENCE APPLIED TO NATIONALITY PROBLEMS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Ashkhabad IZVESTIYA AKADEMII NAUK TURKMENSKOY SSR, SERIYA OBSHCHESTVENNYKH NAUK, No 4, Apr 81 pp 18-22

[Article by I. Khalmuradov, Turkmen State Institute imeni V. I. Lenin: "Soviet Experience in Solving the National Problem and the Developing Countries"/]

[Text/ The Great October Socialist Revolution laid a firm foundation for the flowing together into a single riverbed of the moving forces of the world revolutionary process; that of the world's first socialist state (now a world system of socialism), as well as those of the international labor movement and the national-liberation struggle. The development of this process is taking place under the enormous influence of the experience of the Land of the Soviets, where the revolutionary-transformational ideas of Marx, Engels, and Lenin are being implemented.

In the eyes of the toiling masses of the East our country is the embodiment of the ideals of justice and liberty, of the struggle for a better future for the working people and for all mankind. The ideas of the October Revolution and the experience of building socialism in the USSR have become attainable by the working people in countries all over the world--in the West as well as in the East.

The tremendous successes and achievements of the Soviet republics, of all the peoples of the USSR, are the result of carrying out the Leninist nationality policy, an important factor of the revolutionary national-liberation movement in the Eastern countries.

The ideologists of imperialism are applying great efforts to hinder the use of our experience by the developing countries. They are striving to distort it in all manner of ways, while, at the same time, imposing various forms of neo-colonialism on these peoples. In the ideological sphere neo-colonialism has manifested itself as anti-communism. In other words, the ideology of neo-colonialism is a part of anti-communism. W. Kolarz, for example, writes that the communist theory on the national problem was created on the basis of materials of Europe, North Caucasus, Transcaucasia, Soviet Central Asia, and that it cannot be acceptable for other countries [13, p 137].

After the victory of the October Revolution Russia comprised a combination of peoples who were at various levels of development. Here were regions with high and middle levels of capitalist development, as well as regions where feudal, semi-feudal, and even patriarchal relations existed. Hence, the experience of the socio-economic and cultural-political changes among our peoples are acceptable not only

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

for the industrial but also for the developing countries. The successful solution of the national problem in our country has shown that the policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state is the truly correct policy, ensuring liberty, sovereignty, and equal rights of all nations and peoples. L. I. Brezhnev has remarked as follows: "Summing up the results of the heroic achievements of the past half-century, we are entirely justified in stating that the national problem, in that form in which it has come down to us from the past, has been fully resolved, resolved finally and once and for all. This achievement, which can rightfully be placed alongside such victories in building a new society in the USSR as industrialization, collectivization, and the cultural revolution" [3, pp 11-12/].

Bourgeois ideologists, reformists, and revisionists have striven to prove that there can be no common principles in building socialism, including any in the field of national relations; they have stepped up their attacks on proletarian internationalism, made absolutes out of national characteristics, and pushed other peoples onto the capitalist path of development. These attempts found reflection in the so-called theory of "democratic socialism," as set forth by present-day reformists. There are also other theories of national variants of socialism (African, Arab, Indian, etc.). These theories are either the result of immaturity on the part of the revolutionary movement in individual countries or a means by which the bourgeoisie deceive the peoples of the newly liberated countries. The ideologists of the bourgeoisie disseminate the particular traits of the "pragmatic socialism" or "lyrical socialism" of L. Senghor, which is directed against genuine socialism.

Today "African socialism" is lauded to the skies by the ideologists of neo-colonialism, especially by the leaders of social-reformism. The Socialist International is striving to unite "African socialism" with the international social-democratic movement on an anti-communist basis. That same Senghor, appearing at a conference of 26 political parties of Africa, held in Tunis in 1975, spoke about the unadaptability of Marxism-Leninism to the conditions of Africa. He even denied the decisive role of world socialism in the revolutionary struggle and accused the communist movement of attempting to impose a "uniform model" of development on the young states, etc. [12, p 53/]. However, many leaders of the liberated countries understand the necessity of studying the ideas of building socialism. At the Sixth Congress of the Democratic Party of Guinea Sékou Touré declared that to speak about African socialism is just as fallacious as to speak about Senegalese chemistry or Moroccan mathematics [11, p 129/].

No one denies that the solution of the national problem and other problems has specific characteristics among different peoples. But they can acquire a great deal which is useful for themselves by utilizing the experience of the socialist countries. The peoples of the developing countries are confronted with approximately the same problems which had to be solved by the peoples of Central Asia: industrialization as a basis for strengthening economic independence; carrying out agrarian reforms; abolishing age-old cultural backwardness and the development of a national culture; the training of national staffs; the overcoming of inter-national and inter-tribal conflicts and the consolidation of the population on the basis of a revolutionary program; the conduct of a consistent peace-loving and foreign-policy course and the struggle against imperialism and aggression, for cooperation with all countries on an equal-rights basis. V. I. Lenin foresaw that "all the primary

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

and many of the secondary traits of our revolution are of international importance in the sense of its influence on all countries" [2, p 3].

In formerly backward countries socialist production relations are being formed on the basis of weakly developed production forces. As a result there arise difficulties in creating a material-technical base for socialism. Hence, the necessity for industrialization. Building socialism cannot be considered completed if industry does not exert a substantial influence on agriculture, but depends on agriculture, and if a system of machine production has not taken shape.

As is known, prior to 1917 two-thirds of mankind was living in feudal and semi-feudal countries. From this fact it is obvious what importance pertains to the experience of making the transition to socialism by-passing capitalism.

Also instructive are such aspects of the experience of the peoples of the Soviet East as the introduction of the language of the native population into state administration, the development of a written literary language based on the popular-spoken language, the economic development of mining and desert regions, irrigation and land reclamation, carrying on a struggle with the aid of medicine against such widespread diseases in the East as malaria, trachoma, mange, and others. Of great interest for the progressive forces of Asia and Africa is the solution of the women's question in Central Asia and the liberation of the women of the Soviet East.

The acquisition of national independence by the formerly oppressed peoples of Russia has exerted a great influence on the patriotic forces of the colonial and dependent countries. The head of the first Afghan mission, upon arriving in Moscow stated the following: "My government has devoted its principal attention to the independence and self-sufficiency of all Muslim republics. And so (we) greet all these elevated ideas, all these lofty slogans which have been put into practice, thanks to which the Kirghiz Republic, the Khorezm Republic, and the Bukharan Republic have attained their own independence and self-sufficiency" [10, pp 249-250].

The experience of resolving the national problem in the Central Asian republics and certain other parts of our country has shown that the complex problems of the developing countries, connected with the regulation of inter-national and inter-tribal relations can be successfully solved by means of building a new, socialist society, free of all forms of exploitation. One of the results of promulgating the Leninist nationality policy has been the rise in our country of Union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and national okrugs. All these forms of national statehood have afforded the opportunity to give fuller and deeper consideration to the national characteristics of peoples, their everyday way of life, customs, and traditions. And this has drawn the organs of Soviet power still closer to all peoples. Serving as an example of the drawing closer of the Soviets to the toiling masses was the national-state demarcation of Central Asia in 1924. As a result of this, the international ties among the peoples of Central Asia and the entire country have become even stronger and firmer.

Many bourgeois authors have been compelled to recognize the successes of the Central Asian peoples in the economy and culture. M. Rywkin acknowledges that "the achievements in the field of education in Central Asia are impressive. Russian and Muslim children have equal opportunities for study." He writes that as early as 1950 school attendance in Uzbekistan was close to the level of the southern states of America [16, pp 95-96].

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

W. Kolarz also admits that with regard to economic and cultural development the republics of Central Asia stand much higher than the developing countries of Asia and Africa. He writes that the number of schools in Uzbekistan, the industrial development of Azerbaijan, the extensive irrigation structures of Turkmenistan, and the highly organized health care of Kirghizia cannot be compared with Iran or Pakistan [13, p 126].

The reactionary bourgeois ideologists declare that the economy of the Central Asian republics was developed by means of force. Some of them even assert that the Central Asian peoples would have preferred to live in poverty and ignorance [15, p 112], whereas G. Wheeler considers the Soviet experience to be successful in many material aspects, but he accompanies all this with the words "colonial exploitation," "imperialist domination," etc. [17, p 250].

Thus, even those bourgeois authors who have been compelled to acknowledge the successes of the Soviet nationality policy strive to conceal the true sources of these successes or are silent about them. And these sources comprise proletarian internationalism, the friendship and fraternal mutual aid among peoples, the overcoming of economic and cultural backwardness, the nature of the socialist system itself, and the implementation of the Leninist nationality policy. The experience of the Soviet multi-national state teaches that the unification of material and labor resources speeds up the economic and cultural progress of each nation individually and of the country as a whole.

The Soviet state has made widespread use of the unified state budget for redistributing the country's financial resources in order to equalize the level of the economic development of the individual republics. This is testified to by the following data: the proportion of outlays on the national economy amounted to the following in the period 1925/26 in the state budget of the RSFSR 11.6 percent, the Ukraine 15.9 percent, the Turkmen SSR 33.4 percent, and the Uzbek SSR 24.3 percent. In the next budget year these figures amounted respectively to 16.7, 21.3, 36.5, and 33.1 percent. Also testifying about the redistribution of funds is the differing proportion of revenues from the All-Union budget within the total sum of the incomes from the republics. For the RSFSR this indicator amounted in 1931 to 18 percent, the Ukraine 21, the Turkmen SSR 80, the Uzbek SSR 58, the Tajik SSR 82 percent [7, pp 36-39].

In pre-revolutionary Turkmenistan industry was poorly developed. But now this republic's territory is covered with a dense network of industrial enterprises. The leading branches of industry are the petroleum, chemical, gas-extraction, and machine-building industries. Over the 60 years of the Soviet regime the volume of industrial production in this republic has increased by a factor of 75. In 1977 six times as much electric power was produced in the republic for one day than was produced throughout all of the year 1913 [5, pp 26-28].

In the struggle to overcome de facto inequality in the sphere of culture as well as in the sphere of economic development the Soviet state redistributed the total financial resources of the country for the benefit of the previously backward peoples. Fraternal aid in developing education was expressed not only in the allocation of the necessary funds. It also manifested itself in such forms as the development and printing of textbooks, the transmitting of pedagogical experience, assignment of teachers, and reserving places in the VUZ's of the country's central cities.

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

As a result of the concerned care of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, the aid of the Great Russian people and that of the country's other peoples gradually overcame the inequality in the spheres of education and culture. By the end of the Second Five-Year Plan the number of pupils in the general-education schools, as compared with 1914/15 had increased on the whole throughout the Soviet Union by a factor of 4.7, while in Turkmenistan the figure was 23, in Kirghizia--32.4, Uzbekistan--19.4, Tajikistan--68.2 [6, p 250].

In 1914 the Trans-Caspian Province had 58 general-education schools, where about 7,000 children of tsarist officials and local landowners were enrolled. There were no technical schools nor any other secondary special educational institutions, without even mentioning higher educational institutions. Only 15 kopecks per capita were allocated for public education [8, pp 184-185]. During the year of its formation the Turkmen SSR stood near the bottom of the entire country with regard to the level of literacy. Now Turkmenistan has been transformed into a republic of solid literacy.

The economic and cultural achievements of the previously backward peoples of the USSR have a magnetic force for the developing countries. The following words of V. I. Lenin are coming true: "For all of Asia and for all the world's colonies, for thousands and millions of people the attitude of the Soviet republic of workers and peasants toward the weak, up-to-now oppressed peoples will be of practical importance" [1, p 304]. One of the testimonies of the growing interest on the part of the world community in our achievements is the holding of a UNESCO conference in Ashkhabad in 1972. Such conferences, symposia, and seminars are also being held in the capitals of the other Central Asian republics.

Works by honest, objective bourgeois scholars also constitute an answer to the falsifiers. The progressive American bourgeois historian C. Lamont has justly remarked that the Soviets have put an end to all forms of ethnic discrimination [14, p 104]. He emphasizes the great international importance of attitudes toward the national minorities in the Soviet Union [14, p 80].

In such countries as Turkey, Iran, Pakistan the population even now is approximately at the same stage as were the peoples of Soviet Central Asia under tsarism and the domination of the feudal lords. They are just as deprived of their rights, in just as much darkness and ignorance as they were half a century ago. The exploiter classes there are to blame for prolonging the national enmity between the members of the various peoples.

Hunger, need, diseases, and a high infant mortality rate were the lot of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries of 60 years ago; their situation is no better even now. The infant mortality rate remains high in Turkey. On the average 150 out of every 1,000 newly born infants die before the age of one year. In certain of the most backward countries of Asia and Africa only one-third of the children in the appropriate age group are enrolled in the elementary schools. One of the reasons for this is the difficult material situation. In many families the incomes are so low that the parents are not able to acquire textbooks or a school uniform for their child. In Turkey a school uniform, textbooks, and writing materials cost at least 1,000 liras, whereas the average wages of a Turkish worker amount to 1,100 liras [9, pp 15-16].

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

History has confirmed the correctness of V. I. Lenin's foresight that "with the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries the backward countries can make the transition to the Soviet system and through specific stages of development--to communism, by-passing the capitalist stage of development" [2, p 246]. The successful solution of the nationality problem in our country serves as one of the indicators of socialism, vivid and accessible to the understanding of the broad masses of the people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Ylym", 1981

2384

CSO: 1830/29

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTERNATIONAL

BOOK ON SOUTH YEMEN'S SOCIAL, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Moscow NARODNAYA DEMOKRATICHESKAYA RESPUBLIKA YEMENA: EKONOMIKA I TORGOVO-EKONOMICHESKIYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian 1981 (signed to press 24 Apr 81) pp 1-2, 175-176

[Table of contents and brief description of book by V.N. Burmistrov]

[Excerpts] Title Page:

Title: NARODNAYA DEMOKRATICHESKAYA RESPUBLIKA YEMENA: EKONOMIKA I TORGOVO-EKONOMICHESKIYA OTNOSHENIYA (The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen: the Economy and Economic Trade Relations)  
Publisher: "Nauka"  
Place and year of publication: Moscow, 1981

Signed to Press Date: 24 April 1981

Number of Copies Published: 2000

Number of Pages: 176

Brief Description:

The main directions in the development of South Yemen's economy in the colonial period, after winning independence, and at the present stage of implementing reforms in South Yemen are covered. The foreign trade policies, means of state control of the republic's foreign trade, and basic trends in the development of foreign economic trade ties are examined.

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 3

Chapter 1. Characteristics of the Social-Economic Development of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and the Role of Foreign Trade in the Country's Economy..... 11

1. Characteristics of the social-economic development of South Yemen in the period of colonial enslavement..... 11

2. Social-economic reforms in the period of South Yemen's independent development..... 22

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

3. General characteristics of South Yemen's present economic state.....	39
4. The role of foreign trade in the country's economy.....	60
Chapter 2. The Basic Principles of Foreign Trade Policies and the Means of State Control of South Yemen's Foreign Trade.....	65
1. The basic principles of South Yemen's foreign trade policy.....	65
2. The role of the state in South Yemen's foreign trade.....	71
3. The means of state control of South Yemen's foreign trade.....	78
Chapter 3. Basic Trends in the Development of South Yemen's Economic Trade Ties.....	89
1. The dynamics, structure and geographic distribution of South Yemen's foreign trade.....	89
2. Characteristics of South Yemen's economic trade ties with capitalist countries.....	113
3. South Yemen's economic trade ties with developing countries.....	122
4. South Yemen's economic trade cooperation with socialist countries.....	128
5. South Yemen's economic trade cooperation with the Soviet Union.....	134
Conclusion.....	141
Appendixes.....	152
Footnotes.....	172

COPYRIGHT: Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatel'stva "Nauka", 1981

CSO: 1807

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTERNATIONAL

BOOK ON DOMESTIC FACTORS AFFECTING U.S. FOREIGN POLICY REVIEWED

Moscow VOPROSY ISTORII in Russian No 9, Sep 81 pp 152-154

[V.F. Petrovskiy review of A.A. Kokoshin book on U.S. foreign policy\*]

[Text] The monograph by A.A. Kokoshin, candidate of historical sciences and head of the Domestic Policy Problems of the United States Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada, is the result of a thorough study of the domestic factors of American imperialism's foreign policy. This is the first comprehensive work on such an important and pertinent subject in Soviet American studies since the publication in 1965 of the collective work "Dvizhushchiye sily vneshney politiki SShA" [Driving Forces of U.S. Foreign Policy].

A study of the domestic factors of the formation of U.S. foreign policy with the accent on superstructural phenomena in American society helps us get to the essence of the complex processes currently occurring in U.S. political life and understand the ongoing turnabout toward the country's militarization and the exacerbation of confrontation in the international arena. Concentration of attention in the 1970's, that is, in a period when many processes and phenomena ripened which have been developed in our day, makes it possible to ascertain long-term trends in American foreign policy.

Systematizing a vast amount of material, the author has concretely shown the connection between U.S. foreign and domestic policy, revealed the imperialist nature and content of this policy and attempted to determine the trends of its further development. A.A. Kokoshin devotes much space to the change in the United States' international positions in the 1970's and its impact on domestic policy and socioeconomic processes in the country. And this is perfectly justified inasmuch as there was a marked increase in the United States' dependence on the outside world in the said period. It is becoming a long-term factor which is exerting and, to judge by everything, will continue to exert an ever increasing influence on the development of domestic processes in the United States. The depth and extensiveness of the relations

\*"SShA: za fasadom global'noy politiki (Vnutrenniye faktory formirovaniya vneshney politiki amerikanskogo imperializma na poroge 80-x godov)" [The United States: Behind the Facade of Global Policy (Domestic Factors of the Formation of the Foreign Policy of American Imperialism on the Threshold of the 1980's)], Moscow, Politizdat, 1981, p 368.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

between external, international processes and the trends of the United States' domestic development have in recent years come to approach what West Europe, for example, has been experiencing for many years now.

The examination of the change in the United States' international positions and their impact on the domestic political and socioeconomic processes in the country serves as a point of departure for the author for an analysis of the domestic factors of American imperialism's foreign policy. The book attempts to synthesize this analysis with the results of a study of the changes which occurred in the United States' international positions in the 1970's. True, this is not entirely successful, which has to be explained to a considerable extent by the complexity of the task set by A.A. Kokoshin and also the insufficient number of sources and material.

The book examines the singularities of the United States' current domestic economic situation, the main social problems and the trends in the development of mass public movements. The multilevel analysis of the energy crisis as the most acute domestic and foreign policy problem of the United States, and not only economic but also social problem, moreover, is of particular interest. Unfortunately, the author has concentrated almost all his attention on oil imports and oil and gas prices and paid insufficient attention to the struggle over questions of the development of nuclear power engineering, which was characterized by considerable sharpness in the 1970's. Its results were reflected in the energy policy of the monopolies and the J. Carter administration.

The book's analysis of the struggle in the United States over the question of the order of priority and correlation of the state's foreign and domestic tasks, that is, "national priorities" may be considered successful. The author examines the activity of the military-industrial complex as the main force of imperialism and reaction in U.S. domestic and foreign policy, studies the dynamics of the alignment of forces in the ruling elite in connection with the discussion of "national priorities," traces their reflection in the federal budget and describes the role of numerous public-political movements in the struggle on this problem. The monograph's analysis enables us to comprehend in greater depth the reasons for the U.S. ruling circles' transition to a policy of detente at the start of the 1970's. The author establishes, for example, the existence of a definite connection between the switch from a policy of confrontation to negotiation and a certain restructuring of the federal budget, particularly the reduction and limitation of military spending. In the same way the author also reveals the factors of the U.S. ruling elite's departure from this policy in the latter half of the 1970's, which are characterized by the start of a new buildup of military preparations and increased appropriations for military needs.

Investigating the crisis of power and its foreign policy significance, A. A. Kokoshin devotes paramount attention to the "Watergate affair"--its sources, dynamics and consequences. The author is far from having simplistic ideas about this affair. He shows the entire complexity and at times ambiguousness of the factors which brought about this biggest crisis of presidential authority in the country's history, which also had a considerable impact on its foreign policy. The book shows convincingly that Watergate cannot be viewed as a phenomenon typical only of the political life of 1973-1977; the consequences of this crisis were reflected not only in the position of the administration of G. Ford but of J. Carter also. The author

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

reveals the strength and depth of the influence of the Watergate crisis on the subsequent development of the entire system of federal authority in the United States.

The study of the crisis of power, particularly from a foreign policy angle, enables us to compose a more profound idea of the formation and practical implementation of American imperialism's foreign policy. Taking into consideration the fact that the formal structure of the American foreign policy mechanism has been studied in great detail by a number of Soviet scholars (A.A. Mishin, R.G. Bogdanov, Yu.A. Shvedkov, P.T. Podlesnyy and others), the author puts the accent on how this mechanism operates in practice and, what is of particular interest, how foreign policy is shaped at the highest level of federal power. The monograph justifiably pays particular attention to organizations of the ruling class, particularly the activity of the foreign policy lobby and its role in the power mechanism in the United States.

The fruitfulness of such an approach was graphically revealed upon the author's examination of the conflicts in the J. Carter administration. The monograph shows the persons who really influence the formation of foreign policy decisions at the highest level. There are among these not only the president himself, his national security adviser, secretary of state and defense secretary but also the White House chief of staff, domestic policy adviser, legal adviser and others. The author shows how in the "purely" foreign policy logic of decision-making on international issues are interwoven domestic policy, including purely business, considerations which increase the unpredictability and zigzag appearance of U.S. policy in the international arena and make the United States an even more unsuitable partner for constructive foreign policy acts.

Today it is obvious that much of what was typical of the "post-Watergate" G. Ford and J. Carter administrations in the sphere of the functioning of the highest echelon of the United States' foreign policy mechanism is also characteristic of the R. Reagan administration, in which there is an incessant struggle for influence-- among the secretary of state, leaders of the White House staff, the vice president and certain other figures and their groupings.

The monograph's analysis of the domestic factors of the formation of U.S. foreign policy helps us understand more deeply the essence of the present global strategy manipulations of American imperialism, which are perfectly definitely based on achieving world domination. For this purpose U.S. ruling circles are setting themselves the task of securing military superiority over socialism, achieving leadership in the capitalist system and resisting the social renewal of the world with every means. At the same time this analysis shows what an effect domestic policy processes are having on U.S. strategy and diplomacy.

The monograph under review, which contains much very useful and hitherto little-known material, will undoubtedly attract the attention of all who are interested in contemporary problems of American imperialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Voprosy istorii", 1981

8850  
CSO: 1807/7

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

NATIONAL

WESTERN VIEWS ON SOVIET ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ATTACKED

Moscow VOPROSY EKONOMIKI in Russian No 10, Oct 81 pp 100-109

[Article by Yevgeniy Sergeyevich Troitskiy, doctor of philosophical sciences, Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee: "Economic Unity of the Peoples of the USSR and Bankruptcy of the Bourgeois Falsifications"]

[Text] The resolution of the national question, formation of socialist national relations, and formation of a new historical community, the Soviet people, are important results of building socialism in the USSR. "Fraternal friendship of a all the peoples of our multinational motherland is being steadily strengthened," the Accountability Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th Party Congress stresses. "Our course is to increase the material and spiritual potential of each republic, and at the same time, its maximum use for the harmonious development of the entire country. We have made truly historical advances on this path."

With a radical change in the correlation of forces in the international arena in favor of the socialist system, and strengthening of the world revolutionary process as a whole, the imperialist reaction places great stakes on undermining ideological work in the socialist countries. In particular, the spokesmen for its interests distort the essence and the forms of manifestation of the processes of strengthening the economic unity of the socialist nations and nationalities. For example, the French "sovietologist" H. Carrère d'Encausse compares the USSR with a "colonial empire."<sup>1</sup> The Swiss professor, L. Revesz and other anticommunists, repeat over and over the "colonial nature" of the economic policy of the CPSU.<sup>2</sup> The antisoviets try to slander the economic and national policy of the Leninist party, the relations between different socialist nations and nationalities, and in this manner to shake their solidarity and friendship, and the monolithic economic foundation for the social international community. Their goal is to weaken the great magnetic force of the economic and national policy of the CPSU and its influence on the progress of mankind.

Falsification of Socioeconomic Fundamentals of Friendship of the Peoples of the USSR

Deepening of national economic cooperation of our republics under conditions of mature socialism is characterized by a further increase in the significance of the socialist system of public relations, and the role of the national and kolkhoz-cooperative property. Speaking about the accomplishments of the Soviet people in economics, culture and other spheres of life, and the blossoming of the Uzbek

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

socialist nation, candidate for membership to the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, First Secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee Sh. Rashidov noted: "When you really make an evaluation of what has been accomplished and you look into our socialist reality, you involuntarily ask the question: where did these rich fruits come from? There is one answer: they are the natural result of the development of the Soviet society, the result of indisputable advantages of socialism, the Soviet way of life, our social and state structure over capitalism."

The essence of national relations of the socialist type, and their progressiveness are primarily determined by the nature of the socialist social structure. This is why the anticommunists advance the thesis that public ownership of the means of production in the USSR, and centralized national economic planning supposedly cause difficulties, crisis phenomena in the economy, in the sphere of social and national relations, create obstacles to the improvement in the "quality of life" of the peoples of the USSR.<sup>4</sup> Some "sovietologists," counting on the degeneration of our society, assert that the interests of development of the peoples of the USSR are supposedly incompatible with communism, with the production relations existing in our country.<sup>5</sup>

These inventions clearly contradict reality. The volume of industrial production of the USSR in 1979 was 157-fold greater than the 1913 level, while in Belorussia it was correspondingly 221, in Kazakhstan 238, Moldavia 281, Khirgizia 344-fold, etc. The advanced rates of development of previously backward regions, and their comprehensive socioeconomic progress have become possible namely under socialism.

Kazakhstan, at one time the poor outskirts of Russia, has now taken third place among the union republics for the level of industrial development, and has become a region of the coal, oil, mining, light and food industry. In the years of the 10th Five-Year Plan alone, 250 industrial enterprises, shops and industries were started up here. In the framework of the Pavlodar-Ekibastuz territorial production complex, tractors, ferroalloys, alumina, and products of the chemical and oil refining industries are produced. After development of the virgin land, the Kazakh SSR occupied one of the leading places in the Soviet Union for the production of agricultural products.

Public ownership of the means of production and centralized economic planning in which all of the peoples of the USSR actively participate is the basis for the economic achievements of the socialist nations and nationalities. However, certain bourgeois falsifiers of the development of socioeconomic and national relations in the USSR, defending the "theory of convergence," view socialist ownership and the ownership of capitalist monopolies as factors which supposedly have equal importance in solving the national question. Proponents of this theory often say that the nature of relations of ownership does not fundamentally affect the development of national relations and international conflicts.<sup>6</sup> For example, N. Glazer and D. Moynihan (United States) believe that in the modern world, social stratification primarily depends on the ethnic community, while the nature of ownership in this case supposedly plays a secondary role.<sup>7</sup>

This type of "methodology" however cannot serve as the basis for a scientific analysis of the mutual influence of economics and national relations. Marxist science proved long ago the radical, fundamental difference between socialist and state-monopolistic ownership. State enterprises in the capitalist enterprises serve in the final analysis to enrich the monopolies and extract an

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

additional cost. Under socialism, man's exploitation of man is eliminated. The all-power of the monopolies, especially the transnational ones, is the source of class and national oppression. The enterprises of the transnational corporations which control about half of the industrial production of the capitalist world exploit millions of workers of different countries. The immigrant workers and the national minorities are in an especially difficult position. According to the estimates of the National Chairman of the U.S. Communist Party G. Winston, almost 50 million Blacks, people of Asian and Latin American extraction, American Indians and representatives of certain other national minorities suffer from racial oppression. The income of half of the Black families is below the officially established poverty level.

The situation of the national minorities in Canada, Great Britain and other countries is slightly better. The transnational corporations subject the workers of Asia, Africa and Latin America to neocolonial exploitation. The profits for the invested capital of foreign companies in the liberated countries is much higher than in the developed capitalist states. The imperialist monopolies generate international conflicts and frictions.

Public ownership plays a completely different social role. The founders of Marxism-Leninism have convincingly proved that the common interests of the people who have been liberated from oppression and exploitation lead to their actual unification.<sup>8</sup> Public ownership unites the working people of different nationalities and is the basis for the success of the Soviet people. The national economic complex of the USSR and the unity of the Soviet people will be strengthened on the basis of the socialist system of public relations. National differences in the Soviet Union do not result in conflicts since all peoples have common interests. The socialist social structure guarantees steady economic progress of different nations and nationalities.

Achievements in the economic development of a number of union republics in certain cases have forced recognition even from the agencies of the bourgeois press which are far from sympathetic towards the socialist states.<sup>9</sup> Certain Western researchers, in analyzing the problems of socioeconomic and national relations under capitalism reveal a picture which is disquieting for it. At the same time, they indicate weighty advantages of the socialist economy, and the achievements of the peoples of the USSR. "The Soviet national policy," wrote G. Zimon, "promoted the attainment of that level of development of the Asian peoples within the federation and in the direction of civilization, which considerably surpasses the level of development of the Asian peoples beyond the border, from China to Turkey."<sup>10</sup>

As is known, it is precisely the national minorities, the immigrant workers and the workers of the developing countries who become the first victims of economic crises in the capitalist world. Hundreds of thousands of immigrant workers have lost work in the FRG, France and other countries of West Europe because of the economic crises affecting the capitalist system. Thus, in 1974-1978, 450,000 Spaniards who had been working outside the country returned to Spain. The unemployment level in the United States among the Indians on the reservations is 9 times higher than on the average for the country.

Some representatives of bourgeois science do not distinguish between the two opposite types of national relations, capitalist and socialist. Thus, the

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

American professor R. Pipes who has become one of the advisers to the new U.S. administration, believes that the national policy and national problems in the Soviet Union supposedly have the same nature as in the capitalist countries.<sup>11</sup>

However, the practice of economic interrelations of the peoples of the USSR refutes such conjectures. The classics of Marxism-Leninism revealed that socio-economic relations determine the processes of formation of international and national relations and ties. This is why V. I. Lenin stressed that "under capitalism, it is impossible to eliminate national (and political in general) oppression."<sup>12</sup> The friendly and fruitful cooperation of Soviet socialist republics does not know the antagonisms that are inherent to capitalist society.

## Bourgeois Ideologues on the Unified National Economic Complex of the USSR

Ignoring the constructive role of the unified national economic complex of the USSR is one of the main trends in distorting the essence of Soviet economics and the socialist national relations. "The unified economic organism which has formed within the entire country," L. I. Brezhnev stressed at the 25th CPSU Congress, "is the strong material foundation for friendship and cooperation of the people." The national economic complex is the foundation for the indestructible international unity of the socialist nations and nationalities. Its development makes it possible to unify and efficiently use the resources of the country for the purposes of successful construction of communism, steady strengthening of the unity of the Soviet people as a social and international community of people, and improvement in the level of life of the Soviet citizens.

The Western economists ignore all of this, however, asserting that centralization of the economy and national economic planning supposedly have a "totalitarian" nature and violate the "freedom of economic activity" of the people. They contradict the national and international interests of the peoples of the USSR. In the opinion of some "sovietologists," because of centralization of economic control and the development of a unified national economic complex, the economic interests of a number of nations and nationalities of the USSR are supposedly infringed upon. The British bourgeois economist A. Nove, for example, wrote that the rights of the peoples of the USSR to solve questions of economic development are mainly fictitious.<sup>13</sup> Kh. Yu. Wibopuu (Austria) believes that the national minorities in the USSR are supposedly deprived of the right to determine their economic, political, social and cultural development.<sup>14</sup> He is echoed by the mentioned Revesz who wrote about "Soviet colonialism" in economics.<sup>15</sup>

Reality completely refutes this type of assertion. The Western ideologues do not take into consideration the deep organic interrelationship between the socialist ownership and political power which is in the hands of the people. The unified national economic complex in our country is characterized by a combination of centralized basis with freeing of local initiative, the national interests of the socialist nations and nationalities with international. The economy in all the union republics is controlled on principles of democratic centralism. This provides complete scope for the development of productive forces in the union and autonomous republics, the maximum utilization of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, and strengthening the common character of the life of the socialist nations.

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The multifaceted activity of the soviets of people's deputies and the active participation of the collectives of socialist enterprises in production control indicate the flimsiness of the attempts to present the USSR economic system as undemocratic. Socialist competition has become an important lever in involving the workers of all the union republics in control of the economy. The "worker's relay race" was thus born at the construction of the Nurek GES in Tajikistan. This is a unique form of socialist competition which rallied many enterprises of the RSFSR, the Ukraine and other republics. "Nurek sections" were set up at enterprises of 250 of the country's cities where the workers on mutual contracts with the builders search for reserves for early manufacture of industrial equipment of high quality.

The CPSU and the Soviet government have always focused and are focusing considerable attention on the development of a unified national economic complex. In this case they take into consideration both the national and the specific interests of all the union republics. In particular, the "Main Directions for Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and for the Period to 1990" set the task of guaranteeing an "improvement in the disposal of production forces in order to increase the efficiency of social production on the basis of further specialization and proportional development of the economy of the union republics and economic regions in the unified national economic complex of the country."

The attempts to cast a shadow on the economic unity of the socialist nations and nationalities are manifest in the fact that the West distorts the essence of the USSR Constitution which supposedly limits the rights of the union republics in the area of control of the economy.<sup>16</sup> At the same time, article 77 of the USSR Constitution clearly states that each union republic provides the integrated economic and social development for its territory. The rights of the union republics in control of the economy have been seriously expanded in recent years according to the decisions of the CPSU and the Soviet government. The new USSR Constitution, in addition to the former guarantees of the rights of the union republics, stipulates their right to participate in solving questions referring to management of the USSR, coordination and control of activity of enterprises, institutions and organizations of union subordination, and the right to legislative initiative in the USSR Supreme Soviet. The union republic constitutions have sections on the State Plan for Economic and Social Development and the State Budget. Thousands of state enterprises are under union republic subordination.

The peoples of all the union and autonomous republics are actively participating in solving questions of the socioeconomic development of their republics and the country as a whole. Thus, discussion of the draft of the CPSU Central Committee of "Main Directions for Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and for the Period to 1990" involved over 121 million people, representatives of all nations, nationalities, and national groups of our motherland. A large number of suggestions, additions and refinements were made, in particular in terms of satisfying certain economic needs of different union and autonomous republics. Many of these suggestions were adopted, and at the same time, the contents of this important document were enriched.

Expansion of the economic rights of the union republics is organically tied to strengthening of the centralized planned principle. According to the USSR Constitution, the competence of the USSR includes conducting a unified socioeconomic

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

policy, determination of the basic trends for scientific and technical progress, formulation and approval of the plans for development of the national economy and social-cultural construction. The centralized economic policy is conducted in the interests of improving the efficiency of social production and perfecting the efficient disposal of production forces. This provides direct benefit to all peoples of the USSR.

The organic unity of the labor efforts of the socialist nations and nationalities in the framework of a unified national economic complex is based on cooperation and specialization. The bourgeois economists, acting on the method of "the end justifies the means," falsify the processes of both cooperation and specialization of production. In the opinion of the authors of the article in the British journal THE ECONOMIST, specialization of the economy of a number of Soviet republics in the USSR national economic complex is supposedly done to prevent the creation in them of a multisector economy that could become a "base" for the separation of these republics from the USSR.<sup>17</sup>

However, the peoples of the Soviet Union do not think about leaving it, since real life demonstrates that unification of resources on the scale of a unified national economic complex is combined with the harmonious and comprehensive development of each republic. They implement production specialization in order to satisfy the constantly growing material and cultural needs of the population with regard for the national specific nature and cultural traditions. These processes are characteristic for all the union and autonomous republics.

Thus, in Azerbaijan before the revolution there were two developed branches of industrial production, oil extraction and oil refining. During the construction of socialism, this monotonous marketability was overcome through the creation and accelerated growth of other sectors of industry. Industry was set up with a broadly differentiated structure. The volume of industrial production in Azerbaijan in 1979 increased as compared to 1940 11-fold, and the production of electricity rose from 1.8 billion to 15.2 billion kW-h. The volume of production of the chemical and petrochemical industry increased 100-fold, metallurgy, machine construction and metal working 10-fold, etc.<sup>18</sup> "Azerbaijan, in the past one of the backward Transcaucasian regions of tsarist Russia," the Turkish journalist A. Dora noted, "is now a prosperous and industrially developed kray."

The "Main Directions for Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and for the Period to 1990" notes the further improvement in the structure of Azerbaijan industry through the advanced development of electrical engineering, instrument making, radio engineering, electronics and other sectors of the industry. Production in the light and food industry of the republic will rise 1.3-fold in 1985 as compared to 1980.

Socioeconomic progress of nations and nationalities of our country promotes the further strengthening of their economic unity, reinforcement of the solidarity of the Soviet people and refutes the conjectures of the bourgeois falsifiers who cherish the vain hope of disintegration of the Soviet society. The deepening internationalization of economic life and the growing economic interdependence of the nations and nationalities of the USSR is a factor of the solidarity of the Soviet people. All of them are vitally interested in a further improvement in cooperation of their labor efforts.

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Endeavoring to search for antagonism in the sphere of international economic relations of the peoples of the USSR, the anticommunists distort the nature of their cooperation. Thus, R. Pipes reiterates the economic "competition" which supposedly occurs between different union and autonomous republics.<sup>19</sup> Slanderous slogans of "competition" and "antagonisms" in the economic ties of the nations and nationalities of the USSR are disseminated by other Western ideologues as well.<sup>20</sup>

These assertions are groundless however. The unity of the national economic complex of the USSR which was organized on the principles of democratic centralism, is predetermined by the public ownership of the means of production, separation and cooperation of labor, common character of the basic interests and goals of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR that do not know any antagonistic contradictions in their development. The quality level and efficiency of their economic cooperation are steadily rising. "The life of today's Dagestan is unthinkable without machines, automobiles, and turbines sent from Russia, without coal of the Ukraine, oil of Azerbaijan and Siberia, and bread from Kazakhstan," wrote Dagestan resident M. Gadzhiev, CPSU member since 1924. "Without the Russian and Ukrainian teachers we would not have our schools, five VUZ's and 30 technical schools. If there were no friendship, we would never have had our powerful industry and hydroelectric power plants, of which a whole cascade is currently being erected on the Sulak."<sup>21</sup>

Strengthening of the national economic complex of the USSR, further deepening of mutual complementing of the national economy of all republics, and the successful work of the laborers in each republic is the guarantee of their further prospering and convergence. Mutually advantageous cooperation of the efforts of the socialist nations and nationalities is displayed in many forms. For example, the material production of the Kazakh SSR uses the products of 96 sectors of the economy of other union republics, while Kazakhstan in turn supplies them with products of 76 sectors. Major industrial enterprises of all the republics are interlinked by thousands of ties. Thus, the Minsk tractor plant which sends products to many union and autonomous republics, receives set-completing items from 274 subcontracting plants from the RSFSR, Ukraine, Armenia, Latvia, Uzbekistan, etc.

By the way, these facts of the actuality of economic cooperation of the peoples of the USSR are hardly capable of changing the mind of the anticommunists. They try to distort them as well. Even some of their colleagues who are trying to keep in step with the times speak ironically of such "dinosaurs" which are acting in the spirit of the "cold war" and are not capable of more refined methods of ideological struggle. Nove has noted, in particular, that in the opinion of certain Western authors, the "center (government of the USSR, Ye. T.) can not be fair. If capital investments are made to the development of the economy of a certain region, then this is to exploit the local residents and confiscate their resources. If the investments are not made, then, in the words of these nationalists, this is to purposefully leave the region poorly developed and a backward appendage of the center."<sup>22</sup>

Our country is constantly conducting a course to equalize the levels of economic development of different peoples. This task has fundamentally already been resolved. At the same time, a number of bourgeois ideologues exaggerate the thesis that in the USSR special attention is supposedly never given during the planning to equalization of the economic development of all peoples, and today this task has been altogether pushed to the background.<sup>23</sup>

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

In refuting this slander, candidate for membership to the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, First Secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee E. Shevardnadze wrote: "Our enemies, class enemies abroad are spreading a lie about Soviet Georgia, about the other union republics and about their economy and culture, asserting that the USSR supposedly ignores the economic interests of individual republics and nations. The facts, however, speak of something completely different." In 1970-1979, the national income of the USSR rose by 57%, and the Georgian SSR by 76%. The total volume of production of industry increased in the country by 72%, and in Georgia by 80%.<sup>24</sup> There is roughly the same situation in the sphere of production of the gross agricultural products and in capital construction. These leading rates of development of the republic's national economy are the direct result of the Leninist national policy of the CPSU. In 1979 for 1,000 people 10 years old and older, the following had higher and secondary education: 645 in the RSFSR, 698 in Georgia, 645 in Latvia, 639 in Uzbekistan, 713 in Armenia, etc.

The "Main Directions for Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and for the Period to 1990" notes the further rise in the economy and culture of all the union republics and economic regions, improvement in the integration of their economy, and deepening of the all-union division of labor. The development of industry in the republics of the Transcaucasus, Moldavia, Belorussia and Uzbekistan is envisaged at higher rates than for the country as a whole. In evaluating the importance of this document, member of the Presidium of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee, Chairman of the Government of the Slovak Socialist Republic P. Tsolotka noted that it "reflects the leading achievements of the USSR in implementing the principles of socialist internationalism. The Soviet Union has attained true equality of people of different nationalities and has created all the conditions for their full and equal participation in the life of the Soviet society."

Individual bourgeois scientists refute the falsification of the policy of proportional and harmonious development of the national economy of all union and autonomous republics. The British sociologist S. White who has been to the Soviet Union many times has indicated the higher rates of economic development of Armenia, Moldavia, Kazakhstan and the Baltic republics as compared to the RSFSR.<sup>25</sup>

A brilliant example of the concern for comprehensive progress of previously backward peoples is the decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers "On Measures for Further Economic and Social Development of the Regions of Residence of the Nationalities of the North" which was adopted in February 1980. The economic backwardness of the former national regions of our country in the times of tsarism and capitalism have been completely and entirely eliminated. All the republics have attained enormous success in developing industry, agriculture, transportation. They are no longer divided into industrially developed and agrarian.

The flimsiness of the falsification of the economic unity of the peoples of the USSR is clearly manifest in the fact that the "Sovietologists" often use contradictory "arguments." Thus, setting hopes on the nationalistic moods, S. Shrayok (United States) writes that supposedly in the Baltic region "economic progress

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

may cause pride, bordering on the feeling of superiority over other nations," striving to attain autonomy.<sup>26</sup> But with these words he involuntarily refutes many fabrications of his colleagues. His recognition of the progress of the Baltic republics contradicts the assertion of "Russian" and "Soviet colonialism" in the sphere of economics, etc.

As for the calculations of provoking nationalism, they are completely groundless, since it is precisely cooperation of efforts and cooperation of sovereign Soviet republics, and all the socialist nations and nationalities that serve as one of the main sources of economic advances in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and equally in other republics. Two heat and electric power stations were built in Riga, a plant of chemical fiber in Daugavpils and many other facilities as a result of the cooperation of efforts in the framework of the unified national economic complex in Latvia. At the same time, the workers of Latvia are helping to build a giant automotive plant in Naberezhnyye Chelny, the Sayano-Shushensk hydraulic power engineering complex, and many other facilities. The production process of the Riga "VEF" plant supports 900 enterprises of other republics. "Without the fraternal international support and unselfish help on the part of the peoples of the Soviet Union, without reliable support on the unified national economic complex of the country, small Latvia which has been suppressed for centuries would never have been able to even approach the level of those achievements which are now evident to the entire world," said the First Secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee A. Voss at the 26th CPSU Congress.

## Bourgeois Concept of "Modernization" in the Service of Antisovietism

Socialist society affords the broadest outlook for scientific and technical progress which serves as one of the main levers for creating the material and technical base for communism, strengthening of the unified national economic complex of the USSR, prospering and convergence of all classes and strata of society, all nations and nationalities of the USSR. Realization of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution has become one of the chief areas of competition of other systems. This is why the bourgeois ideologues cast a shadow on the processes of evolution of the scientific and technical revolution in the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union. They widely advertise the so-called concept of "modernization," in particular.

In the opinion of the authors of one of the collective works, "modernization" is the process of evolution from agrarian to industrial society, which results in an improvement in the level of knowledge and strengthening of man's control over nature.<sup>27</sup> This concept, using the methodology of the theories of the "industrial" and "post-industrial" society, "convergence," "stages of economic growth," supplements and develops them. In contrast to the theory of "unified industrial society," the theory of "modernization" seems to have a complicated nature. It focuses attention not only on the problems of industrial growth, but also on the development of social, national relations, modern culture, urbanization, science, public health, means of mass communication, etc. The apologists of "modernization" generally ignore the role of socioeconomic formations and social-class factors.

The "sovietologists," armed with this concept, strive to undermine the friendship of the peoples of the USSR. The mentioned G. Zimon thus asserts that industrialization, urbanization, increase in the level of education, development of national

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

elites, and creation of a network of interregional communications all promote the growth of nationalism in the USSR and disintegration of Soviet society.<sup>28</sup> "Modernization and its accompanying demographic shifts which occur in Central Asia and Kazakhstan," R. Levis, R. Rowland and R. Klem believe, "can result in social and political tension."<sup>29</sup>

In this case they start from the bourgeois sociological concept of "ethnic stratification" which is based on the false idea of the long age of nations and national antagonisms. "Ethnic stratification," in their opinion, "is concerned with the hierarchical division of peoples in the sphere of socioeconomic relations, and is the universal characteristic feature of all states which are populated by more than one ethnic group, that is, essentially the overwhelming majority of countries in the world."<sup>30</sup> These "specialists" classify the United States and the USSR among these states, ignoring the class structure of society and absolutizing the ethnic and scientific-technical factors.

The experience of social development of mankind has shown against the assertions of the falsifiers that national inequality is the inherent feature of any exploiting structure. The objective foundations for national inequality have been eliminated under conditions of socialism. It is precisely the unification of peoples in the Soviet multinational state, their consolidation into a unified historical community which have provided really reliable guarantees for equal rights, the prospering of all nations and nationalities, and their truly free and sovereign development. Each union republic independently implements state power on its territory, with the exception of the rights in the competence of the USSR. The communists successively support the free will of the peoples.

The bourgeois apologists often assert that "different ethnic groups do not enjoy the results of modernization to an equal degree."<sup>31</sup> By their words, only the Russians are supposedly the "most modernized" nation of the USSR, while the nations and nationalities of Central Asia are poorly exposed to modernization.<sup>32</sup> The flimsiness of these conjectures is evident, however, in studying reality. Before the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the peoples of the Caucasus, Central Asia, Kazakhstan and other national regions were economically and culturally poorly developed. No major industrial enterprises had been built in Central Asia before the revolution, and agriculture was in an extremely neglected state. In all of Central Asia there were no more than 58,000 industrial workers. The number of literate people in Kazakhstan in 1906 was about 2% of the population.

Under socialism, especially under conditions of its maturity, scientific and technical progress has become an important factor of the true modernization of all nations and nationalities, primarily the previously backward. Practical implementation of the national program of the CPSU has eliminated national oppression in our country, achieved actual equality of all nations and nationalities, unprecedented prospering of their economy, political and cultural life. Today at one Tashkent textile kombinat alone there are more workers than there were before the revolution in all of Uzbekistan. The industry that has been created in the republic during Soviet power is represented by over 100 sectors, including metallurgical, machine building, power engineering, chemical, gas, gold extracting, etc. Tens of thousands of Uzbek workers labor in industry jointly with the representatives of other nationalities. In Central Asia, the power saturation for 100 ha of arable land is double the average union indicators.

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The eastern Soviet republics have attained unprecedented success in training personnel, developing public education and culture. Essentially 100% literacy of the population has been attained. In Uzbekistan in 1978 there were 33,634 scientific workers as compared to 3024 in 1940. There were no higher educational institutions in the republic before the revolution, but in 1979-80 school year, 43 VUZ's were in operation. It is characteristic that the rates of training specialists in many union republics is higher than the union average.

This is why the American "sovietologist" M. Shorish could not help but admit: "The Soviet strategy for development has converted Central Asia in 50 years from a society defeated by poverty and illiteracy into an economically developed region, where at least the basic needs of the population have been provided for and almost 100% literacy has been reached."<sup>33</sup> The USSR does not have those contrasts in the level of economic development of different regions, as the developed capitalist countries. Zones of "economic disaster" are sometimes named in Great Britain, for example, Scotland, Wales and North Ireland. In Italy the incomes of the residents in the southern regions is twice as low as in the north.

The attempts of certain proponents of the concept of "modernization" to contrast the Russians to the other peoples of the USSR are completely unfounded.<sup>34</sup> Analysis of the achievements of the peoples of our country in the development of economics and culture shows that this success is very much the result of mutual cooperation of all peoples of the USSR, and primarily the Russian people. The workers of Russia have given enormous help to the other peoples of the USSR in their socio-economic development and national liberation, in attaining true modernization of the economy and society. "We feel special love and boundless gratitude to our sensitive and concerned older brother, the great working Russian people," the First Secretary of the Bashkir CPSU obkom M. Z. Shakirov said at the 26th CPSU Congress.

The ideologues of anticommunism do not cease their attempts to belittle the universally historical role of the Leninist party in uniting the Soviet people, and to falsify such factors of its unity as the USSR national economic complex, public ownership of the means of production, and centralized economic planning. The "sovietologists" distort the processes of internationalization of the economic life of the socialist nations and nationalities, and balancing of the levels of economic development of the union and autonomous republics. Life has demonstrated, however, that participation in a unified national economic complex makes it possible for the socialist nations and nationalities to make the maximum use of their resources. Unification of material and labor resources of all peoples of the USSR meets their basic international and national interests, reflecting the important advantage of socialism over capitalism.

## FOOTNOTES

1. H. Carrère d'Encausse, "L'Empire Éclaté: La Révolte des Nations en URSS," Paris, 1978.
2. THE ECONOMIST, March 19, 1977, pp 62-63; L. Révész, "Volk aus 100 Nationalitäten. Di sowjetische Minderheitenfrage," Bern, 1979, p 409.
3. A JOURNAL OF COMPARATIVE POLITICS, No 2, 1978, p 140.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

4. "The Ukraine within the USSR: An Economic Balance Sheet," New York, 1977, p 311.
5. "The Future of Communism in Europe," Detroit, 1975, pp 175-177, 236-241.
6. "Nationality and Population Change in Russia and the USSR," New York, 1976;  
"Ethnic Conflict in the Western World," Ithaca, 1977.
7. "Ethnicity. Theory and Experience," Cambridge (Mass.), 1975, p 17.
8. See K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 4, p 371, Vol 35, p 221.
9. U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 25 September, 1978, p 44.
10. OSTEUROPA , No 6, 1979, p 448.
11. "Nationalities and Nationalism in the USSR: A Soviet Dilemma," Washington, 1977.
12. Lenin, V. I. "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 30,  
p 22.
13. A. Nove, "The Soviet Economic System, " London, 1977, p 67.
14. "Review of Socialist Law," No 4, 1976, p 226.
15. L. Révész, Op. cit., p 409.
16. H. Carrère d'Encausse, Op. cit., OSTEUROPA, No 6, 1979, pp 455-457.
17. THE ECONOMIST, 19 March , 1977, p 63.
18. See "Narodnoye khozyaystvo SSSR v 1979" [National Economy of the USSR in 1979],  
Statistical Annual, Izdatel'stvo "Statistika," 1980, p 142, 168.
19. "Ethnicity. Theory and Experience," p 463; "Handbook of Major Soviet Nation-  
alities," New York-London, 1975.
20. THE ECONOMIST, 19 March, 1977, p 63; INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 1, 1976, p 119.
21. IZVESTIYA, 26 January 1979.
22. A. Nove, Op.cit., p 68.
23. N. Penkaitis, "Der Finanzausgleich in der Sowjetunion und seine Bedeutung für  
die Wirtschaftsentwicklung der Unionsrepubliken," Berlin, 1977, p 191; "Soviet  
Studies," No 3, 1980, p 368.
24. See "Narodnoye khozyaystvo SSSR v 1979," p 405, 143, 134.
25. "Political Culture and Political Change in Communist States," New York, 1977,  
p 51.
26. "Nationality Group Survival in Multi-Ethnic States. Shifting Support Patterns  
in the Soviet Baltic Region," New York-London, 1977, p 95.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

27. THE RUSSIAN REVIEW, January 1979, p 117. H. Kahn interprets the content of this theory in roughly the same way (H. Kahn, "World Economic Development 1979 and Beyond," Colorado, 1979).
28. OSTEUROPA, No 6, 1979, pp 449-450.
29. CANADIAN SLAVONIC PAPERS, Nos 2 and 3, 1975, p 300.
30. "Change and Adaptation in Soviet and East European Politics," New York, 1976, pp 217-218.
31. Ibid, p 218.
32. "Nationality and Population Change in Russia and the USSR," New York, 1976.
33. CANADIAN SLAVONIC PAPERS, Nos 2 and 3, 1975, p 413.
34. "Ethnic Russia in the USSR: The Dilemma of Dominance," New York, 1980.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Voprosy ekonomiki", 1981

9035  
CSO: 1800/99

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NATIONAL

SOVIET ETHNOGRAPHIC THEORIES OUTLINED

Moscow SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 81 pp 174-178.

[Review by G. E. Markov of book "Sovremennyye problemy etnografii (očerki teorii i istorii) [Contemporary Problems of Ethnography (Essays in Theory and History)] by Yu. V. Bromley, Moscow, Nauka, 390 pp.]

[Excerpts] The development of Soviet ethnographic science during the past few decades has been marked by great successes in the elaboration of theoretical and practical problems, in the study of the peoples of the world, and, first of all, in the study of the peoples of the Soviet Union. New significant directions have developed, the contacts and interactions with a number of adjacent sciences have been strengthened. In the development of these processes the works of Academician Yu. V. Bromley have been of outstanding significance, in particular his book "Ethnic Community and Ethnography".

In the introduction of the book the author defines the contents and task of his work in the following way: "With all the difference in profile (approach, subject, and scope) of the different essays, as a whole they are all in the final analysis subjected to one general idea: To the further substantiation and development of conceptions about the subject sphere of contemporary ethnography as the science of ethnic communities and at the same time to the more precise definition of the range of its most important current problems" (p 6).

In the examination of one of the key questions of ethnographic theory--the nature of the ethnic community and its basic types--Yu. V. Bromley introduces a great deal that is new by comparison with his earlier research. Noting the multi-plane character of such a complex phenomenon as the ethnic community, he clearly formulates its most characteristic features. Yu. V. Bromley writes: "As the common external reference point for the determination of the phenomena standing for the term "ethnic community" we may take the circumstance that it is applied to those cases of the use of the word "people" (and correspondingly of the terms "tribe", "nationality" and "nation") when it signifies the community of people who have their own self-designations" (p 12). It must be noted that with the whole simplicity of this criterion, he accurately characterizes the concept of "ethnic community" in all stages of its historical development. And later the author examines the question of how one can distinguish ethnonym from toponym and politonym (a new and, it appears, successful term proposed by Yu. V. Bromley for designating the development

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

of power [potestarnyy] or authority [politicheskij]. In connection with this, it is noted: "If an appropriate group of people persistently from generation to generation preserves its self-designation, then most likely this self-designation is an ethnonym... But a politonym. . . goes out of use comparatively quickly. . . Frequently the fate of the toponym is analogous" (pp 13, 14). The author points out that, apart from the ethnonym as an external criterion, the community of self-consciousness (the anti-thesis "we"--"they") suggests the belonging to a certain ethnic community. Moreover, by ethnic self-consciousness is meant the conceptions of people about their own ethnic community, while "ethnic consciousness includes the whole complex of the ethnically colored components of social consciousness" (p 15). Thus, the ethnic community is characterized by the stability of criteria and the presence of a specifically ethnic culture.

In connection with the determination of the criteria of the ethnic community, Yu. V. Bromley enters into a polemic with authors who have tried to advance biological (racial) features as ethno-differentiating criteria and convincingly shows that the ethnic community does not represent a biological population and that the existence of ethnic communities is called forth not by biological, but by socio-cultural factors (p 18). As in earlier works as well, the author emphasizes the significance of endogamy for the self-reproduction of ethnic communities and examines the mechanism of its manifestation in different historical situations.

Of exceedingly great theoretical significance is the proposal by Yu. V. Bromley to distinguish the concept of ethnic community in the broad and the narrow meaning of this term. Properly, ethnic community (in the narrow meaning of the term) is determined in this connection as "a historically developed stable aggregate of people on a defined territory, possessing common and relatively stable peculiarities of culture (including language) and psyche, as well as consciousness of its own unity and difference from all other similar formations (self-consciousness), fixed in the self-designation (ethnonym)" (p 27). Already in earlier works the author proposed to call this narrow concept of the term "ethnic community" "etnikos" (ethnokos).

It is proposed to consider "ethno-social organisms" (ESO)--synthetic formations, in which ethnic communities are linked with social organisms of a territorial-ethnic character (tribes, states) (pp 31, 32)--as a more general type of ethnic formation. The author distinguishes three basic varieties of such ethno-social organisms: (1) the ethnic community and the social organism coincide; (2) from one ethnic community some ethno-social formations are excluded from membership by social organisms; (3) several compact and relatively independent ethnic communities exist within the boundaries of one sociopolitical community (state) simultaneously (pp 35, 36ff).

The delimitation of the narrow and broad understanding of the term "ethnic community" is of great significance, as Yu. V. Bromley correctly emphasizes, for the solution of the debatable problem of the interrelationship of the concepts of "nation" and "nationality". In connection with the multiple meaning of the term "nationality" the proposal is advanced to render it more precise through a special "indicator" which emphasizes the strictly ethnic meaning--"ethnonationality" (p 40).

Exceedingly promising from the standpoint of further research is the author's idea of the necessity of the delimitation and terminological fixation of the types of

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

ethnic communities that have developed in conditions of different socio-economic formations. In so doing, the ethnic communities of the primitive-communal period, it is proposed, are to be called "paleogenetic", those of the pre-capitalist period --"archogenetic", and those which developed later--"neogenetic" (p 42). That kind of historical classification will play a positive role in further ethnogenetic research.

Yu. V. Bromley arrives at a number of important conclusions in the analysis of the problem of the hierarchical nature of historical-cultural communities. The author notes that ethnography is called upon to study all varieties of historical-cultural communities, their basic features and tendencies of the dynamic of development. By historical-cultural communities are meant communities which are characterized by a whole complex of distinguishing characteristics, one of which may be regarded as the system-forming one. These communities are subdivided by the author into two categories: ethnic communities which have stable, historically-developed traits of culture, and "metaethnic" communities, which subdivide themselves into ethno-social and strictly ethnic communities (see pp 46, 47). In addition, micro-ethnic units (for example, the family) are distinguished, which represent the limit of the divisibility of the basic ethnic community. An intermediate position between micro-ethnic units and ethnic communities is occupied by "subethnic communities", the existence of which is connected with the "realization of group peculiarities of these of those components of culture" (p 48).

Yu. V. Bromley emphasizes that all varieties of ethnic communities must be distinguished from ethnographic communities, which appear in two varieties: "Ethnographic groups" and "historical-ethnographic regions". Also noted is the presence of a distinctive hierarchy of historical-ethnographic (traditional-cultural) units: (1) the ethnographic group; (2) the historical-ethnographic region; and (3) the historical-ethnographic province (pp 49, 50).

Of exceptional interest for theoretical ethnography is also the analysis and general characterization of ethnical processes, the theory of which for a long time remained one of the least elaborated questions in ethnographic science. In recent years, thanks to the works of Yu. V. Bromley and his followers, this important gap began to be rapidly filled. The work under review contains new and exceedingly important conclusions and generalizations.

As the author correctly notes, ethnography is confronted with the task of making known the typical peculiarities of the dynamic of ethnic processes (p 63). The author has in mind, and this must be emphasized, not only the change of ethnic membership, but above all the change of ethnic selfconsciousness. The change of ethnic membership takes place at the rate of the change of individual components of the ethnic system. This process has an evolutionary character. The change of ethnic self-consciousness is the break of gradualness and the transition to a new state. Yu. V. Bromley proposes to call the first of the processes mentioned "ethnoevolutionary" and the second "ethnotransformational"--which is completely acceptable. Exceedingly important is the conclusion about the general character of the ethnic processes, which, as the author indicates, flow in two directions: processes of ethnic division (ethnic divergence) and ethnic unification (pp 65, 66). Yu. V. Bromley defines these general theoretical propositions concretely,

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

examining the course of ethnic processes in the conditions of various socio-economic formations. Thus, for pre-class societies ethno-divisive processes were most characteristic. With the formation of class society, ethnic unification emanating in the course of the consolidation, assimilation and interethnic integration becomes the main direction of ethnic processes. Besides the two types of consolidation processes proposed earlier--ethnotransformation and ethnoevolution--Yu. V. Bromley establishes the presence of a third type of process, viz., ethnogenetic intermixture. The author emphasizes in this connection the possibility of the transformation of interethnic integration into ethnogenetic intermixture.

As a whole, the typology of ethnic processes proposed by Yu. V. Bromley is as follows: (a) ethnic divergence; (b) interethnic consolidation; (c) ethnic intermixture; (d) intraethnic consolidation; (e) interethnic integration; (f) and ethnic assimilation. In connection with the typology that has been examined, the author especially emphasizes that of six enumerated processes five have a unifying character (p 70).

Of great theoretical and practical significance is the typology of the ethnic structure of the ethnosocial organisms of mankind throughout world history proposed by Yu. V. Bromley. It appears that he is completely right in considering that the basic ethnic subdivision of primitive society was not the family, but the tribe. Incidentally, the author of the present review, in investigating the question of who was the bearer of the specific way of life in the primitive period, in due course arrived at a similar conclusion.\*

With the disintegration of primitive society, as Yu. V. Bromley shows, nationality becomes the basic ethnic subdivision in the pre-capitalist period, having arisen mainly as the consequence of unifying processes.

And, finally, the book examines the process of the transformation of nationalities into nations--which was accompanied by the further increase in the homogeneity of culture and the increase of the strength of internal cultural and information relations (see p 75).

Of special significance are the parts of the book which deal with the problems of ethnography which have remained a subject of sharp discussions for so long in science at home and abroad. And although some questions may be the subject of discussion in the future, on the whole Yu. V. Bromley was able in a convincing way to generalize the experience accumulated by Soviet ethnography and, in our view, perfectly correctly outlined the subject sphere of ethnographic science.

Continuing research begun earlier, the author of the work under review defines more precisely the place of ethnography among the adjacent sciences--history and sociology. Correctly regarding ethnic communities and peoples as the subject of ethnography, Yu. V. Bromley concludes that "the examination of the components of the ethnic community through the prism of their fulfillment of ethnic functions, above

---

\*See G. E. Markov, "Etnos, etnicheskiye protsessy i obraz zhizni" [Ethnic Community, Ethnic Processes and Mode of Life] in RASY I NARODY, vyp. 7, Moscow, Nauka, 1977.

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

all under the aspect of ethnic specificity, is the basic criterion for the isolation of the subject sphere of ethnography (p 83).

Yu. V. Bromley graphically and convincingly shows the urgency of ethnographic research, refuting the current notion according to which it is proposed that the weakening of ethnic specificity will lead to the disappearance of the subject of ethnography. In this connection he writes: "As long as peoples and ethnic communities exist, ethnography will preserve its research subject, and besides not only as the historical past, but also as the living reality" (p 85).

While sharing the basic ideas developed by the author in connection with the problems under review, we must, however, note a certain disputability of some particular questions. We shall touch above all on the correlations between the particular and the general, in other words, the ethnic, i. e., the particular, and the typical (the general) in the economic-cultural types and historical-ethnographic regions. Yu. V. Bromley sees the most urgent task in the research on the first of these aspects. Its importance, indeed, is so evident that it does not need any further discussion. However, the chief accent on this aspect of the life activity of peoples is nevertheless somewhat one-sided since the second aspect is no less essential for its ethnographic characterization. Regardless of the ethnic peculiarities of different groups of the population living in similar natural conditions and finding themselves on approximately the same level of development of socio-economic relations, the features of community in their ethnographic characterization are no less significant than the particular ethnic features. We have in mind, above all, the community of the economic-cultural type, social structure, social organization, etc. There are very many examples of this: It is sufficient to refer to the groups that are known to us, such as the hoe cultivators, the taiga and tropical hunters, the nomads, etc. Of course, among each one of these ethnic groups one can find a multitude of specific peculiarities in material and spiritual culture. But all the same, the main thing in their vital activity is a common type of economy and social structure.

Thus, within the limits of ethnography as a unified science, two subject spheres exist and interact in the closest manner: The sphere of the ethnic community and ethnic processes, and the sphere of comparative research on culture. The synthesis of these two spheres leads to an exhaustive characterization of the vital activity of peoples in terms of ethnic and economic-cultural aspects.

Of theoretical and historiographical interest are the parts of the book in which bourgeois cultural and social anthropology is subjected to a profound and detailed critique from the perspective of Soviet ethnography. In this connection the author again returns to the question of the subject matter of ethnographic science and notes in addition that in our time ethnic specificity is increasingly displaced in the sphere of spiritual culture and psychological phenomena (p 109).

The assessment of the significance of the work by Yu. V. Bromley has in essence already been given in the course of reviewing its individual parts. It will, without a doubt, become a handbook of every ethnographer. Unfortunately, we must note the intolerably small edition of the book (5,000 copies). Already on the day on which it went on sale it became a bibliographical rarity. At the same time, I want to emphasize the urgent necessity of the republication of another work by Yu. V. Brom-

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

ley--"Etnos i etnografiya" [The Ethnic Community and Ethnography], which already long ago became a bibliographical rarity and for this reason inaccessible for a wide circle of readers who have experienced a constant demand for this publication.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Sovetskaya Etnografiya", 1981

8970

CSO: 1800/66

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

REGIONAL

LACK OF ARMENIAN LITERATURE IN CENTRAL PRESS DEPLORED

Yerevan LITERATURNAYA ARMENIYA in Russian No 7, Jul 81 pp 80-84

[Article by Karen Simonyan: "The Critic and the Contemporary Armenian Literary Process"]

[Text] First Article

Perhaps there are other works which deserve attention, but I have not read them.

Suren Agababyan,  
critic

There is no doubt that the time between the writers' congresses and all of the 1970s were sterile and poor years for Armenian Soviet literature in achievements, but nevertheless they were not, as the critic asserts, a period of losses of the "frontiers conquered earlier," i. e., a period of deviation.

And of this we can be convinced, having remembered the numerous books of Armenian authors published by the union republic publishers. This qualitatively new approach to our national literature arose from the efforts of the leadership of the Union of Writers of Armenia and thanks to the initiative and supportive attitude of the publishers "Sovetskiy pisatel", "Khudozhestvennaya literatura", "Molodaya Rossiya", and "Detskaya literatura". Let us add to this also the publications of our journal LITERATURNAYA ARMENIYA. Especially in recent years, the journal has striven to present in Russian practically all of the best that has appeared in Armenian literature. Thus, the all-Union press now has a greater opportunity to judge the features, developmental tendencies, creative search and--and why not?--failures and shortcomings of our national literature.

And in essence, it seems, there are no grounds to regard our literature isolated, to think that it does not take part in the all-Union literary process or does not march in step with it. And really all the more it is not "representative" as in the recent past.

But let us leaf through LITERATURNAYA GAZETA and the journal DRUZHBА NARODOV. Let us turn the pages and be convinced that, judging by this paper and periodical, Armenian Soviet literature does not exist or hardly exists on the general map of our

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

national literatures.

This circumstance alone must compel us to ponder seriously, to attempt to discover the reasons for the given phenomenon. And to find them is very important since many misunderstandings, having formed against each other, create the impression as if Armenian Soviet literature really does not exist, but there are "individual writers." By the way, "individual writers" exist also in Estonia, Georgia and Lithuania, but side by side with them, you know, there exists also the phenomenon of Estonian, Georgian or Lithuanian prose, for which the same distinctiveness and individuality is characteristic as for every representative of this prose.

Our search naturally leads us to the critics and specialists in literature who study Armenian Soviet literature, some of whom for many years running already are engaged in a deplorable business: to prove by whatever means, both inside the republic itself and beyond its boundaries, that contemporary Armenian prose as such is a fiction.

Thus, for example, the critic Suren Agababyan asserts in his article "Once Again on the Alarms of Criticism" that no literary process exists and that the so-called literary process was invented, as it were, by some malefactors as a peculiar "shield" with whose aid they "smooth over individualities" and "justify false and superficial pulp literature".

Well, but since the "literary process" is only "a shield for the smoothing over of individualities," it is also precisely because of the existence of this very literary process that our literature yielded to "frontiers conquered earlier."

What indestructible logic! . . .

And all the same, we will raise the question--but why?

Because, explains Suren Agababyan, our literature "in the best case reflects only external, visible aspects of reality, but not its . . . inner picture."

What of it, every critic, as well as every individual, can have his own opinion, even if they are unsubstantiated. And I would not ascribe significance to such private opinion if . . . if this conviction--that there is no contemporary Armenian national literature, that there is no literary process--had not already outgrown the limits of merely personal opinion and had not become transformed into a fully determined frame of mind.

Here is still another example. Feliks Meloyan, who in his article "Style and Stylization" cited an extensive list of our well-known prose writers actively taking part in the contemporary literary process, after enumerating one by one, raises the question: "Who among them has established the frontiers of his world and confirmed the laws controlling this world that are characteristic of it alone, who among them has shown us their own life experience and his own world view interpreted by this life experience?" And he himself answers this question--nobody. Of course, a critic can put the question in this way, we have already long ago become used to such "vacillations of literary criticism." However, the whole point is that no one,

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

literally no one among the enormous list cited by Meloyan is perceived by the critic as a full-fledged prose writer, as a real writer.

I believe that the reader is sufficiently prepared, therefore I will present him with still another dubious judgment.

In one of his articles ("Criticism in Retreat"), Suren Agababyan writes: "Our prose --I am thinking not of individual works of it, but of the general level--having indulged in the element of abstract-moralizing maxims, has moved away from the solution of contemporary reality and the contemporary hero. It contains no real life with its complex heroes, with its breathing and colors."

And in order for no one to appeal this declaration, the critic, after the publication of his "sentence", hastily saddled the creative work of the prose writers with such labels as /"technocratism", "Kafkaesque tendencies", "cosmopolitan symbiosis", and "biological pessimism" (??)./ And these labels were hung on talented representatives of our contemporary prose, whose works are not only known to readers throughout the Soviet Union, but have become noteworthy phenomena of the Soviet multinational literary process--although for the critic it simply does not exist.

However, the fears of Suren Agababyan that someone will attempt to contradict him are in vain. On the contrary, he is aided on the spot by another "specialist on Armenian literature"--Yelena Aleksanyan, who maintains that, yes, "on the whole, Armenian Soviet prose, 'having indulged itself in the element of abstract-moralizing maxims,' has moved away from the solution of the problems of contemporary reality and the contemporary hero." We shall be lenient towards her and not call attention to the fact that, after having repeated the idea of a colleague in entirety, she--in a fit of inspiration, did not enclose it fully in quotation marks. But what of it, we will leave this to the conscience of the author.

But let us return to Suren Agababyan.

Having become enticed by the possibility of making a "discovery", he attempts to prove in his article "The Meaning of Struggle" that "there is an important difference between a "writer of life" and a "writer of reality". While the "writer of reality", he explains, recreates the chain of the lines of the actions of occurrences, events, and things that are evident (precise translation, K. S.), the writer of life immerses himself, penetrates into the depths and interprets life in all its unity." Let us leave this inspired terminological discovery on the conscience of the critic, a discovery which prior to this was unknown in the history of world literature and about which neither Aristotle and Herodotus nor Losev and Asmus managed to know. Let us only say that after this it is at least understandable why Armenian Soviet prose "does not exist." It turns out, because our writers who are engaged in the writing of prose are only "writers of reality", who "do not immerse themselves," "do not penetrate," "do not interpret life in all its unity."

It seems to me that some of our critics simply became confused in their contradictory "discoveries" and were mistaken in the diversity of the means of thematic, genre and artistic embodiment of life in Armenian prose. And it is precisely out of this confusion of theirs that such unsubstantiated declarations arise.

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

By way of illustration, one of them, Zaven Avetisyan, is convinced that "in our time not only the city penetrates the village, but the /village also penetrates the city in its turn/ (?!--K. S.). The reason for this, it turns out, is "the so-called scientific-technical revolution." And since this scientific-technical revolution is "a so-called one", the concepts of urban and rural prose, in the opinion of Zavena Avetisyan, are relative concepts. Let us agree for a minute that this assertion of the critic is true and let us listen further: "One of the secrets of the force and power of the literature conditionally called rural prose, lies in the fact that, by comparison with the other (i. e., urban literature; at the same time we call attention to how bashfully the critic circumvents the word "urban"--K. S.), it does not ignore. . . the objective process." However, conditionality through conditionality, and "one of the secrets of village prose lies in the fact that it does not ignore the objective process." Consequently, "urban prose" not only does not possess strength and power, but also "ignores the objective process."

In the not so distant past, these critics regarded as real literature only those works whose theme was the village. But not the contemporary one, with its people, problems and concerns. No, as real models of prose they regarded only those works in which the rural reality of the Thirties and Forties was made contemporary. Lately they have begun to convince those who are gullible: They say, everything we say--we say conditionally.

This "weakness" of the critics towards rural prose is not, of course, anything new. The fact is that in their delusion they regard morals and morality as values which are inherent only in the peasant. And even more: They also assert that it is the village which is the source and well of virtue.

The matter even goes so far that some critics who speak of the "people's" or of the "national" mean the village.

But the city is bad, it is the nest of all sorts of vices, since there is nothing national in it, and the inhabitants of the city represent a formless amoral mass.

Such direct or disguised assertions first of all are antihistorical, and their exposure are very important for the organic development of national literature.

I imagine the bewilderment or even doubts of the reader. And what, if the author errs and exaggerates, can he think--for is it possible, really, that a critic or even a number of critics would devote themselves to such an unworthy cause? You know, the role of the critic is by far more responsible and noble than some of our critics imagine who occupy themselves only with the denial of the literary process and national prose.

I must disperse all possible doubts by the following fact.

The fact is that some of our critics not only do not see, more correctly, persistently try not to notice the noteworthy phenomena of the Armenian literary process, but also feverishly try to refute what others have said.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

In her article "Theatrical Armenia," T. Chebotarevskaya exposed the developmental tendencies in the development of Armenian Soviet drama and, having analyzed and given an assessment of several plays and productions on the Armenian stage, came to the following conclusion: "Every one of the works I have named can--I am convinced--be played in many theaters of our country. For all of these plays, written on the basis of the material of the life or history of one people, bear extended interpretation, raising questions which trouble wide circles of Soviet spectators."

The successes of the Armenian drama were also given a high assessment by V. Frolov, doctor of art criticism, in the newspapers KOMMUNIST and SOVETSKAYA KUL'TURA. "For the Armenian drama the elaboration of the intellectual drama is characteristic," he wrote. "In their creative work the authors take the most difficult boundaries: They penetrate into the psychology, the moral world of contemporary man, they rise above the narrowness of everyday life, above the centuries-old traditions and try to perceive the "latent" movements of history." And again: "The authors of many present-day plays master (we call attention--not already "mastered", but for the time being "master"--K. S.) "the undercurrent" of Chekhov, the social quality of Gorki's characters, and the publicity of Mayakovskiy's satire."

It would seem that the only thing remaining is to rejoice over this restrained, but good assessment.

However, no! Suren Agababyan hurried to appear in the pages of the journal DRUZHBA NARODOV and refute this--for the Armenian drama--favorable opinion. He says, allowances are being made with respect to Armenian Soviet literature. A relapse of this phenomenon are "the articles on the plays of contemporary Armenian dramatists," Suren Agababyan sounds the alarm and with unconcealed irony adds that in these articles "it is literally said that the Armenian playwrights, neither more nor less, inherited "the art of the Chekhovian undercurrent." Yes and Gorki's depth in addition. . . The second example, continues the critic, is the article by T. Chebotarevskaya. . . where the author demands immediately "the all-Union stage" for all Armenian plays mentioned by her. So that there are relapses, as we see."

Here we became convinced that any favorable opinion expressed in the union press about our literature not corresponding to the narrow limits of the conceptions of Suren Agababyan is nothing else but a relapse.

Here I would like to turn your attention to the astonishing carelessness of the critic, which is manifested in his "distinctive" principle to quote. Having given advance notice that he is quoting "literally", Suren Agababyan distorts the ideas of authors in such a way that after this it is already an easy thing to smile ironically at the "naivete" of T. Chebotarevskaya and V. Frolov.

By the way, similar illicit "methods" are sufficiently characteristic for some of our specialists on Armenian Soviet literature.

In order to mask the militant nihilism with respect to our contemporary literature, these critics "regard favorably" the writers of the past, who, however, have no need whatsoever for such "advocates", who "defend" the classics in order to pronounce "the death sentence" for contemporary writers. . . But there are exceptions. . . In his monograph "Aramashot Papayan", Suren Agababyan examines the

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

creative work of one of the leading dramatists of Armenia. The critic not only subjected the dramatic compositions of Papayan to analysis, but also gave a certain resume. Papayan, he writes, is "one of the well-known and strong dramatists of Armenia, recognized not only by the national, but also by the all-Union spectator. . . Aramashot Papayan became one of the discoverers of the national quality of laughter in Armenian dramatic compositions of our time." How is one to explain this exception? This question is kindly answered by the critic himself, who writes: "In order to interpret this book I began to meet more frequently /with my old friend/ (Emphasis supplied by S. Agababyan). A strange acknowledgment, is it not?"

However, we shall return to our "specialists" on Armenian Soviet literature. Is it possible that this persistent nihilism and subjectivism with respect to our national literature is the consequence of malicious intent? Hardly so. Some of our critics for some reason simply have not grown up, they were unable to rise above the level of criticism of the Forties and Fifties, and indeed in the future I do not see any comforting perspectives for them.

And it is not a coincidence that they almost do not appear in the pages of the union press, and if there are such attempts, then another organ of the union periodical press never is slow in expressing its attitude towards their insignificant and superficial articles.

Thus, for example, not long ago the journal LITERATURNNOYE OBOZRENIYE wrote on the occasion of one of these articles: "Absolute unintelligibility, inspired collection of uncombed ideas: "His path as a writer had almost no zigzags, and in this case splashes and disruptions, ascents and falls, signify only two stories that are following one another, let us say. . ." "A familiar reality and familiar people dictate the subjects, the subjects, in their turn, dictate the corresponding prototypes, in other words, the material itself dictates the movement and development of the subject." "Since the event presents to us and gives us a child, its childlike "I" somehow softens the real, wiry body of the work, gives the narration a sweet taste. . ." Thus writes . . . Feliks Meloyan."

And everything without any commentaries, simply: "Thus writes Feliks Meloyan."

Such a nihilist attitude towards one's own literature worries not only us, but Russian critics as well. Lev Zolotarevskiy, for example, wrote with pain that he had "to read and listen already that in a discussion of contemporary Armenian prose the literary process in the republic is frequently reduced to a restriction. . . The opinion even appeared in the press alleging that it is impossible to make judgments about "Armenian life" on the basis of the Armenian press. Having studied contemporary Armenian prose, the Russian critic states decisively: "The contemporary prose of Armenian writers gives much rich food for seeing the life of the Armenians and for judging it."

This is precisely how, in fact, things are. Through its genre and thematic diversity, through the presence of true creative individualities and ideological-aesthetic glow, contemporary Armenian literature takes directly part in the all-Union literary process, and confirmation of this is found in the numerous translations of the best works of Armenian literature in our country and abroad.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

I would like for LITERATURNNOYE GAZETA and DRUZHBA NARODOV to pay special attention to this circumstance. And the illumination and assessment of the process of development of Armenian Soviet literature in these press organs is, above all, the business of our critics, critics with a wide horizon, a professional ethic and a set of principles. This is also the honorable and noble obligation of our representatives in these organs, our writers' organization, and, without a doubt, the literary press of the republic.

Participation in the union-wide literary process and the repudiation of reticence are dictated, first of all, by the interests of the mutual enrichment of the multi-national Soviet literature, by the interests of maintaining our spiritual values.

And is it worthwhile, after all of this, to say that I agree with Suren Agababyan's view that, yes, "the interests of the development of our literature require that people go into criticism who are completely dedicated to this cause, who have a feeling for art, and who are ready to respond to the vital needs of literature."

However, it is appropriate here to remember the wise words: He, who is able, does; but he, who is unable, teaches.

This is how things are.

Translation from the Armenian

COPYRIGHT: "Literaturnaya Armeniya", 1981

8970  
CSO: 1800/59

END