

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Speechwriting, White House Office of:
Research Office, 1981-1989

Folder Title: 05/31/1988 Soviet Writers Union
(Clark/Rowena) (3)

Box: 384

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

REPORTAGE ON WRITERS UNION CONGRESS IN MOSCOW

27 June Speeches

PM301418 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Sharing the Concerns of the Modern World. At the 8th USSR Writers Congress"]

[Excerpts] Not cutting themselves off from the anxieties of the modern world and the life of the people -- this is the stance that has been firmly taken by Soviet literary workers. It is being displayed most convincingly at the 8th USSR Writers Congress. Discussion of the most important tasks set for the masters of the written word continued at the Great Kremlin Palace in Moscow 27 June.

Analyzing the literature of the last few years, V. Beekman (Estonia) described many of its defects as a syndrome of social fatigue evident among some writers in the republic. This is a direct or indirect cause of the isolation from life that can be observed at times in some spheres of literature and of authors' departure from acute and socially significant themes and conflicts into the world of intentionally complicated images and allegories of their strange deafness toward the present.

Touching upon the problems of young literary workers' creative growth, R. Rozhdestvenskiy (Moscow) stressed that this category is now taken to include people who are 30, 40, and more years of age. The development of a poet and even a prose writer now takes place much later than in the past. A young poet displays all his best qualities, including his individuality, at the age of 30-40 years. But here is something strange: The age of first love is still the same as ever, people still obtain their personal passport at the age of 16, and they still begin their military service at the age of 18. Only young writers develop late. Could it be that it is not the times but writers' practice that is to blame for this prolonged delay? It is, after all, no secret that the more talented and original a manuscript is, the longer it spends gathering dust in publishers' desks. This is how a young writer "matures" and this is how the "theory of late development" is confirmed.

The session noted the noticeable galvanization of the patriotic subject in Soviet press. Emphasis was placed in this regard on the great importance of addressing historical subjects, which is one of the most important means and methods for inculcating civic awareness, Soviet patriotism, and internationalism.

Many practical proposals were made for improving the leadership of the creative process and publishing work, and the need for the utmost enhancement of exactingness toward the admission of new Writers Union members was noted.

For a long time now, B. Mozhayev (Moscow) said, I have heard it said at our plenums and congresses: Some of our literature is colorless and it is necessary to combat it. This is said mainly by editors of leading literary journals and by Writers Union leaders who are in charge of both journals and publishing houses. I imagine that colorless literature does not appear out of the blue, it is supplied by literary journals and publishing houses. This proves the truth of the proverb: "You reap what you sow."

Ye. Sheveleva (Moscow) described indifference as a fatal shortcoming in literature. A book's fate is at times decided without being carefully read, and a writer's fate without a closer look at his life. This is closely linked with literary organizational work.

Many speakers spoke about the writers active stance in the solution of important national economic problems. B. Rasputin (Irkutsk), in particular, criticized what he considered unjustified plan to divert northern rivers in the country's European part and recalled that many representatives of the public, writers, and scientists have presented sensible arguments against this. He spoke with concern about the fact that hitherto no resolute measures have been taken to protect Lake Baykal, even though there has been much publicity on the subject. There are no plans to do anything about the pulp combines. That poses the greatest threat to the lake and also damage the economy. One's heart aches when thinking of the fate of Lake Sevan and the Aral Sea, the Dnieper and the Volga, and the felling of the Far Eastern and Atlay cedar trees. It is necessary to look into the prevailing situation again and to make radical decisions.

Greetings messages to the congress were delivered by (Dozhoogiyn Tsedev) (Mongolia), (Kim Yen-Von) (DPRK), (Bkhisham Sakhni) (Association of Asian and African Writers), Wojciech Zukrowski (Poland), Frederik Phol (United States), Anna Lilova (Bulgaria), and Max Walter Schultz (GDR).

It was decided to end the debate. Some 200 speakers addressed the congress.

In a resolution adopted by the delegates, the 8th USSR Writers Congress called on every Soviet literary worker to make an active and fitting contribution, using all his talent and civic responsibility, to the implementation of the program tasks set by the 27th CPSU Congress.

The delegates moved on to the election of the USSR Writers Union's leading organs.

Taking part in the work of the congress were Ye. K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; A.N. Yakovlev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Yu. P. Voronov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Cultural Section.

The congress continues its work.

Yevtushenko Speaks

PM010859 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Sharing the Concerns of the Modern World. At the 8th USSR Writers Congress"]

[Excerpts] Sittings of the 8th USSR Writers Congress continue at the Great Kremlin Palace in Moscow. The debate on the USSR Writers Union Board report and the Central Auditing Commission report continued 26 June.

The human factor principle means not only a humane attitude toward the living but also an attitude toward the dead. Voicing this idea, Ye. Yevtushenko (Moscow) named many of the fatherland's literary workers whose talents deserve proper recognition by posterity. The historic tasks being set for us today by the people and the party cannot be carried out emotionlessly [s pustoserdechiye].

The present time of change is a time of hope and restoration of justice. The hopes whose air we are now all breathing will not be made to come true on our behalf by somebody else, because we ourselves are the totality of these hopes. No one will present us with socialist democracy ready-made on a platter, because we ourselves must bring this democracy to life. Each day of our lives and every one of our acts must be a lesson of such democracy in action. Some people tried to frighten us by saying that democracy apparently inevitably leads to anarchy, to rocking the ship of state. Everything depends on who is steering this ship. Its helm is now in reliable hands. And we writers must also put our hands on the helm. The captain's role in a socialist democracy is a matter for the whole people. Socialist democracy means not disorder but the supreme ideal of moral self-discipline and discipline. Ours is a time of change because it is fittingly demolishing ineffectual spinelessness. We writers in a socialist country fully support this Leninist turnabout.

Discussion of the most important tasks set by the times for the masters of the written word continued at the congress 27 June.

No one else will eliminate the shortcomings in our life and in creative affairs which have been spoken of here -- we ourselves will have to do this, V. Karpov (Moscow) emphasized. Recalling the traditions of the journal NOVYY MIR which was led by K. Simonov, A. Tvardovskiy, and S. Narovchatov, the speaker noted that its present employees, fostered by their brilliant predecessors, sacredly preserve these traditions and persistently struggle for the life of every manuscript. The journal has been correctly criticized here, the speaker said, but it must always be borne in mind that we all share the same ideas and together must find the correct ways to implement the inspiring tasks set for us by life, correct ways to implement the inspiring tasks for us by life, the party, and the fate of the people.

30 June Press Conference

LD301625 Moscow TASS in English 1538 GMT 30 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS -- The 8th Congress of Soviet writers became a major event in the cultural life of the Soviet Union, well known Soviet prose writer Chingiz Aytmatov said here today at a press conference on the results of the congress. It was attended by about 600 writers who represented Soviet multinational literature, published in 78 languages.

* The congress, Aytmatov continued, was characterized by lively debates, keen formulation of artistic problems and utmost frankness. The writers reaffirmed their commitment to the method of socialist realism, which offers boundless opportunities for an indepth analysis of the life of society.

The delegates to the congress stressed that Soviet literature should keep pace with major events taking place in the country. Moscow playwright Mikhail Shatrov said. The most important thing for writers today is to create innovative works which would analyze reality in depth, raise serious social problems and portray our contemporary [sentence as received].

Speakers at the congress levelled strong criticism at the Board of the Union of Writers, which did little to promote creativity, Moscow writer Sergey Mikhailkov said.

It was announced at the press conference that the congress of Soviet writers had launched the initiative to establish a museum of Soviet poet Boris Pasternak (1890-1960).

^{KGB}
Writers **Genrikh Borovik** and **Yevgeniy Yevtushenko**, answering questions from American journalists, called for broader cultural exchanges between the USSR and the USA. They noted that the American side was holding back cultural exchanges and did not respond to proposals from Soviet men of letters on cooperation with American colleagues.

RSFSR SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUUM MEETS IN MOSCOW

LD301533 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 30 Jun 86

[Text] A routine meeting of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium was held today. Issues related to the 3d session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation were considered. Proposals on the agenda and the order of work of the meeting of the highest organ of state power of the Russian Federation were discussed and approved. The issue on the conclusion of the work of the plan, budget, and other standing commissions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on the preliminary review of the state plan of economic and social development of the RSFSR for 1986-90 was considered.

On the recommendation of the standing commissions, the report was delivered by **Comrade Cherepanov**, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Planning and Budget Commission.

The meeting discussed the question of putting forward for approval by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet the decisions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium that were adopted in the period between the second and third sessions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The Presidium also discussed the question of work of the Soviets of people's delegate from Orel oblast in the legal and moral education of young people.

Several other issues of the state life of the republic were considered.

RSFSR SUPREME SOVIET MEETS 1 JULY

LD010820 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0740 GMT 1 Jul 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] As the Grand Kremlin palace today the 3d session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation started work.

Deputies and guests greeted with applause **Comrades Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Demichev, Dolgikh, Yeltsin, Sokolov, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Nikonov and Kapitonov.**

The session was opened by **Deputy Gribachev**, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet. The session's agenda and the order of business are being confirmed. The following questions are put forward for discussion:

Changes in the composition of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; the Russian state socioeconomic development plan for 1986-90, and confirmation of the decrees of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

A report on the republic's state socioeconomic development plan during the 12th 5-Year Plan is being delivered by **Deputy Vorotnikov**, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

The session is continuing its work.

New Local Industry Minister

PM011200 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Jun 86 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "In the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Anatoliy Grigoryevich Shumeyko RSFSR minister of local industry. Comrade Viktor Konstantinovich Uspenskiy has been released from his duties as RSFSR minister of local industry in connection with his retirement on pension.

Session Ends

LD020929 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 2 Jul 86

[Text] The session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has just finished its work. The deputies and guests, who assembled this morning in the Great Kremlin Palace, greeted with applause Comrades Gorbachev, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Logachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Demichev, Dolgikh, Sokolov, Birukova, Dobrynin, Nikonov, and Kapitonov,

At the meeting discussion continued on the state plan for the economic and social development of the Russian Federation for the 12th 5-Year Plan.

Deputy Kudyashev, chairman of the Udmurtiya Council of Ministers, focused attention on the solution of personnel problems, and on efficiency in the use of favor resources. Deputy Manyukin, second secretary of the Sverdlovsk Obkom, spoke of the importance of a careful attitude to raw and other materials. Complaints against the designers of machines for light industry were made by a knitter from the Velikolukskiy knitted-goods factory in Paskov Oblast, Deputy Sirizneva.

Deputy Kovalchuk, chairman of the Irkutsk oblispolkom, devoted his speech to the problems of capital construction. Common to all who spoke was thought for the need to strive for unity of word and deed. Deputies also devoted much attention to raising the sense of responsibility of those elected by the people.

Discussions at the session have ended. The deputies unanimously approved the program for the development of their republic for the 12th 5-Year Plan, and the decrees of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet presidium.

REPORTAGE ON WRITERS UNION CONGRESS IN MOSCOW

1st Plenum Held

PM011453 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Plenum of the USSR Writers Union Board"]

[Text] The First Plenum of the USSR Writers Union Board elected by the 8th congress was held 28 June.

The plenum elected G.M. Markov chairman of the USSR Writers Union Board. V.V. Karpov was elected first secretary of the USSR Writers Union Board.

A bureau of the Secretariat of the USSR Writers Union Board was formed consisting of Ch.T. Aytmatov, G. Ya Baklanov, Yu.V. Bondarev, V.V. Bykov, A.T. Goncharov, S.P. Zalygin, V.V. Karpov, and G.M. Markov. Yu.N. Verchenko was elected secretary of the USSR Writers Union Board for organizational and creative work.

The following were elected secretaries of the Board: G. G. Abashidze, Ch. T. Aytmatov, M.N. Alekseyev, A.A. Ananyev, G. Ya. Baklanov, S.A. Baruzdin, Yu.V. Bondarev, G.A. Borovik, P.P. Botsu, V.V. Bykov, V.E. Beekman, Yu.N. Verchenko, A.A. Voznesenskiy, R.G. Gamzatov, N.S. Gilevich, A.T. Gonchar, N.A. Gorbachev, D.A. Granin, N.M. Gribachev, Yu.T. Gribov, I.A. Dedkov, A.D. Dementyev, Yu.V. Drunina, M.A. Dudin, Kh. Durdyev, Ye.A. Yevtushenko, S.P. Zalygin, A.S. Ivanov, Ye.A. Isayev, Mumin Kanoat, V.V. Karpov, V.A. Korotich, V.N. Krupin, F.F. Kuznetsov, L.M. Leonov, A.M. Maldonis, E.B. Mezhelaitis, T.A. Minnullin, A.M. Mirzagitov, A.A. Mikhaylov, S.V. Mikhalkov, Yu.M. Mushketik, P. A. Nikolayev, B.I. Oleynik, D.V. Pavlychko, Ya.Ya. Peters, V.A. Petrosyan, P.L. Proskurin, V.G. Rasputin, R.I. Rozhdestvenskiy, V.S. Rozov, A.D. Salynskiy, Ye. Yu. Sidorov, K.V. Skvortsov, O.O. Suleymenov, Yu.I. Surovtsev, Maksim Tank, U.R. Umarbekov, G.Sh. Tsitsishvili, A.B. Chakovskiy, A.N. Chepurov, Yu.D. Chernichenko, M.F. Shatrov, and Ismail Shikhly.

V.P. Telpugov was elected chairman of the USSR Writers Union Central Auditing Commission at the commission's first session.

Voznesenskiy Speaks

PM011148 Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 Jun 86 p 4

[Unattributed feature: "Responding to the Heart's Prompting. Writers Congress Delegates Speak"]

[Excerpt] Andrey Voznesenskiy:

A characteristic feature of the present writers congress is the sincere and confessional tone of the delegates' speeches. All the problems facing the masters of the written works and, moreover, all our creative intelligentsia have been discussed frankly by congress delegates with a desire to find a response in Soviet people's hearts. We must speak the truth out loud; this is the main thing that readers expect from us. They expect a serious and dispassionate discussion of what exists in life.

Readers themselves know life; they know that there is evil in it and that there are also people struggling against evil. The trouble is that people often do not see in literature the things they know about life. In literature they often encounter a varnished reality, a varnished hero with negligible shortcomings and a halcyon fate. He essentially has no need to struggle; everything works out for him, and if it doesn't higher-ranking comrades spring lightly to his assistance. This is unfortunately how many conflicts are resolved in books -- easily but not the way it is in life. Life is full of dramatic situations, but in literature they often take the form of vaudeville rather than drama.

Could this be the reason for the slackening of the "book boom" that we have been observing quite recently? Previously people used to buy all book output. But now they are not buying. Because the product is often colorless. This decline in readers' demand for books reflects a crisis of confidence in writers. What is the reason for this? To some extent it lies in the double thinking [dvumysliye] often inherent in writers. This is dangerous for the healthy development of social thinking. Yet the best of us have always written the truth.

Our best writers oppose indifference and passivity and urge active involvement in all spheres of life to improve it. Their main objective is to instill in people a new view of the world and new, progressive thinking. And we need such people at this time, when a process of regeneration [ozdorovleniye] and restructuring is actively in progress in the country.

Yevtushenko Speech

PM011556 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 27, 2 Jul 86 p 7

["Abbreviated account" of the Yevgeniy Yevtushenko speech in the 26-27 June debate at the USSR Writers Congress"]

[Text] Justice toward the name of Boris Pasternak is now being restored; his books are being published in print runs thousands of copies and his poems, that at one time seemed overcomplex, are now becoming accessible not only to a narrow circle of the elite intelligentsia but to the spiritually matured people as a whole. His home and grave have become a place of constant pilgrimage for our young people. But 26 years have already passed since Pasternak's death, and to this day we have not found the time to honor his memory with a fitting house-museum.

The present time of change [perelomnoye vremya], which our poetry also helped to prepare with its civic poems, is a time of hope and of the restoration of justice. The principle of the human factor as the prime factor means a most humane attitude not only toward the living but also toward the departed.

Allow me to hand to the presidium a letter addressed to the congress and the future secretariat signed by 40 congress delegates expressing concern that, to our shame, we could get to 1990, when the centenary of Pasternak's birth is celebrated, empty-handed, without a house-museum.

Some specific proposals on the structure of the future board and secretariat.

Only leading writers must be elected to leading posts on the secretariat. But if a leading writer becomes a working secretary, is it sensible to separate him from his writing desk for a whole 5 years? Life is short, and plans are numerous... For some reason mediocrities, whose sole intention is to find a place in the sun, fill the vacuum left by our writers who are engaged wholly in creative work. Yet if 5 years is too long a period, even the busiest and most major writer can and should devote at least 1 whole year of his life to our administrative affairs [tsekhovyye dela] since this is not only a self-sacrifice but also an honor. My proposal is as follows: to make a joint approach, as they say [obratitsya, chto nazyvayetsya, vsem mirom], to five such writers who are ethically incapable of moral bureaucratization and possess nationwide and international prestige as writers rather than officials. In my view, it is necessary to change the statutes and elect five first secretaries with equal rights so that they can divide these 5 years into five sequential tours of duty and meet together at least six times a year as the supreme moral organ of the writers union. And what a joy it would be for each one of us to be received by such principle-minded [printsipialnyy] and major masters as, for example, V. Bykov, V. Rasputin, or Ch. Aytmatov to share our plans with them and, if necessary, seek their authoritative protection!

Gorkiy said at the first writers congress: "...Our legacy of philistinism still includes some pustules incapable of understanding the substantial difference between 'leaderism' is an individualistic desire to rise above a comrade, which is easily achievable given the existence of mechanical chicanery, an empty head, and an empty heart." The historic tasks that the people, the party, and history are setting us today cannot be resolved with an empty head and an empty heart.

To fulfill these tasks even ministries must now operate as creative unions, and our creative union too has long had no right to imitate a ministry in repairing roofs leaking creativity into the homes beneath, as was inexpertly said from this lofty rostrum in the presence of the country's leadership, which is concerned with the supreme problem of saving mankind from a nuclear catastrophe.

Some of us warn that democracy allegedly leads inevitably to anarchy and the shaking of the ship of state, but it all depends on who is steering the ship, and the helm is now in reliable hands; and our writers hands must also be on this helm since under socialist democracy captaincy is a matter for the entire people. Socialist democracy is not chaos but a supreme type of moral self-discipline and discipline, where indifference toward the living or the dead must rank among the most severely punishable disciplinary offenses.

Our time is indeed a time of change, but the people do not want it to become a time of head breaking [kostolomnoye]. It is a time of change because it is fittingly demolishing ineffectual spinelessness, and we writers in a socialist country fully support this Leninist turnabout. The development of democracy in our country is a path toward not only spiritual but also material flourishing since, as history has shown, the anti-democratic method has always been unproductive from the most ancient times. The development of democracy, publicity, and social justice in our country will be the strongest blow to international militarist reaction, since it will destroy its propaganda trump cards, boost socialism's prestige, and intensify its alluring example for the peoples of the entire world.

Lizichev Speaks

PM011455 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 4

[Abbreviated version of Writers Congress Speech of Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate]

[Text] Allow me to report to the congress of the country's writers that the main concern of our fatherland's Armed Forces is the life and aspirations of its people and that their combat potential and combat readiness are maintained at a level which makes it possible reliably to protect the peaceful, creative work of the Soviet people.

In our country's history the "man at arms" has always occupied a worthy place. And literature has given us brilliant examples of the bolshevik soldier and sailor storming the rotten old system; it produced Vasiliy Chapayev [story by D. Furmanov about the legendary civil war hero] and Pavka Korchagin [N. Ostrovskiy "How the Steel Was Tempered"] during the civil war period and a whole galaxy of fighters who forged a path through the incredible difficulties of the Great Patriotic War to win the cherished victory.

Quite a few good books have also been written about people who today, in peacetime, in the eighties, are discharging with honor their noble duty as defenders of the motherland or servicemen doing their international duty.

But let us be frank: The time in which we live, the army's responsibility for the future of peace, the beauty and greatness of the spiritual image of the Soviet serviceman, and his hard, intensive military labor deserve more attention and greater interest from the country's best literary forces.

A frank and, in my view, useful discussion on this subject was held on the eve of your congress at a meeting between members of the Ministry of Defense collegium and leaders of creative unions and organizations and leading figures from the spheres of literature and art.

Among the congress delegates there are also writers who have been frontline soldiers, who underwent the baptism of fire during the war. Many of them have given us an invaluable heritage of eyewitness accounts about its soldiers. We treasure the sacred truth about the war from the mouths of those who themselves experienced the trials and tribulations of life at the front and thus acquired the moral right to describe its grim days and nights honestly, convincingly, and from the position of socialist realism.

There is an inseparable link between the memories of the past and the concerns of the present. Once again, I would like to draw your attention to two circumstances: During the postwar years, new generations have grown up that have no experience of war. In their view peace is the normal state of society. This can, involuntarily, lead to complacency, to underestimation of the real threat of war.

And the second point. Mankind now faces a most acute problem: the choice between war and peace. The threat hanging over civilization, over the very existence of life on earth has never been more acute. The same applies to the ideological struggle between the forces of war and progress. However, a real possibility to preserve and strengthen peace exists today. Our party and government are doing all they can in this respect. The USSR Armed Forces are a mighty factor in curbing the aggressive aspirations of imperialism. In this context the military-patriotic education of the population, and in particular young people and, of course, army and navy servicemen, assumes a special significance. It is impossible to overestimate the role of literature in this nationwide and partywide task.

Today, excellent people are serving in our Armed Forces. Multinational collectives live as one friendly family in the Army and Navy. This, too, is a field where writers could apply their talent. Since the war, a galaxy of outstanding Heroes of the Soviet Union has grown up in our country whose feats are comparable to those of the front line.

The life of the motherland's servicemen currently serving in the DRA is full of examples of a high-minded fulfillment of duty. It is an inexhaustible source of interesting destinies and amazing examples of fidelity to military and international duty, love of the motherland, and comradeship-in-arms.

Of course, it is impossible to write about life in the Army and Navy today from an ivory tower. The Army must be seen. It is extremely important that the writer himself feels and understands the inspiring motives for the glorious military deeds worked daily by our soldiers and sailors, commanders, and political personnel. Only what they have seen and experienced can result in truly creative writing which the reader will understand and believe.

I have pleasant memories from a visit to our Transbaykal Military District by a group of writers from Siberia and the Transbaykal region, which included Valentin Rasputin. There were no long discussions, and the detachment of writers was immediately sent to work among the troops, where skills are forged, where yesterday's schoolboys grow into soldiers. With what energy, what creative enthusiasm did those writers set to work in the units! I remember what fruitful results this trip bore for both us and them. Furthermore their articles were published not only in the central press but also in the district newspaper.

Incidentally, the work of writers who contribute to the Army and Navy press deserves our full approval. Writers contributions to the journal SOVETSKIY VOIN and the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA are frequent and carry much weight. But do not forget, comrades, that your contributions would also be welcomed by district, group, and fleet newspapers which have a wide readership.

There are plenty of questions waiting for your attention. Their positive solution will contribute to the enrichment of both artistic creation and military and patriotic work in the country and in the Soviet Armed Forces. For its part, the Main Political Directorate will continue to pay most serious attention to the development of heroic and patriotic themes and back up creative workers in every possible way. I am deeply convinced that these purposeful efforts will bear fruit.

30 June Press Conference

PM011543 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Literature -- The People's Conscience"]

[Text] The 8th USSR Writers Union Congress has demonstrated an identity of views regarding the role and purpose of literature and art at a crucial stage in Soviet society's development. It was held in the favorable creative atmosphere generated by the 27th CPSU Congress, Ch. Aytmatov, member of the Bureau of the USSR Writers Union Board Secretariat, declared at a press conference devoted to the results of the forum of Soviet literary workers. The press conference was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow 30 June.

The keen discussion among writers, in which some 200 delegates and guests took part, was distinguished by a spirit of lofty exactingness and demandingness. It demonstrated the invariable loyalty of the masters of the artistic word to the principle of socialist realism as a creative method for the study of life. The best works of the multinational Soviet literature, which offer the readers real lessons in truth, provide convincing evidence that literature is rightfully the conscience of the people.

Much attention was given at the press conference to the problems of modern artistic creativity. It was noted that a number of recent books are distinguished by profound interest in the image of the man of energetic actions and clear conscience and in the realistic study of the historical past. Answering in particular a question on the topicality of the military subject, V. Bykov, who has dedicated his talent to the interpretation of the people's exploits in the Great Patriotic War, stressed: This literature is particularly topical in our anxious time. Essentially, it is antiwar literature. Bringing to mind the grim years which cost the Soviet people 20 million lives, it calls for vigilance and serves as a warning against a new war, against militarism and aggression.

The foreign guests noted the free and truly democratic atmosphere in which the congress was held, Ye. Yevtushenko emphasized. In their speeches, our writers followed their conscience rather than any prompting. Conscience calls on our literary workers to address the most painful aspects of the age and of life. No subjects are taboo for them. Every talented work is entitled to see the light of day. Barriers are raised only against works which contain propaganda of war, violence, and chauvinism, S. Mikhalkov and V. Korotich noted.

The participants in the press conference -- G. Borovik, V. Rasputin, M. Shatrov, and others -- spoke about the responsibility assigned by the time to Soviet literary workers and the effectiveness of their active civic stance, and they described the qualitative changes in the work of the Writers Union's leading organs. Answers were given to numerous questions from Soviet and foreign journalists.

Auditing Commission Elected

PM011415 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 2

["USSR Writers Union Central Auditing Commission Elected by the 8th Congress" -- LITERATURNAYA GAZETA headline]

[Text G. A. Abbaszade

T. Abdrakhmanova

S.A. Abramov

M. Abylkasymova

P.F. Avtomonov

M.K. Agashina

N.M. Adalyan

I.I. Akulov

V.N. Aleksandrovskiy

S.I. Aleshin

Zh.S. Arutunyan

P.V. Afanasyev

I.Ye. Belousov

K.B. Bobulov

V.F. Bokov

S.M. Borzunov

A.M. Borshchagovskiy

N.I. Bratan

V.I. Bubnis

L.N. Vasilyeva

E.V. Vakhidov

Yu.S. Vekilov

(Yu. Samedoglu)

Yu.A. Vinogradov

I.I. Vinogradov

N.P. Voronov

N.A. Gasan-zade

A.I. Gelman

I.M. Gogolev

D.Ya. Gusarov

V.I. Gusev

N.T. Dabizha

O. Danikayev

A. Dzhakshylykov

A.N. Dzhonua

T. Dzhumageldyyev

I.M. Dvoretzkiy

N.S. Yevdokimov

A.A. Zhuk

F.E. Zalata

V.V. Zuyenok

T.M. Zumakulova

L.I. Ivanov

F.A. Iskander

B.S. Istru

A.P. Kalandadze

I.A. Kalinkin

T.V. Kallas

A.A. Karapetyan

I.V. Kashpurov

Z.S. Kedrina

M.Ye. Kilchichakov

R.T. Kireyev

K.T. Kireyenko

I.S. Kozayev

K.-E.K. Kudazhi

I.P. Kudinov

Yu.P. Kuznetsov

T.V. Kuzovleva

S.Yu. Kunyayev

K.F. Kurg

P.V. Lebedenko

G.M. Lezgintsev

B.A. Leonov

V.I. Likhonosov

V.N. Maksheyev

Ye.Yu. Maltsev

V. Martinkus

V.I. Marchenko

G.I. Matevosyan

Kh. Melyayev

Mirmukhsin Mirsaidov

A.G. Mikhaylenko

K. Murzaliyev

N.G. Nikonov

I.F. Ogorodnikova

A. Omarova

P.V. Paliyevskiy

Ye.I. Parnov

P.M. Perebeynos

G.F. Petrov

T. Pulatov

B.N. Pshenichnyy

M.R. Rasulov

P.P. Rebro

B.S. Romanov

V.P. Roslyakov
M.M. Roshchin
N.P. Ryzhikh
P.A. Sazhin
A.S. Salutskiy
N.G. Samvelyan
E.I. Safonov
Yu.N. Sbitnev
M.Ya. Svire (Kayyaka)
O.V. Sidelnikov
V.M. Sidorov
Yu.S. Skop
Ts.S. Solodar
I.I. Strelkova
G.A. Sulaymonova
O. Sultanov
I.K. Tarba
V.P. Telpugov
G.I. Tolmachev
K. Tursunkulov
B.U. Ukachin
V.A. Ustinov

R.V. Filippov
V.I. Folvarochnyy
F.I. Khalvashi
Kh. Khudayberdyeva
O.A. Tsakunov
M.T. Tsirikhov
V.V. Chelidze
O.I. Chiladze
G.I. Chokoy
S.I. Chuprinin
A.D. Shavkuta
A.I. Shadrin
M. Shakhanov
Ye.V. Sheveleva
M.P. Shevchenko
L. Sheraliyev
V.S. Shefner
L.V. Shikina
Elchin (E.I. Efendiyev)
S.E. Eraliyev
G.A. Yushkov

Board Members Listed

PM011343 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 2

["USSR Writers Union Board Elected by the 8th Congress" -- LITERATURNAYA GAZETA headline]

[Text] G.G. Abashidze

I.V. Abashidze
T. Abdumomunov
A. Abu-bakar
Y.K. Avizhyus
A.M. Adamovich
A. Aylisli
Ch.T. Aytmatov
K. Akmatov
M.N. Alekseyev
S.P. Alekseyev
A.G. Aleksin
M.I. Aliger
F.G. Aliyeva
A.T. Alimzhanov
R.B. Amashukeli
V.I. Amlinskiy
A.A. Ananyev
Yu.A. Andreyev
I.L. Andronikov
S.P. Antonov
Yu.V. Antropov
V.I. Ardamatskiy
A. Aripov
V.P. Astafyev
B.A. Akhmadulina
R.S. Akhmatova

T. Akhtanov
A.U. Ashimov
R. Babadzhan
N.A. Babayev (Nabi Khazri)
S.P. Babayevskiy
G. Ya. Baklanov
S.A. Baruzdin
V.I. Belov
A.P. Belyauskas
G.P. Berdnikov
Ye.Ye. Berezikov
S.F. Bobkov
Yu.V. Bondarev
G.A. Borovik
Yu.S. Borodkin
P.P. Botsu
P.A. Brazhenas
G.N. Buravkin
S.R. Burlakov
V.V. Bykov
V.E. Beekman
B.M. Vagabzade
K.Ya. Vanshenkin
B.L. Basiyev
I.A. Vasilyev
A.A. Vergelis
Yu.N. Verchenko

S.V. Vikulov
Ye.M. Vinokurov
A.A. Voznesenskiy
S.A. Voronin
Yu.P. Voronov
P.N. Voronko
L.N. Vysheslavskiy
R.G. Gamzatov
M.A. Ganina
V.N. Ganichev
N.S. Gilevich
A.K. Glushko
M.M. Godenko
A.T. Gonchar
N.A. Gorbachev
G.Ya. Gorbovskiy
G.A. Goryshin
D.A. Granin
N.M. Gribachev
Yu.T. Gribov
A.P. Grigoryan
G.D. Gulia
V.A. Davtyan
N.G. Damdinov
S.A. Dangulov
S.P. Danilov
I.A. Dedkov
A.D. Dementyev
V.V. Dementyev
Ye.A. Dolmatovskiy
A.I. Dombrovskiy
N.K. Dorizo
I.F. Drach
Yu.V. Drunina
I.P. Drutse
A.A. Dudarev
M.A. Dudin
Kh. Durdyev
Ye. A. Yevtushenko
V.N. Yeremenko
S.N. Yesin
V.S. Zhukov
Yu.A. Zhukov
S.N. Zhunusov
P.A. Zagrebelnyy
M.E. Zalite
S.P. Zalygin
N.Ya. Zarudnyy
Yu.O. Zbanatskiy
I.Ya. Ziedonis
G.I. Zubkov
Zulfiya
M. Ibragimbekov
M.A. Ibragimov
A.S. Ivanov
A.Ye. Ilchenko

Ye.A. Isayev
Ya.S.Kh. Yueryuyt
V.A. Kaverin
R.F. Kazakova
T. Kaipbergenov
K.R. Kaladze
A.V. Kalinin
V.A. Kanivets
Mumin Kanoat
S.B. Kaputikyan
M. Karatayev
L.V. Karelin
Mustay Karim
V.V. Karpov
T. Kasymbekov
L.P. Kayumov
A. Kekilbayev
A.P. Keshokov
A.A. Kim
Ye.F. Knipovich
L.N. Knyazev
V.P. Kozachenko
Ya.A. Kozlovskiy
V.A. Kozko
M.B. Kozmin
A.F. Kolomiyets
M.M. Kolosov
V.A. Kolykhalov
V.L. Kondratyev
V.V. Konetskiy
G.I. Konovalov
A.D. Koptayeva
Kh.G. Korbu
V.G. Kornilov
V.A. Korotich
V.A. Kostrov
A.I. Kravchenko
V.P. Krapivin
L.D. Krivoshchekov
Ya.Ya. Kross
V.N. Krupin
D.N. Kugultinov
K.I. Kudiyevskiy
F.F. Kuznetsov
A.P. Kuleshov
K.M. Kuliyeu
Yu.N. Kuranov
K. Kurbannepesov
P.A. Kuusberg
L.I. Lavlinskiy
K.Ya. Lagunov
A.S. Levada
L.M. Leonov
A.A. Likhanov
V.V. Lichutin
G.I. Lomidze

K.A. Lordkipanidze	Yu.M. Polyakov
R.M. Lubkivskiy	V.F. Popov
A.P. Lupan	O.M. Poptsov
I.I. Lyapin	N.A. Potapov
A.M. Maldonis	A.V. Prelovskiy
G.M. Markov	M.P. Prilezhayeva
Zh. Mamytov	Yu.L. Prokushev
Yu.M. Martsinkyavichyus	P.L. Proskurin
M.L. Matusovskiy	A.A. Prokhanov
S. Maulenov	V.G. Rasputin
M.I. Machavariani	A.Ye. Rekemchuk
I. Sh. Mashbash	L.V. Reshetnikov
E.B. Mezhelaytis	A.R. Rzayev (Anar)
A.P. Mezhirov	R.I. Rozhdestvenskiy
T.B. Mingnarov	V.S. Rozov
T.A. Minnullin	Ya.V. Rugoyev
A.M. Mirzagitov	Suleyman Rustam
N.I. Miroshnichenko	A.N. Rybakov
A.A. Mikhaylov	N.F. Rybakov
S.V. Mikhalkov	Yu.S. Rytkeu
A.N. Misharin	A.S. Sagiyan
B.A. Mozhayev	A.D. Salynskiy
A.T. Moroz	S.A. Samsonov
I.P. Motyashov	V.M. Sangi
D. Muldagaliyev	S.V. Sartakov
S.M. Muratbekov	G. Safiyeva
Sh. Murtazayev	A.Ya. Sakhnin
A.G. Musiyenko	G.V. Semenov
F.A. Mukhammadiyev	Yu.S. Semenov
A. Mukhtarov	Yu.A. Serdyuk
Yu.M. Mushketik	Ye.Yu. Sidorov
Yu.M. Nagibin	A.K. Siyg
I.Ya. Naumenko	B.D. Silayev
G.L. Nemchenko	K.V. Skvortsov
P.A. Nikolayev	V.P. Skomarovskiy
B.N. Nikolskiy	Z.Ya. Skuin
Sh.G. Nishnianidze	Ye.I. Skurko (Maksim Tank)
V.V. Novikov	N.I. Sladkov
L.N. Novichenko	M.G. Slutskis
D.M. Novruzov	O.P. Smirnov
Ye.I. Nosov	S.V. Smirnov
A.K. Nurpeisov	V.N. Sokolov
R.K. Ovanesyan	V.V. Sorokin
V.M. Ozerov	L.L. Sorokin
B.Sh. Okudzhava	A.V. Sofronov
B.I. Oleynik	I.F. Stadnyuk
S.G. Ostrovoy	N.K. Starshinov
L.I. Oshanin	V.A. Stepanov
D.V. Pavlychko	V.Ye. Subbotin
G.N. Panderin	O.O. Suleymenov
B.D. Pankin	Yu.I. Surovtsev
P.Ye. Panchenko	T. Sydykbekov
Ya.Ya. Peters	K. Tangrykuliyeu
V.A. Petrosyan	A.N. Timonen
A.N. Pletnev	B.T. Tlegenov
V.D. Povolyayev	G.N. Troyepolskiy

Uygun (Atakuziyev)
U.R. Umarbekov
F.U. Ungarsynova
Ya.G. Ukhsay
Rakhmat Fayzi
I. Fayzullayev
N.T. Fedorenko
R.N. Fedoriv
V.I. Firsov
O.A. Fokina
L.A. Frolov
P.V. Khalov
S.N. Khanzadyan
V.N. Khayryuzov
U. Khashimov
G.K. Kholopov
G.Sh. Tsitsishvili
V.D. Tsybin
M.A. Chaklays
A.B. Chakovskiy
D.A. Charkviani
A.N. Chepurov

Yu.D. Chernichenko
A.I. Chibotaru
I.G. Chigrinov
T.I. Chiladze
I.K. Chobanu
F.I. Chuyev
I.P. Shamyakin
M.F. Shatrov
O.N. Shestinskiy
B.V. Shinkuba
Ismail Shikhly
I.I. Shklyarevskiy
A.Ol Shogentsukov
A.P. Shteyn
V.M. Shugayev
N.Ye. Shundik
L.V. Shchipakhina
R.R. Ezera
G.G. Emin
I.G. Yuzeyev
I. Yusupov
A. Yakubov
K.N. Yashen

GROMYKO, DEMICHEV SIGN AIDE SKYLAROV'S OBITUARY

PM011338 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 6

[Obituary of Mikhail Petrovich Sklyarov]

[Excerpts] Mikhail Petrovich Sklyarov, chief of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Reception Office, died 26 June 1986 following a severe illness.

A.A. Gromyko, P.N. Demichev, L.N. Tolkunov, A.E. Voss, A.I. Lukyanov, T.N. Menteshashvili, V.V. Kuznetsov, N.F. Rubtsov, D.N. Nikitin, P.I. Sabayev, L.N. Chernikov, R.B. Eldarov, V.G. Vysotin, M.Ye. Mogilevets, Yu.A. Korolev, V.I. Zabaznov, B.P. Tokmakov, A.A. Petrov.

CPSU'S ZAYKOV ATTENDS INVENTORS DAY MEETING

PM011522 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 86 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In the Vanguard of Progress"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting devoted to Inventors' and Rationalizers' Day was held in Moscow 25 June.

On the presidium were L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, A.I. Volskiy, chief of a CPSU Central Committee section, I.S. Nayashkov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Investigations and Discoveries, leaders of ministries and departments, scientists, and production innovators.

Characterizing the contribution of innovators to the country's socioeconomic development, the keynote speaker, Ye. I. Tyurin, chairman of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalizers Central Council, reported that in the 11th 5-Year Plan economic savings to the tune of more than R36 billion were secured as a result of the introduction of technical innovations. The participants in the meeting expressed confidence that the 14-million-strong army of innovators will augment their efforts in the struggle for the successful implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions.

FURTHER ON 8TH WRITERS UNION CONGRESS IN MOSCOW

Text of Resolution

PMO21007 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 1

["Congress Resolution" -- LITERATURNAYA GAZETA headline]

[Text] The 8th USSR Writers Union Congress has met at a time when our country is living through a crucial stage in its history. The strategy of accelerating socioeconomic development, elaborated by the 27th party congress, has received the unanimous support of the Soviet people and has galvanized all spheres -- the political, economic, and spiritual.

By means of its own example, the party offers a lesson in principledness and truth, calls for active participation in the struggle for a new qualitative state of society, and expresses profound faith that the moral force of Soviet Literature will also manifest itself vividly in this cleansing and essentially revolutionary work. It was emphasized at the party congress and later at CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with writers that literary workers could play a considerable role in the implementation of the psychological and moral reorientation and the struggle against negative phenomena.

The 8th congress of the country's writers, representing multinational Soviet literature, unanimously and wholly supports the general line set by the 27th CPSU Congress and believes that the USSR Writers Union, just like all other detachments of the artistic intelligentsia, is capable of augmenting its contribution to the creative potential of socialism.

The businesslike and sharply critical discussion that took place at the congress on topical problems concerning the literary process, the writer's responsibility and position in the reorientation of public awareness, the galvanization of the "human factor," and the representation of the new phenomena being engendered by our reality was in line with the demands of the time.

The congress notes that, by means of the best works created in recent times, Soviet literature has fittingly lived up to its lofty purpose of being in the front line of the struggle for people's hearts and minds and has helped to develop social energy and civic activeness and to affirm lofty moral ideals and norms and feelings of patriotism and Soviet internationalism. The best novels, short stories, plays, poems, and works by publicists, critics, and specialists in the study of literature have offered readers real lessons in truth. They are distinguished by a profound study of the people's life, ennoblement of the fighting man, the man of energetic actions and clear conscience, and realistic analysis of the historical past. There has been a fruitful continuation of the further artistic study of the Soviet people's heroic exploits in the Great Patriotic War. The generation of young writers now inheriting the Soviet classical traditions is confidently playing its part.

The congress declares that the main attention today must be focused on concern to ensure that literature develops on a scale equal to that of the renewal that is underway in the country. Priority must be given to creative quest backed by the desire for truthful and dialectical analysis of the deep-seated phenomena of our reality, to the ennoblement of all that is truly heroic and the debunking of all that is spiritually bankrupt.

Barriers must be erected more actively to block the way to superficiality, timeserving, and hackwork -- everything that thrives in the soil of compromises of an artist's conscience and generates a stream of works that are superficial, trivial, and inferior both ideologically and artistically. In contrast with real artistic creativity, anodyne and colorless works are in themselves phenomena of stagnation.

There is every justification for calling for resolute eradication of serious shortcomings in literary criticism -- a sphere where ostentation, indifference, and sycophancy have grown deep roots. The ideological and artistic quality and the future of literature depend on the active development of the restructuring process in criticism and in the editorial collegiums of publishing houses and journals.

The new tasks demand qualitative changes in the style of organizational and political work by leading organs of the USSR Writers Union, the republic creative unions, and all writers organizations. They are called upon to show greater concern for establishing in the literary environment a climate of confidence and open discussion of urgent questions of literary life and to overcome inertia, bureaucracy, and formalism. Matters must be organized so that the shaping of public opinion about authors and works and decisionmaking about awards, prizes, and other forms of incentive take place not behind closed doors but publicly, on a broad democratic basis, and really according to merit.

The responsibility assigned by history itself to Soviet literary workers is growing today.

This demands unswerving commitment from everyone in affirming the principles of party-mindedness and popular spirit in artistic creativity and constant and extensive work to enhance professional skills. Only thus will it be possible to make gains and discoveries capable of augmenting the treasury of the spiritual culture of our multinational Soviet state.

Having heard and discussed the report "Let Us Never Cut Ourselves Off From the Concerns of the Contemporary World and the Life of Our People" by Comrade G.M. Markov, first secretary of the USSR Writers Union Board, the 8th USSR Writers Union Congress resolves:

1. To approve the activity of the USSR Writers Union during the period under review. To accept the work by its Board as satisfactory.
2. The USSR Writers Union Board and the leading organs of all writers organizations must focus their attention mainly on the practical implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress stipulations and conclusions concerning the crucial role of literature and art in the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development and in the struggle for society's moral health. The paramount task must be to establish within the creative union an atmosphere which contributes to the development of a literature that affirms the truth of life and ennobles the man who is boldly shouldering the burden of the time.
3. The most important avenue for activity by writers organizations and their leading organs must be the implementation of specific measures to establish a spirit of lofty principle and objectivity and accurate evaluation in literary and artistic criticism. It is necessary to considerably boost the influence of the literary press on quality standards, to make broader use of the writing community's opinion in the assessment of works, and to oppose vacuous or complimentary critical publications and unjustified, excessive praise.

4. The necessary work must be done to improve the forms and methods of educating young literary workers and to introduce stricter criteria for the admission of new members to the USSR Writers Union.

The USSR Writers Union Board must study the question and take the necessary steps to further improve the work of the A.M. Gorkiy Institute of Literature.

5. The USSR Writers Union Board is instructed to sum up the proposals for a new edition of the rules of the country's Writers Union and to discuss the relevant question at a plenum of the board.

6. The USSR Writers Union Board is ordered to analyze in depth the proposals and observations made by congress delegates and in the reports by the USSR Writers Union Board and Auditing Commission and to approve and implement measures for their implementation within the time limits set.

The 8th USSR Writers Union Congress calls on all Soviet literary workers to work actively, to the full extent of their talents and civic responsibility, to make a fitting contribution to the implementation of the program goals set by the 27th CPSU Congress.

Voznesenskiy Speech

PMO21339 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 6

["Abbreviated version" of the speech delivered by Andrey Voznesenskiy during the 26-27 June debate at the 8th USSR Writers Congress]

[Text] I see in the auditorium the flower of our literature, the best writers of Moscow, Tbilisi, Alma-Ata. But it seems to me that our congress would be broader, brighter, and more diverse if Bella Akhmadulina, Bulat Okudzhava, Yuriy Chernichenko, Vyacheslav Kondratyev, David Samoylov, and Arseniy Tarkovskiy, our most precious poet, were in the auditorium. The Strugatskiy brothers are not here, the satirists Arkanov, Gorin, and Zhvanetskiy are not here. The plays "We, The Undersigned" ["My, Nizhpodpisavshiyesya"] and "The Prize" ["Premiya"] were the first swallows heralding the start of our reorientation, but their authors are not on the list of delegates. Roshchin is not here, Ruslan Kireyev is not here, and many more... After the report of the auditing commission, the question arises -- did the elective principle truly prevail in the Moscow Writers Organization, which is led by F. Kuznetsov? How can it have done so? I believe the Moscow Writers' Organization has always been the pride of our literature, and today it consists of the most honorable people, but one way or another our congress is impoverished. Platonov said: "Without me, the people are incomplete!" I think that without these writers our literature is incomplete.

I wish to speak about the literary climate. How we lack generosity toward talent other than our own! I believe we have had enough of infighting, squabbling, and factionalism; we have a sacred cause -- literature, that unites us. Our congress is taking place at a difficult time, with the Chernobyl disaster hanging over the country. Among the many "to be or not to be" questions now facing mankind is this one: Is it to be or not to be for literature in general -- that is, for the cause we serve, to which we devote our lives. Through the will of fate, ours is perhaps almost the last country of readers in the world. Only we publish Anna Akhmatova in an edition of 300,000, while in Latvia -- a republic with a population of more than 2 million -- the poems of Peters and Zigedonis have print runs of 33,000 copies.

Spiritual aridity besets culture. People here have spoken passionately about the crime of diverting the northern rivers and the devastation of nature. My father was a hydro-engineer and taught me to fight against this senseless project and for the purity of the waters, for Baykal.

But now culture has become so twisted that it is running dry like the rivers! I am talking about a painful topic -- the death of the spirit, the ecology of culture. Our indifference destroys the past just as they destroyed the Sukharev Tower. Indifference disfigures the present -- how uniformly faceless are the new districts of Moscow, Tbilisi, Tashkent! And what is even more terrible -- sometimes we destroy the future.

You have all traveled along Kutuzovskiy Prospekt, past the demolished Poklonnaya Hill and the uprooted old park. They are building the monument to Victory there. It is costing tens of millions of rubles. When they built the Church of Christ the Saviour in honor of the victory over Napoleon, all the people gave donations toward the building, and Herzen admired the design. But we are amazingly indifferent. We did a day's voluntary work, but it is all the same to us what they build, as if Moscow did not belong to us. And now -- following the new trends -- the design has been put on display near the Kremlin Bridge, for discussion. Go and see! I went yesterday. The design is for an ugly column 70 meters high, that is, the height of a 30-story block. It is one of the most depressing, uninspired monuments in the world... Moreover even red granite will look black in silhouette, and everyone approaching Moscow will be threatened by this huge black sign. What a horror...

But let's get back to literature. Why do readers turn aside from certain books? There are many reasons. But the most important is that the people want openness. They know the truth about the monstrous forces of evil, lawlessness, corruption, extortion, deception, and duplicity. They fight against those evils in their lives, they see an unfair distribution of benefits, and they are palmed off with timid books smoothed out by editors, not "Dead Souls" but vaudevilles.

Alas, only an isolated few of us sounded the alarm about the monstrosity of these crimes. And now the main enemy within our society is bureaucracy, which hampers restructuring, everything new; it is stagnation, the old way of thinking, which, alas, has not surrendered.

Nowadays there are fewer and fewer lacunae in culture. For a long time people wondered whether or not to make public the works of Gumilev -- would it start something? Our readers have matured enough to read everything. But not only have we no decent edition of Avvakum, the "first Russian avant-gardist," we do not have academic collections of Mayakovskiy or Yesenin. It is time to publish Zamyatin and Khodasevich, it is time to publish the complete Akhmatova and the complete Pasternak. Who better than the Writers Union to defend masterpieces and safeguard literature's holy places?!

The other day I went back to the dacha where Pasternak lived. A depressing picture. The genius of 20th century poetry has not even been left the study in which he worked. My opinion has not changed -- this sacred house should become a Pasternak museum. The Ministry of Culture's literature museum is now in charge there. Writers should take this matter into their own hands.

Who better than the Writers Union to defend writers' honor? Akhmatova and Zoshchenko are now widely published. They are classics. I think the well known unobjective assessments of them should be withdrawn, as was the case with the opera "Great Friendship" ["Velikaya Druzhba"].

I would like an authoritative commission to be created, made up of respected writers who would help unpublished writers, those who have for a long time been unable to get their work published. There are many of them.

After all, sometimes a writer spends 10 percent of his life writing a book and 90 percent trying to get it published. That even happens to well known masters. As for young people! For instance, the young poet S. Solovyev's book, which was recommended by B. Oleynik, L. Vysheslavskiy, and I. Drach and consists of works already published in the periodical press, has been at the publishing house, headed by a council of five to seven well known masters, such people as the conscience of our intelligentsia Academician D.S. Likhachev, Ch. Aytmatov, V. Bykov, D. Granin, S. Zalygin, V. Rasputin. The reader trusts them. In no time the books would be sold out and the desks freed.

Several times at our congress the question has been raised of respect for the mighty literature created in the republics. This means it is a sore point! The true intellectual still takes as his motto Dostoyevskiy's words: "Not in hostility... but in friendship, with total love, we have taken to our hearts the geniuses of other nations... without regarding tribal distinctions as predominant..."

Nobody must think that everything has changed and been resolved. Our fatherland could be in danger even now, unless the new way of thinking is victorious. I repeat: Our main enemy within is not the hard-hitting book, but the monster of bureaucracy and the inertia of the old way of thinking which hampers the new.

Everyone must fight against it. Our country has the foremen to supervise the work of the spirit, some of them are in this room.

Address by Chakovskiy

PM021154 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 3

["Abbreviated version" of the Aleksandr Chakovskiy speech in the 26-27 June debate at the USSR Writers Congress]

[Text] More than a year ago, when addressing a combined plenum of the creative unions here in the Kremlin, I said that our party, its Central Committee, and our government had sensed and divined our people's longing and done everything to ensure that Victory Day -- a jubilee that is sacred for us all -- was a truly historic celebration for eternity. I again wish to talk about this same subject: sensitivity toward the people's heart, pains, thoughts, and aspirations. The 27th party congress taught us all a lesson in truth, social justice, and resolute and implacable struggle against misappropriators, bribe-takers, tricksters, parasites, varnishers of the truth, and "self-advertisers" -- in brief, everything that impedes our life and work.

Soviet writers have absorbed the party's appeal and the commands of the times and have joined punctiliously in the difficult but so necessary work of improving the social atmosphere. Living, thinking about life, and writing about it have undoubtedly become more interesting. It is no mere coincidence that literary and creative life in the country has become appreciably more active and that our debates about the writer's place in the worker's system have become more specific, responsible, and, finally, simply more intelligent.

We have already seen works which, it seems to me, match the spirit of the times, awaken our conscience, and demand the mobilization of civic qualities on the part of the reader. I do not wish to launch into a list of names, which is the custom at writers' congresses, and so I will merely mention Valentin Raputin's "Fire" [Pozhar], Viktor Astafyev's "Sad Detective Story" [Pechalnyy Detektiv], and Vasiliiy Bykov's "The Quarry" [Karyer]. These are very necessary, truthful, and modern books! And I have no doubt that they will be followed by more and more new talented works providing readers with a powerful charge of social activeness and inspiring them to make their contribution to our common cause -- the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic and spiritual development.

At the same time I am convinced that we would be mistaken to restrict the concept of truth in literature to just zeal in unmasking ills. If we did, we would be giving a one-sided and thus distorted picture of life. For there is current truth -- the truth of the moment, so to speak; the truth of the individual fact, and artistic truth in the sense that we have inherited it from the giants of Russian realism and the founders of socialist realism -- the truth of great historical generalizations transcending transient everyday circumstances. This truth is always historical and social. For a writer the thirst for truth, artistic truth, is primarily a passionate affirmation of our socialist way of life.

At a sharp turning point in history it is important for us writers to soberly and realistically measure what has been achieved against what the party has planned and what the Soviet people expect of us. The time has finally come to learn how to identify not only the successes -- we have considerable experience of panegyrics here -- but also the "bottlenecks" and problems requiring urgent solution.

There is no need to repeat that for a Soviet writer there are no prohibited subjects or heroes unworthy of attention. But I am alarmed, I confess, at the pettiness of some works and the enthusiasm for deep philosophizing on petty subjects.

I often recall with bitterness Balzac's words: "There are writers who look at the greatest events through a reducing lens." I am grieved by a process that can be observed in some books, including books written by talented and experienced hands -- the process of erosion of ideals and lowering of not only purely literary but also ideological, spiritual, and moral criteria, which are verified by reality. It seems important to me to draw attention to the fact that the moral concepts of some heroes, and sometimes of their authors, have become too flexible -- I would even say elastic -- and are applied to circumstances rather than transcending them.

No matter what a book talks about -- ecological problems, the nature of family relationships, production, or the "external questions" of everyday life -- we must see the political thrust and ideological essence of every phenomenon.

It would be no bad thing if this was also remembered by literary critics, some of whom obliviously bury themselves in abstract theorizing divorced from practical life and others of whom engage in petty intergroup squabbling unworthy of Soviet men of letters and transform their comments on literature into a means for settling scores, furthering their careers, and indulging themselves. We cannot fail to be concerned by the fact that in our press -- including in the pages of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA -- disputes often surround not essential matters but details of little interest to the broad reading audience.

One of the most important features of our time is the further democratization of social life. I am convinced that this cannot fail to have an impact on literature too: on broadening the circle of heroes and focusing attention on the fate of the ordinary person, who is -- and it our duty to graphically show this -- the real master of society, creator, and builder.

When comparing wartime and peacetime it is impossible not to mention another sacred duty of the Soviet writer. The writer and peace -- this theme is unavoidable today, as is the theme of the writer and humanism. Because there is no greater demonstration of humanism that saving mankind from the threat of self-destruction!

Granin Speech

PM021540 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 3

["Abbreviated version" of the Daniil Granin speech in the 26-27 June devate at the USSR Writers Congress]

[Text] Imagine, comrades, that you have been sent on a reconnaissance mission. On completing the assignment you come back and report that you counted 100 enemy tanks. "Oh, no!" you are told. "That's too many! Report that there were no more than 20. That's more pleasant." The was approximately the situation in which our literature found itself quite recently.

In the last year and a half the evil began to be revealed -- naked and, I would say, at times fearless evil with extensive connections and rights. Its scale, which we had not imagined, became discernible. The cleansing work of the party requires courage and implacability; it is continuing and will continue, and this is a great benefit of our times. We have seen a great deal that is different from this, a great deal in our books now seems timid, petty, and anodyne. Who is to blame? Our conciliationism? The pressure of half-truth? The situation in the Writers Union? There are many reasons but few justifications.

The demand for the wholeness of truth was extremely important for us all. The wholeness of truth does not apply just to the current 5-year plan period. It also relates to our immediate past, the postwar years, and the war. And Russian history. But it also relates to literature. Russian literature has accumulated treasurehouses of the works of authors of the twenties and thirties: Vasliy Andreyev, Dobychin, Oleynikov, Zamyatin, Vvedenskiy, Kuzmin -- dozens of remarkable writers who have been unjustly forgotten.

The dynamics of life compel us to give thought to not only the positive hero but also the so-called negative hero. World literature -- and Russian literature in particular -- has created a gallery of evil and flawed heroes: Rastignac and Smerdyakov, Idushka Golovlev and Iago, Klim Samgin and Tartuffe. Our antiheroes are feeble, innocuous, and slow-witted against the backdrop of these great heroes.

Yet the struggle that is getting under way today has made both feelings and characters bigger. In this duel, evil has shown itself to be much stronger and more dangerous and numerous than we thought. Why should evil adapt if it can feel comfortable where is is? We have learned a great deal about it, as we have also learned a great deal about the struggle against it -- often a heroic struggle by individuals.

It has to be acknowledged that many of our positive heroes would not be equal to such trials: Very often they are infantile and have been oversolicitously protected by editors, both paid and unpaid, living in our very midst -- protected against injustice, defeat, despair, or a tragic end. They have been deprived of serious opponents. The negative hero in our literature is not Satan, not the devil; he takes the form of minor devils, ill-doers without masks or support, solitary tricksters. And they are not so much a phenomenon as a chance occurrence. And we have reason to criticize ourselves not because of sacred exactingness, which is a commandment for every artist, but because in our own way we have participated in embellishing reality, making concessions, and vaunting achievements and have been guided not by our own conscience but by signs of approbation.

But for all this it must be said that throughout these years really significant things were being created without thought of rapid publication and success. The fate of some of these proved to be unjustifiably difficult and took years to decide. I know several talented novels written in response to the immutable demands of conscience and pain. Who should have shown interest in their years-long trials and assisted discussion and investigation? Who? I believe it should have been the Writers Union. Otherwise what purpose does it have? The Union did not do this. It opted out.

The 27th party congress and its decision, spirit, and thrust demand that we writers support the party's efforts and renew social life. But to actively and effectively help the party we have to restructure our work. The restructuring that is taking place today in all spheres of life also applies to our writers organization. Because -- unnatural as it may be -- our creative union suffers a great deal, from bureaucratic ills. We have become a departmental institution. Lists of books recorded, accepted, published; average ages, trips made, reports delivered... But who needs this if the union is not concerned about the fate of an acute, controversial, and talented work? So I listened to the keynote report and looked for an answer to a question which seems most important to me: How are things to be done so that things in our union are good for talented writers but bad for time-servers?

Why is this not happening? The union has lost its creative spirit. A young writer goes into the union and what does he see? He sees that writers holding high positions enjoy literary advantages. A position and title often offer protection against objective criticism, so you have to seek a position, he reasons. He seems that the people who win out are not the ones who seek the truth or practice their skill but those who are ostentatiously active.

He becomes convinced that service of the muse allows for ostentatious activity. But can creativity be measured in awards? And how do awards match up with reader recognition? Is it not a strange situation when literature is fragmented -- you get a writer well known for his activity and a writer well known for his books? The fate of a manuscript and the fate of a book are the two fates which go to make up a writer's fate. And this must be the union's prime concern.

The fate of a manuscript does not include only the extreme cases which I have mentioned. In production the technical supervision department is called on to safeguard product quality. Our technical supervision department quite often lowers and worsens the quality of our output. Nature suffers as a result of ecological ignorance. But literature also suffers and is hurt by crude ad-hoc interference by editors and publishers. It would be a good thing to be concerned with protecting manuscripts, protecting the writer's individuality which makes him precious to the reader. By contrast, it is his similarity which makes him more convenient for a publisher.

One day -- a long time ago -- when the question of the editorship of a journal was being discussed, I proposed Vera Fedoronva Panova. Impossible, I was told, she is an unmanageable person. Unmanageable means having an opinion and views of your own... I was told: We have enough on our hands with Tvardovskiy! In reality we do not have enough editors like Aleksandr Trifonovich Tvardovskiy!

Our literature is like reconnaissance; it can help the party by exploring the truth, and it is to be hoped that talent with its principle-mindedness and implacability, rather than subservience and conciliationism, will be increasingly valued in our literary practice.

Our congress must become the start of the restructuring of the union, so that it does not work out that we spend 3 days talking here and then all go back to our old ways.

MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI INTERVIEWS FORMER LEADER MOLOTOV

LD020656 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0555 GMT 2 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jul (TASS) -- A MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI correspondent has visited Vyacheslav Molotov, USSR political figure. (From 1930 to 1941 Molotov headed the Soviet Government, then up to 1957 he was deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, and, at the same time, USSR foreign minister). The road was leading us to the Zhukova dacha settlement near Moscow, the correspondent writes. At last we are standing on front of a two-story building surrounded by greenery. The owner of the house, Vyacheslav Molotov, leaning on a cane, met us in the courtyard.

When he learned that I was a journalist he said: "It is dangerous to have anything to do with you" and greeted us with a smile.

He invited us to a study where all the walls were covered with bookshelves. "Anti-Duhring" by Engels and "Quiet Flow the Don" by Sholokhov were on his desk. I noticed notes in pencil on an open page in 'Anti-Duhring'.

As though he had read my thoughts, he speaks about his daily routine (Molotov is 96). He gets up at 0630, and for 20 minutes he exercises in the open air. After breakfast he walks in the forest for about an hour, after which he reads the newspaper. A 2-hour break and then the worktable again and books, books. He devotes 6 hours to reading.

"I am up to date with all the events," says Vyacheslav Molotov. "I am inspired by the changes which are taking place in our life. It is a nuisance that age and health do not permit me to take an active part in them. The older a man gets, the more he wants to be useful to society.

"I used to be very fond of wandering in the streets of Moscow, dropping into bookshops. Even though I have a large library at home, all the same I always buy something. I have a large pension. And I can afford it. My leg has been acting up just lately, and such long walks are now too much for me. My daughter Svetlana and her husband Aleksey Nikonov help out. They are both historians.

"I do not watch television very much, but I do not miss two programs: "The World Today" and "Vremya."

GROMYKO PRESENTS STATE AWARDS IN KREMLIN

LD042100 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 4 Jul 86

[Text] Today Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko presented a group of comrades with state awards in the Kremlin.

Lenin Orders and Second Hammer and Sickle gold medals were received by Klepikoc, hero of socialist labor and team leader of the Kuban kolkhoz in Krasnodar Kray; (?Plyuchinskiy), chairman of the Zarya Kommunizma kolkhoz, Rovno Oblast; and Shlifer, chairman of the Zarya Kommunizma kolkhoz, Kirovograd Oblast.

Lenin Orders and Hammer and Sickle gold medals were presented to the poet Isayev; Academician Osipyanyan, director of the Solid Physics Institute; Ulyanov, artiste of the Vakhtangov State Academic Theater; and Feodosiyev, head of a department of the Imeni Baumana Moscow Higher Technical Institute.

Comrade Gromyko conveyed to all recipients the congratulations of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and wished them happiness, health and new successes in their work.

WRITERS UNION CONGRESS SPEECHES REPORTED

V.M. Mishin

PM031419 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 27, 2 Jul 86 p 6

["Abbreviated version" of speech by Komsomol Central Committee First Secretary V.M. Mishin at 26-27 June debate at Eighth USSR Writers Union Congress in Moscow]

[Text] I can say in all confidence that our young people are deeply concerned about the problems that are being discussed at this congress, the problems raised by leading writers in their books -- problems of moral duty and social responsibility, environmental conservation, the cultural legacy of the past, and the peaceful future of our planet.

Still equally important is the theme of the contemporary comrade in the struggle for the party's ideas who has gone from a life of labor into literature and then returned to the working ranks from the writing desk in order to help the young gain a deeper understanding of life, assess their moral criteria, and do battle with routine and stagnation.

But where is this hero? It is difficult to find him in the pages of many journals and anthologies, on the stage, and among the main characters in novels. What you do find there in prominent roles are cynical, overgrown adolescents, foppish parasites in the inevitable jeans, infantile and pragmatic at one and the same time.

What can one say? Perhaps our young people have spent all their ardor in the pursuit of fashionable finery, danced themselves silly in discotheques, and squandered their talents on trifles? I think it appropriate to recall here: Whose hands built the Baykal-Amur Railroad? Who is extracting Tyumen oil and guarding the frontiers of the fatherland? Who gave their lives to prevent an even bigger disaster at Chernobyl?

The answer to these questions is provided by life itself. But it is not always provided by our literature, which is meant to sow in young hearts what is wise, good, and eternal, to fire young hearts with the voice of sincerity, wisdom, and truth, and to scrutinize life with talent and perspicacity, highlighting those things that constitute the future.

The 27th party congress set the task of providing scope for youth initiative in all spheres of social life. And in our view the sphere of literature should be no exception.

One can scarcely consider normal a situation where many writers' organizations have hardly any young members, where even winners of respected competitions and prizes are kept waiting for years for union membership.

In past years we have worked together to set up a network of literary associations and various conferences, seminars, and competitions seemingly extensive enough to catch all promising authors.

At the same time, the debate goes on in the press, and passions continue to rise in the corridors: Are young writers entering literature or fighting their way into the union? Are the positive reactions of theoretical seminars a help to them or are they a disservice, giving precocious young people the confidence that they have an exceptional talent and need not work hard? At what point does acknowledged masters' paternal concern for beginners become literary favoritism? These and other crucial questions remain on the agenda.

We are also against young opportunists receiving the lofty title of Soviet writer together with their membership cards. Obviously there is no place in the union either for smart craftsmen with meager experience of life who, as a critic sarcastically observed, can describe a cockroach's passage through a garbage chute so colorfully that you even start thinking it is some kind of symbol.

Every year around 300 books by new authors are published. Publishing house staff give assurances that not a single talented manuscript goes unnoticed. But even now, louder and louder are the voices which claim that ordinary items, nicely tailored but lacking the spark of originality that might "perplex" the editor, are more likely to find their way through the publishing labyrinth.

Incidentally, our Komsomol publishing house, "Molodaya Gvardiya," is no exception in this case.

Clearly, there is a need for bolder efforts and experimentation in publishing.

The party and life itself have prompted the thought that training for any work -- from team leader to minister -- must begin early and that young scientific and technical talents must be moved forward more boldly before they turn apathetic and grow fat. I believe a bolder effort must be made to involve young cadres in the formation of the literary process.

There is no doubt, dear comrades, that the Eighth USSR Writers Congress will accelerate the process of literary life and will be a milestone in the development of Soviet literature. Our dynamic times demand harmonious joint work on the part of the Lenin Komsomol and the masters of multinational Soviet literature: vigorous and creative work.

Feliks Kuznetsov

PMO31422 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 5

["Abbreviated version" of Feliks Kuznetsov speech in 26-27 June debate at Eighth USSR Writers Congress]

[Excerpt] For many years now literary criticism has been placed in a degrading [unizhenny] position, which is again a manifestation of a formalistic and bureaucratic attitude toward literature in the Writers Union and its organs.

To judge by literary periodicals and certain high-powered [vysokiy] literary meetings, some of our comrades do not seem to be heeding the 27th party congress' appeal to critics: "...It is time to shake off indifference and sycophancy, which erode healthy morals..."

Is this not why the restructuring of literary affairs is making such slow progress and in fact standing still? I say this self-critically and with respect to the Moscow writers' organization.

In our view, restructuring must start with the bottlenecks and painful points -- literary criticism and journal publishing. The practical proposals in the report are good, but it is necessary to start with the psychological restructuring of the leaders of the literary process and the creation and consolidation in our creative union of an atmosphere of principle-mindedness and exactingness, full publicity and competitiveness among talents, love and concern for literature, and implacability toward the suppression and retardation of criticism. Then it will be criticism!

In book publishing there are many unresolved problems, troubles, wrongs, bitternesses, injustices, and reproaches -- both from readers complaining about the abundance of bad books and from writers, who complain that it is extremely difficult to publish a good book. All this should have been eradicated most vigorously a long time ago, but the Writers Union has practically nothing to do with even its journals, not to mention its publishing houses. In practice it even lacks the machinery [privodnyye remni] for this.

The creation some time back of an enormous state committee for book publishing did not justify writers' hopes. Printing facilities are in an extremely neglected state. And as for the time it takes to plan the conditions and quality of book publishing, things here not only do not seem to have improved but have even deteriorated. In any event the number of bureaucratic obstacles has increased many times over. There is a need for radical reforms in our publishing business, which is obsolete in printing terms and extremely cumbersome. The State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade has recently been seeking ways to build ties with the writing community. And this is good. The publishing of books -- the end result of a writer's labor -- must no longer be allowed to be so remote from the creator, the writer, and totally removed from the control of the writing community.

The principles of writers' self-management must be consistently affirmed in the form of rights, and it is a great pity that we are not examining the question of amending the statutes of the USSR Writers Union at this congress. But even within the limits of the existing statutes there is a need for new forms of writers' management, and particularly for active creative councils of masters of prose, poetry, all other genres, and journal publishing, who should be elected at a plenum and report back to a plenum. Such councils of masters should also decide on all our creative matters, determine the Writers Union's literary policy, elaborate artistic guidelines and criteria, and preserve the ideological and esthetic dignity of literature.

To judge by its peaks, the literature we have today is talented, powerful, and respected throughout the world. May it be this great and genuine literature, zealously upholding the idea of the transformation of society, that decides matters in our creative union and set the tone in the country's spiritual life by right and authority!

Vladimir Karpov

PMO31619 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 27, 2 Jul 86 p 10

["Abbreviated version" of speech by Vladimir Karpov (chief editor of NOVYY MIR magazine) at 26-27 June debate at Eighth USSR Writers Union Congress]

[Text] On 22 June, on the eve of our congress, on the eve of its opening, there were good television programs and many articles were published in the newspapers about that terrible and tragic day that the war began. This is probably why my recollections of what I experienced in the fighting are mixed up with my memory of the first postwar years, when many of us became students at the Literary Institute. I remember always the witty and prickly Yuriy Bondarev and Volodya Tendryakov, who was kind but always firm in his judgments. I recall Grisha Baklanov, already strict beyond his years; Boris Badnyy, a crystal-pure man and very talented writer; Volodya Soloukhin, still quite young, with a splendid head of wheaten hair and still more a poet than a prose writer; Rasul Gamzatov, cheerful, noisy, and the richest of us, because he had already been published; Mayya Ganina, a beauty who had only just left her school bench behind; a very good and dependable comrade -- the wise Natasha Ilina; Misha Godenko, Semen Shurtakov, Konstantin Vanshenkin; Nikolay Yevdokimov, gentle and even tender in friendship; and many others. I pronounce these names with great pleasure, and I am very glad that they have all grown to be good writers.

But this is what grieves me. We were a happy, united family. After the end of the war it seemed that life would be radiant, but no -- we graduated from the institute and gradually dispersed to places in certain companies and certain small groups. Many people built up personal grudges, which have found expression at this congress. But, however hard it might be, we must come through this. No one will come along the eliminate the shortcomings in our life and in creative affairs. We alone will have to do this ourselves. And, it seems to me, we must remember that the whole country, the whole world is following our work, and not just at the congress, and we have not only friends but also ill-wishers.

I want to recall the situation in the fifties and sixties, when we also talked and argued a great deal. As it turned out then, disregard of the boundaries separating democracy from demagoguery sometimes gives rise to very unpleasant consequences. It was during those years that literary dissidents appeared. We have somehow forgotten about that, about the ideological struggle, and we spend too much time explaining personal relations.

Criticism has been leveled here at the union's leadership and secretariat. And yet, you and I have not stood to one side, dear friends. At numerous sessions and conferences we have almost always voted unanimously, acknowledging the work of our leading bodies as satisfactory.

I would like to say a few words to restore justice concerning the field in which I work. Magazine editorial boards have rightly been criticized for many sins in their work. But these sins, dear comrades, are one side of the truth. Not the whole truth. I will speak, for example, about our NOVYY MIR. Simonov, Tvardovskiy, and Narovchatov died soon after their 60th birthdays, and their position as editor was not the least cause of their early departure from this life.

They burned themselves out in their work. It is necessary to criticize editors, but this must be done specifically, naming first names and surnames and the press organs where they work. It pains me to hear disrespectful words about our NOVYY MIR editors. They are remarkable, educated people, devoted to their work, and they have a great love of their work and help many of you. You yourselves know: If some people were published without correction, authors would be very ashamed of what they sometimes bring to editorial offices. Last year our magazine received more than 3,000 prose manuscripts alone. Four people work in the prose department and process these huge piles. I am absolutely sure that the greatest masters of our literature present here -- Aytmatov, Bondarev, Zalygin, Voznesenskiy, Yevtushenko -- will not throw stones at their editors who helped them during the preparation of their manuscripts.

The NOVYY MIR people keep sacred the traditions of their magazine cherished by our brilliant, shining predecessors. They struggled persistently for the life of many manuscripts. Kron's manuscript of "Long-distance Captain" [Kapitan Dalnego Plavaniya] was around for approximately 10 years. I think that Yevtushenko could say how the editorial board championed his poem "Mama and the Neutron Bomb" [Mama i Neytronnaya Bomba], and Voznesenskiy could say how his story "O" got through. I could also name Grekova's "Widow's Steamer" [Vdoviy Parokhod], Chernichenko's "The Combine Cuts and Threshes..." [Kombayn Kosit i Molotit] and dozens of other works. And each of the authors fought and suffered for his manuscript before giving up, while the editorial personnel stayed the same. They embark on further litigation. And they have to fight on two fronts. As you understand, out of 3,000 manuscripts, 12 novels can be published a year (1 novel per issue, if not spread over more than one), and some space is available for short stories or narratives, so the remaining 2,950 will be offended, and 100 of them will certainly write letters to the Central Committee saying how people who do not understand party policy are ensconced at NOVYY MIR. And some people, as we have heard here, even declare from the congress platform that we committed a very gross mistake by not publishing him but publishing someone else. Incidentally, I wish to thank Comrade Mozhayev for his gentle criticism. He said that we published poor materials in two or three issues. No, Comrade Mozhayev, we have had far more weak issues than that.

Excuse me, but I will also have to defend myself a little. Vasiliy Roslyakov is happily finishing work on his manuscript and will be published soon. The same as Dudintsev, with whom we are linked, if at all, only by absolute clarity and full mutual understanding.

On approaching the final phase of our congress, when it will be necessary to adopt a decision, I would like us to remember that we are liked-minded people and, most importantly, that we have gathered to find the right ways to carry out the fine tasks, which inspire us all, which have been set us by life, the party, and the people's destiny.

Yekaterina Sheveleva

PMO31531 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 9

["Abbreviated version" of speech by Yekaterina Sheveleva at 26-27 June debate at Eighth USSR Writers Union Congress]

[Text] ... I look around the hall and there are few writers left from my generation of the first 5-year plans. A generation which is not only proud of the Dnepr GES and Magnitka, but is to blame for many disasters. We who gazed upon the selfless stars of Soviet literature have let self-seeking trends incompatible with writers' devoted work gain ground.

This has had many consequences -- for instance, the civic ardor of poetry has been dimmed. The atmosphere of the 27th congress prompts us to strictly refuse to accept such poetry. There has been almost no poetry imbued with the spirit of the congress. Workers at editorial bureaus reply that "magazines cannot reflect every political event."

Had Tvardovskiy "taken the rostrum at the writers congress," Lakshin writes in IZVESTIYA, "I do not know what he would have talked about first -- shortcomings in literature or the national disaster at Chernobyl."

I make so bold as to suggest that Tvardovskiy would have linked the national disaster at Chernobyl with the pernicious shortcomings in literature, that he would have asked whether those shortcomings and the terrible accident at Chernobyl had not grown up out of the same root system in which hack work, incompetence, money-grubbing, servility, corruption, and cadre failings are conjoined.

It seems as though the machinery of complacency is also found in this root system: deciding the fate of a book even before it is read and the fate of a writer even without studying his life.

Georgiy Mokeyevich Markov himself is not a complacent man. He reads our books and manuscripts, is concerned about justice, and understands the specifics of the literary process. I am also sure that you will not find among us anyone who does not value the selfless work of Yuriy Nikolayevich Verchenko. The fact is that both Markov and Verchenko have a taste for literary organizational work.

...If I was told that Sergey Vladimir Mikhalkov is a talented poet and playwright and a superb public speaker to the most varied audiences, including foreign audiences, I would immediately agree. But nobody will convince me that Mikhalkov has a taste for literary organizational work or for collating writers' efforts. I once thought of asking Mikhalkov: Just why do you, who have received high awards for virtually every line, you who wrote "Uncle Stepa" [Dyadya Stepa] and other books which we and our children have grown up with, you, a writer who has published many books in the year of your 70th birthday alone -- why do you feel duty bound to become involved with anyone's difficult literary destiny? It is boring, tiresome, and uninteresting for you.

And what kind of intellectuality (which you urge us to espouse) is it when your assistant publishes a complimentary monograph about his boss, namely yourself!

Clearly, to a large extent it has been cadre failings that have led to the emergence of a strange phenomenon -- the arbitrary advancement or belittlement of literary careers. There was even evidence of that, in my view, in the report.

No serious writer is offended when he is named on a roll of honor. But every serious writer is insulted when run-of-the-mill writers get into the ranks of what are virtually the classics while the names of those who are landmarks in the development of our literature are simultaneously forgotten. The report failed to mention S. Yesemin -- the bulwark of our lyric poetry; Isakovskiy -- our major lyricist; Erenburg -- the backbone of our writing on current affairs; and Marshak, the bulwark of children's literature.

The report said nothing about Jewish literature, which is now in the front lines of the ideological struggle along with all Soviet literature.

Here is another example of complacent inattention: The fifth issue of the magazine YUNOST -- for the first time in the magazine's 31-year existence -- was composed of works by graduates of the Literary Institute. Has criticism drawn attention to this interesting experiment? Not as yet.

Here is another type of example. A TV film about Leonid Leonov lay in the archives for a long time and was only recently shown.

Valentin Borokin -- a poet of patriotic ardor and bright temperament -- has been dispatched to quiet pastures. Yet both in ability and moral makeup he is capable of being a working secretary of the Russian Writers Union.

...Tvardovskiy wrote to the then still quite young poet Viktor Dedov that his poems were tidy, lovingly wrought, and -- this is the most important point -- showed a desire to say what the author thought needed and required saying.

We must all really make Tvardovskiy's criteria our own. We must learn respect for those of our comrades who through poetry have been able to say universally what they justly felt was needed. I am thinking above all of Yevtushenko and Voznesenskiy.

...There was in my generation a true poet who sacrificed literary fame for the sake of party and state affairs. He could have published collections of his verse and several books. But he rejected such suggestions. His name was Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov. Let the lines of the poet Yuriy Andropov be heard at least once at a writers congress:

...We are but passing shadows in this world:
Life is a fleeting second; nothingness -- eternal.
The world turns in the universe.
People live and are no more...

But the being born of the gloom
Marches indestructibly to the dawn,
Other generations on earth
Will bear life's baton ever onward.

Yuriy Bondarev

PM051502 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No. 27, 2 Jul 86 p 4

["Abbreviated version" of speech by Yuriy Bondarev in 26-27 June debate at Eighth USSR Writers Congress]

[Text] Everyone of us is writing the story of love and death. And the most serious among us, pained by man's recurring tragedies, try time and again to wipe the dust off truths that people have forgotten -- such is the fate of the philanthropist.

It is said that there is no absolute authority in literature now, and that is not because it is poor, deprived, and empty, but because the criteria of artistic merit and truth have been eroded over many years and continue to be eroded and because fragile imitators are constantly being held up as the yardstick at home and abroad. In fact, is our attitude to criticism not too careless?

A sense of proportion, calm moderation, professional integrity, and common sense -- these are the preconditions for all truths, for all assessments, and above all for self-esteem.

However, theoretical criticism sometimes becomes a kind of literary posture with a hint of a fashionable desire to impress by all-destructive audacity, and here cantankerousness and total tactlessness make themselves felt as the evil of the century, which is highly regrettable.

In a Dostoyevskiy centenary article, one widely known fiction writer, whom I do not want to name out of respect for his venerable age, expressed an opinion about the genius of world literature which surprised many readers and which I cite: "His national narrow-mindedness has always repelled me, while his inexplicable hatred toward other nations filled me with revulsion." This quotation brings back memories of the stormy twenties and the appeals to attack Dostoyevskiy and to judge him as a traitor. Yet what does our venerable fiction writer have in mind today? The result is an acute sense of embarrassment, shame, and awkwardness evoked by this stark remark of an esteemed writer who appears to have forgotten (and quite possibly has) Dostoyevskiy's novels and many of his statements in the "Diary of a Writer," whose essence is unequivocal: Only a person who entertains fraternal feelings for the rest of the world, for all peoples, can call himself a Russian.

Well, it is true that there are always thorns in the laurel wreath which can prick even the dead. If Dostoyevskiy were alive he would have probably been hurt by this undeserved revulsion, but it is difficult to say whether he would have picked up the polemical gauntlet which was thrown down so provocatively and with such malice. In the good old days, as people say, it would have ended with a duel, the two men, regardless of their actual talent, would have had to bow to each other and with a pretense of good manners leave the room by different doors, nonetheless thinking about one and the same banal topic, one and the same banal theme, namely life and death, which levels geniuses and nongeniuses through the defenselessness which descends on them after their departure. How facile the classical ethic was!

Contemporary literary criticism, both verbal and printed, led, for a long time, a pitiful existence for various reasons; at present it pursues not only the ardent affirmation of truth but also underhand, perfidious mischief, steeped in the sweet poison of nihilism and accompanied by sour grimaces of disgust in the direction of our culture. Without a hint of shame, the mischief maker and philosopher, Arkhipov, in the pages of VOPROSY FILOSOFII -- which you would think was a respectable journal -- denies with militant arrogance, which is tantamount to ignorance, the great philosophical capacity of Russian and Soviet literature, depriving it, so to speak, of its ability to reason in an attempt to prove that the philosophical quality was borrowed from German literature, thus enabling the primitive expressiveness of our homespun literature.

Over the past 10 years we have witnessed an unprecedented onslaught of unabashed critical forces and have read and continue to read with genuine curiosity articles in which the thinking writer is accused of lack of thought, a good and subtle stylist of inability to put sentences together, and an important psychological writer of lack of psychological insight and of adopting an apolitical stance; we have learned with interest that talent is very rare, but we have also been told about new geniuses who belatedly emerged from the wilderness to join the ranks of major wartime writers, we have learned that prose has regrettably gotten bogged down in elitism, depicting the intelligentsia, cosy interiors, and inappropriately beautiful heroines, instead of depicting the wartime proletariat; we have been told that it is undemocratic for the hero to think, that fact is the ultimate criterion of art, that drinking cocktails is scandalously anti-people, that our poor flagging literature has not been inspired by the great mythopoeic genius of Marquez, that myth is a parable, and naturalism is the ultimate in art, and that any other "pseudophilosophy" goes against reality, that what we need is truth rather than verisimilitude, literature rather than blow-by-blow descriptions of everyday life [bytovizm].

How many historical moral sermons have been delivered, how much plaintive irony has there been on the subject of articles, stories, and novels that were different, that did not fit into the framework of commonplace or group precepts!

And you end up with an absurd impression: Some people are praised, others abused, hints are dropped, suspicions are expressed about certain people, writers are exhorted to do one thing or another, but you feel at the same time that some critics have their fists tightly clenched in their pockets in a well-known [rude] gesture pointed at literature and the bent backs of the readership.

Is criticism a license for vituperative arbitrariness? Have artists and critics always belonged to warring tribes? Or, perhaps, some people use criticism as a devil's instrument to pollute the clear springs? To begin with, taste is deformed, and subsequently artistic consciousness is eroded. No, criticism is not a science, it is not a social doctrine, it is not a literary vampire, it is not a beneficial leech which the writer needs for his health, it is a literary genre of a higher order, a means for educating taste, that is, the sense of truth and beauty. The critic himself is a writer who occupies the "meeting ground," a builder of bridges, a molder of opinions, whom the reader can either heed or ignore. If a writer flirts with criticism in a base and shameful manner, he admits his weakness, his defeat. An artist must ultimately rely only on himself.

Which writers have left a mark on our epoch? Here the first word belongs to criticism.

Which critics have influenced the development of literature? This is for the writers to answer.

Pushkin, Dostoyevskiy, Nekrasov, and Aleksandr Ostrovskiy owe their establishment and fame to Belinskiy, Dobrolyubov, and Apollon Grigoryev. Who among the important contemporary writers owes his fame to a critic to be reckoned with? Critic? What critic? Where are the critics?

If contemporary criticism so far has had little impact on either literature or the readership, what about social criticism? To what extent is that effective?

Is it possible to express satisfaction or praise about this salutary instrument of society when hundreds of priceless historical monuments have been destroyed, when the straight line and the right angle of featureless style have won the upper hand in architecture and disfigured our cities with standard-design monstrosities, depriving them of their warmth and historical atmosphere and inflicting tremendous, irreplaceable damage on patriotism?

In broadening the scope of publicity, is it not too soon to speak of its victorious influence when the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, despite most serious criticism leveled at it on the eve of the 27th party congress, carries on, unswervingly but in secret, digging the channel, that is, implementing the ill-starred project known as reversing part of the flow of northern rivers, a project for which there is very poor scientific substantiation, a frivolous, not to say harmful project. Do we really want to lose our chernozems, our fertile land in European Russia, the Ukraine, and in Central Asia, do we really want to be deprived within a matter of years of clean fresh water which even now is of crucial importance, and to put our children and grandchildren on near-starvation rations and doom them to extinction? Would it not be better to channel the people's billions which are swallowed up by the water experiments into preserving the substantial part of the harvest which is being lost?

Are we too lazy to learn from our own experience which appears to have taught us nothing? Rather than feeling alarm, we must be aware of the danger which is coming our way, seeing and knowing what is happening to the Volga which has been "tamed" eight times over (what is happening to its water, banks, and fish); what is happening to the changed flora of the Dnepr which is threatened with chemical poisoning -- with the whole of Mendeleev's table -- if it is linked with the Danube; what is happening to the Don which has lost its fish; with the Ural River (it was acidic and is now alkaline), with the Kremenchugskoye and Tsimlyanskoye reservoirs, with the renowned Lake Ladoga dangerously saturated with phosphorus, the until recently crystal clear but now polluted Lake Onega, the once beautiful Lake Valdayskoye whose water is no longer fit to drink, and Lake Sevan whose water level has changed out of all proportion, and with thousands of water reservoirs and small rivers.

Careerism which uses social needs as a cover, the careerism characteristic of the bureaucratic guardians of statistics rather than men's welfare who are a law unto themselves, the careerism which essentially compromises the idea of the plan and turns it into a brake on the economy is a terrible evil.

How can one go along with the optimistic fatalism which is alien to real science and which after the sad story of Lake Baykal and Yasnaya Polyana -- saved only through the intervention of the Central Committee -- after all the ecological problems and the recent accident at Chernobyl, far from producing triumphal victories, has cost the people millions of rubles? At the same time, our wise hope, science, the basis of culture which in the 20th century is called upon to maintain a sensible equilibrium between man and his environment has at times ended up in the hands of sly people who deceived us with promises, of smooth-tongued ambitious people driven by a desire for fame, a desire to climb the next rung on the career ladder -- and science in the hands of such people kills and destroys, it turns nature into a cesspit, and consequently both destroys nature and kills man.

If we do not stop the destruction of architectural monuments, if we do not stop the rape of the earth and the rivers, if a moral explosion does not occur in science and in criticism, then thanks to our boundless optimism we will wake up one fine day which will be our last, the day of our funeral, and we will realize that the national culture of great Russia, its spirit, its love of the fatherland, its beauty, its great literature, paintings, and philosophy have been wiped out, have disappeared, are dead forever and that we, naked and destitute, are sitting on the ashes, trying to remember our alphabet and failing because thought, feeling, joy, and the memory of the past are all gone.

Criticism in life and in literature must militate against fossilized tastes, vulgar habits, false group values, that is, it must militate against second rate ethics and perverted morality. At the same time, criticism, knowing well that it is the expression of national consciousness, cannot not be a synonym for bad taste. Incidentally, throughout history it was necessary to have courage in order to be a realist and a citizen in this genre, to aspire to the position of a Sainte Beuve or a Belinskiy who transcended the confines of mere art expert analysis.

As yet we do not have civic criticism. Although, fortunately, there are talented critics -- that is, writers occupying the meeting ground.

Nevertheless an ice age between literature and criticism, between criticism and life is not that close, not that perceptible, is it?

I see only one way out.

In order to acquire a measured, courageous criterion in literature and in life, we should perhaps recall from time to time the student's unjust words ("Nekrasov...rates above Pushkin") at the poet's funeral. And we should recall Dostoyevskiy's worthy answer: No, it is not Nekrasov but truth which rates above Pushkin, above the people, above Russia.

Because, dear comrades, we are all writing about the same topic -- life, where what is most important is the "politics of consciousness."

KAZAKHSTAN CP CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM HELD

Personnel Changes

LD031553 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 3 Jul 86

[Excerpts] The third plenum of Kazakhstan's Communist Party Central Committee was held on 3 July 1986. The plenum discussed the results of the June 1986 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the tasks facing the republic's party organizations in fulfilling the state plan for the Kazakh SSR's economic and social development in 1986-1990.

A report was read at the plenum by Dinmukhamed Akhmedovich Kunayev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Kazakhstan CP Central Committee first secretary.

The Kazakhstan CP Central Committee plenum examined an organizational matter. The plenum released Comrade K.T. Turysov from his duties as Kazakhstan CP Central Committee secretary and Politbureau member in connection with his being transferred to another job.

Lyudmila Yelmatavna Davletova was elected Kazakhstan CP Central Committee secretary and Politburo member. She previously worked as chief of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee Light and Food Industry Department.

The plenum also has released Anatoliy Rodionovich Karavayev from his duties as minister of the Kazakh SSR Ministry of Motor Transport for abuse of his official position to his own advantage and dismissed him from the CPSU.

Kunayev Delivers Report

LD031853 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 3 Jul 86

[Text] Today the plenum of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee discussed the results of the 1986 CPSU Central Committee June Plenum and the tasks of party organizations in the republic in fulfilling the state plan for the economic and social development of the Kazakh SSR for the years 1986 to 1990. Comrade Kunayev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee, gave a report.

He pointed out that working people in the towns and countryside, by creatively developing what has been achieved, are transferring the emphasis from quantitative to qualitative indexes, from an expansion of production assets to their renewal. At the same time, priority is given to the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the conservation of resources, and the strengthening of discipline and order in every way.

The main means of fighting bureaucratic distortions is efficiency. This means a precise, highly organized work process, where everyone knows his business and has a conscientious, responsible attitude toward it. It also means a party-minded, political approach to resolving problems that arise and persistence in achieving planned goals and the necessary practical results. It is no less important to create the conditions and atmosphere in which the policy of playing safe would not be encouraged but eliminated. The right action is taken where Communists' reports to their comrades are regularly heard and party references are discussed and approved at party meetings. This helps to increase responsibility for the matter at hand.

Criticism and self-criticism are effective methods of operatively disclosing and eliminating all impediments in the way of the restructuring process. Bureaucrats feel uncomfortable in this spotlight. It is the duty of party organizations to concern themselves with ensuring that this light does not go out but, on the contrary, burns brighter. Any attempts to suppress criticism must be resolutely quashed. Wherever criticism and self-criticism die away, all party activity is deformed. Openness has been graphically described as the sword healing the wound. The Soviet individual wants to and must know what is going on in the collective, the city, and the country. The mass information and propaganda media are expected to make their own contributions to the struggle against bureaucracy.

The guarantee of successful and precise implementation of adopted decisions lies in increased exactingness toward cadres and in strict monitoring. Verification of fulfillment is the task of every party, soviet, and economic worker and every primary party organization. It is important in this respect to concentrate attention on the prime tasks facing labor collectives. The basic aim of verification is not the registration of shortcomings and errors but primarily the practical organization of matters. Unfortunately, this is not the case everywhere. Approximately 30 different commissions were in operation at the Vinnitsa meat combine in the course of just 1 month. Dozens of people worked by the sweat of their brow. Once again mountains of paper were produced. But this did not help to overcome the problem of the collective lagging behind. It is clear that this kind of "paper" verification is not what is needed to really improve things.

Our time is a time of change. Great, large-scale tasks require a creative approach. They also dictate the need to wage a resolute struggle at all levels against excessive administration and bureaucracy.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON WRITERS CONGRESS PROCEEDINGS

Rozhdestvenskiy Address

PMO31558 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 8

["Abbreviated version" of Robert Rozhdestvenskiy speech in 26-27 June debate at Eighth USSR Writers Congress]

[Text] The times in which we are living are being called a turning point -- a harsh but just term. The restructuring taking place in our country -- a long-awaited, large-scale, in-depth restructuring -- today is affecting each and every person. A process of renewal, awakening, and daily questing is taking place in our state. An incredibly complex and sometimes agonizing process, but a process which is the only one possible and vitally necessary.

It is splendid that a time has now come when ordinary and highly familiar concepts are gradually regaining their normal, true essence -- a time when work is coming to mean work; a plan means a plan; conscience means conscience; communist means communist; and responsibility means responsibility.

However the old formulas are reluctant to surrender; they continue to live, exist, and show themselves.

So long as there are battles (for the plan, the harvest, quality, or something else), we will not move forward, for a battle is a symbol of a blitz. What is in fact needed is work -- admittedly intensive and difficult, but real, creative, will organized work.

There must be this kind of work in our writers union too.

Let me touch on the problems of young people, although this has already been discussed. You of course know that today's young writers are 30, 40, or even older. This is considered normal. There is even a fine theory that the establishment of a poet (and also a writer of prose) is a slower, much slower, process today than it was yesterday. And that a young poet displays all his best qualities, including his individuality, in his thirties and forties.

Well maybe the theory is right. But the strange thing is that the age of first love remains the same: As in the past, people fall in love for the first time not at 26 or 27 but at 15, 16, or 17. And people continue to receive a passport at 16. And they go off for military service at 18. And they first cross the threshold of school not at 8 but at 6.

So, everybody manages to mature at the right time; it is only young writers who, despite everything, are late. Quite a misfortune! So, is it not the times we live in but writing practice which is suddenly to blame for this lateness? For it is no secret -- and this has also been said at the congress -- that the more talented and original a manuscript is, the longer it spends lying in publishers' offices. How long can it stay there? It can be 5 years, 7 years, or even longer. This is how a young writer "comes to maturity," how he confirms the "theory of late development."

Allow me to say a little about criticism. The situation is as follows: If you judge our present literature from the numerous critical articles and reviews it becomes clear that the USSR Writers Union today consists of creative individuals resembling in some respects Gogol's provincial ladies: They are either "simply pleasant" or "pleasant in every respect." The writers union has nothing else in it. However, it is not only critics who create this bland landscape. After all, poets and prose writers also write about each other, and quite often.

Incidentally, it cannot be claimed that we are absolutely uncritical. For example, for a couple of years in succession now every report at every writers conference or congress, including the present one has obligatorily included a phrase about colorlessness in literature. Some speakers even talk about a "colorless flood." They refer to this very colorlessness in very poor words, abuse it, and call for active struggle against it, and an enormous noise, a great deal of noise is made about this!

Just one fact is worrying: When talking about colorlessness, for some reason the speakers, as a rule, do not name a single name.

Therefore the problem of combatting colorlessness assumes somewhat enigmatic, semimystical overtones. And there is already a hint of overt diabolism: It is as if colorless books exist, but they have no names. It is as if these books have been published, but nobody knows who wrote them. Maybe wartime secrecy is at work? Maybe the authors of colorless works are now so surrounded by secrecy that even their names must not be spoken? Or the enemy will hear!

The absolutely correct demand today is for fewer words and more action. This is all true. But what becomes of us when the main pain and joy, the main doubt and hope, the main act and action for a writer is THE WORD? [Preceding two words published in bold-face]

Thus, it is necessary to work so that our words always serve our country's boundless cause, our Soviet people's cause, the cause wherein our entire life lies. In all its entirety!

Zalygin Address

PM031047 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 pp 3-4

["Abbreviated version" of speech by Sergey Zalygin (Moscow) at 26-27 debate at Eighth USSR Writers Union Congress]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] I think that we should suspend admittance to the union for at least 2 years and take a look around to see what we represent and what we have at our disposal both quantitatively and qualitatively. During this period we must gather applications for admission to the union and select the worthiest from among them. Perhaps we should once again introduce a probationary period.

Why do we need a literary criticism center under the Institute of Literature? In order to grant a post to yet another secretary? So that it may centralize still further? Would it not be better to bring about creative conditions for the whole enormous detachment of critics who are already functioning?

Of course, we shall not resolve all our problems at once, but what should we start with? I think that it is necessary to start with the reestablishment of the decisive role of the board. The present sessions of the board are a vacuous way of spending time. Secretaries deliver for each other the same old hackneyed speeches while the board members sit in the refreshment room or succumb to boredom in the meeting hall.

I read a stenographic account of board sessions which took place immediately after the writers first congress. What urgent, what vital issues were raised by them there! This now seems incomprehensible to us.

It is necessary to give the boards back their original role. The congress must sum up the result of what we are talking about today and of what is alarming us. I think it must begin with the following act -- to elect democratically a real, energetic board.

Nenashev Speech

PM031329 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 27 2 Jul 86 p 7

[Abbreviated version of speech by M.F. Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, delivered at 26-27 June session of the Eighth USSR Writers Union Congress]

[Text] If you assess impartially the overall quantitative results of book production in recent years it clearly has to be acknowledged that readers have not been idle. Some 11 billion copies of books and pamphlets have been published in 5 years. That is almost 19 percent more than in the previous 5-year period. The considerable increase in the overall number of books of fiction and children's literature is particularly marked. The situation in the book market is also changing. The demand for fiction in national languages is now being met in most union republics.

Typical

The achievements are real. However, they should not be overestimated. There is still an acute shortage of many books, and our progress to date in overcoming it is very unsubstantial.

We consider that a differentiated approach rather than one concerned merely with gross output is one of the most realistic. The program for printing large editions of books which enjoy enhanced demand planned for the next decade by the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade is a concrete expression of that approach. The program was initiated by the opening of an unlimited subscription to a three-volume edition of the works of A.S. Pushkin, which was unique in terms of scale in world publishing practice. We are now completing a similar unlimited-subscription two-volume Mayakovskiy. At the same time the large editions of the series "Library of the Classics," "Library for Young People," "School Library," and others will be continued.

A whole series of specific measures to increase the output of children's literature have been outlined. We must look at the inner core of the problem of book shortages about which we talk so much. It is obvious that a book shortage is not all equivalent to a shortage of ordinary consumer goods. Books acquire their value only when they are read. At the same time, it is well known that very often the acquisition of a book certainly does not mean that it is read. Many books, including those which are sought in the stores, circulate extremely slowly, while others are not read at all.

It is also clear that in recent years our mass media have talked a lot about shortages and much less about propagandizing books and fostering a love for them in the family and school or about the problems of libraries and reading rooms. At a rough estimate, there are around 40 million books individual use today and more than 5 billion in libraries. It seems to us that it is time to think seriously about whether we are making sensible use of this enormous wealth of books, which are a national asset and have a direct bearing on the development of culture and science and the spiritual and moral education of Soviet people.

In conclusion, I would like to talk frankly about the critical observations regarding conservatism in publishing houses.

Yes, there is much that is imperfect in modern publishing house practice and which requires substantial changes. Publishing bureaucracy, which generates and encourages the pushy, enterprising literary fixer and relegates the talented manuscripts to the background, does make its presence felt. The hedger, who deliberately obstructs manuscripts which he finds unusual and assiduously smooths out all the rough edges in order to put yet another featureless work on the conveyor-belt, is also alive and well in our sphere.

This a very serious issue. Practice shows that the generator of bold, new ideas, the pioneer in literature, science, or culture often has a difficult, uncomfortable time in our publishing houses. The conservative and the opportunist on the other hand feel much more comfortable.

Nor are we in the business of determining the circulation of literature, where-hot air and thoughtless eulogy predominate and where we -- publishers and editors -- have for a long time now acted as energetic defenders and preservers of customary standards and stereotypes, blameless. There are many causes responsible for these unhealthy influences. One of them is very significant: An infallibility complex developed in recent years has become very influential among editors (and I do not say this to offend but for the sake of truth) and writers. Hence the blandness [blagostnost] in evaluation and the great shortage of healthy dissatisfaction.

The comments regarding shortcomings in thematic planning and circulation policy are justified. Long under the spell of book shortages, today we essentially find ourselves with no effective mechanism enabling us to properly study the existing needs and providing an objective idea of readers' requirements and interests. Therefore, our decisions about a particular author or the size of a print run are quite often not based on reliable feedback and trustworthy information but on very general and often highly subjective notions or mere intuition.

How are we intending to overcome the shortcomings here? We are thinking of substantially changing the system of publishing planning, since it quite often holds up the prompt publication of topical new books. Considerable democratization of the whole practice of drawing up publishing plans in the spirit of the principles of the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum are to be the main thrust here. Considerable expansion of information and publicity at all levels of decisionmaking about the publication of particular works, the requirement and real demand for literature, current and long-term publishing house plans, the actual number of books remaining in the trade network and the specific authors of them will, in our opinion, be particularly useful. We will collaborate more closely with the writers union in this work and will rely on the libraries, the Society of Booklovers, and the mass media. The reader himself and the labor collective, where we must get agreement and approval of publishing plans and intentions, are to be the main link here.

Television Coverage

LD030940 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1413 GMT on 2 July carries a 30-minute report from the USSR Congress of Writers held 24-28 June in Moscow.

Prior to the beginning of the opening of the congress, poet Irakiliy Abashidze says he is expecting "an important discussion" at this congress, which was the case "at the first congress 50 years ago." The Soviet leaders are then shown arriving on the platform after which Chairman of the Writers Union Board Georgiy Markov is shown speaking.

There follows a series of foyer interviews with poet Yustinas Martsinkyavichyus who says: "The main thing the rapporteur pointed us toward is the truth, the truth of life, which must become the truth of art." Poet David Kugultinov opines: "The opening of the congress has given us the feeling that we are about to witness the birth of a new way of thinking, about to see people thinking in a new manner, recognizing that to think in this world in the way we have, and act in the way we have acted in line with this thinking, is no longer possible. In other words, I am talking about a certain prophetic mission of literature, the courage of literature, and the need to eliminate fear in yourself in order to speak that truth which is the basis of all that is best and true."

The video then switches to the rostrum where writer Sergey Zalygin expounds on the meaning of contemporaneity in literature and the "absence of realism" in international relations. He continues: "What do I see in literature that has no business being there? Above all, red tape and an excess of organization which no one needs and which does not meet creative interests. Naturally we will not solve all of these problems, but we must begin somewhere. I believe we must begin with the reinstatement of board meetings to their rightful role. The boards must be given back their original role. I have been reading the minutes of board meetings held just after the 1st Union of Writers Congress. What combative meetings they were and what truly vital matters were raised! For us, it is simply incomprehensible now. And so I believe that a proper conclusion from what is taking place in both our thoughts and in our manuscripts now should be drawn by our congress in the form of the following action: the election of a proper, active board."

The writer Daniil Granin is next seen speaking from the rostrum. He says: "The reorganization which is being effected today in all spheres of life also applies to our writers' organization, because, unnatural though it is, our creative union is greatly afflicted by bureaucratic ills. We have become a bureaucratic institution in which we draw up lists of people honored, accepted, or published, average ages, trips, reports. But who needs all this if the union is not concerned with the fate of polemical, controversial, and talented work? I listened to the [Markov] report, and I sought a reply to a question which seems to me to be one of the most important in our lives, namely, how can we run things in our union that will encourage talented writers and discourage time-servers? Isn't it a strange situation when literature undergoes a fission process and some writers are hailed who are famous for their activities, and others who are famous for their books?"

The poet Boris Oleynik also speaks from the rostrum and asserts: "These insidious stereotypes which we are currently overcoming can sometimes be glimpsed even in the very struggle against stereotypes. What I mean is that in criticizing what is outdated we attempt to distance ourselves from those outdated things in which we ourselves have a part, and we merrily set tasks for others, quite forgetting about ourselves. Boring though it may be, a clean break must begin with oneself if only to be able, once having openly recognized one's blunders and sketched out a constructive program for overcoming them, to bar those from the platforms who found the living easy in the stagnation of the past and who, suffering no pangs of elementary conscience, will, of course, be the first to want to climb up onto the platforms to lecture people about how they are to live and work in the new fashion."

Oleynik continues by referring to the Chernobyl accident, and says that this "is not a subject. Rather, it is the very pain of the people, and it is the worst sin for anyone in this world or the next [as heard] to try to cash in on it." He lauds those who "were the first to go into the fire of the fourth reactor," and praises the role of literature in shaping people's willingness to help the victims of misfortune.

The writer Yuriy Bondarev then speaks: "It is maintained that literature lacks an absolute authority today; this is not because it is indigent, gray or bare, but because the criteria of artistic quality and truth were eroded for many years and continue to be eroded, and because fragile imitators have time and again passed themselves off in their own country and abroad as standards against which others should be judged."

He goes on to praise the role of literary criticism in shaping taste: "If contemporary criticism is still unable to influence literature and the reader, is so-called social criticism fully effective? Can satisfactory words of praise be addressed to this salutary instrument of society if hundreds of priceless historical monuments have been destroyed, if architecture has witnessed the triumph of the harsh flatness and right-angles of a style without style which has disfigured our cities with stereotyped monstrosities, dispersing their warmth and spirit of history, thus, causing enormous harm to the people's quiet irreplaceable sense of patriotism?" Criticism must go against ossified tastes and customary expectations, he declares.

In another rostrum speech, the writer Grigoriy Baklanov asserts that literature must influence hearts and minds. "It has no right to look at life with one eye and bashfully cover up the other one. The consequences of half-truths are more dangerous than those of lies."

There follows a foyer interview with the writer Chingis Aytmtov: "I believe no one attending this congress is looking up with indifference to see who is mounting the platform and listening to what the speeches are about. I have participated in many congresses, and I am not saying this just because this is the latest congress, the current congress, but because I have never seen such an agitated writers' gathering. There have been elements, serious factors for many years now, if I could put it that way, which have not promoted the full-blown, in-depth development of modern literature. This did nothing at all to assist in resolving these problems; quite the reverse, it drove them up a blind alley. It seems to me that literature can only be a force for social activity and act as a social resonator when it can completely fulfill its purpose. I am glad that opportunities for this are opening up today; the conditions do exist for talking at long last about many of the problems which have concerned us and continued to do so to this day."

The poet Nil Gilevich, in another interview, focuses on the results of the congress: "This congress undoubtedly is out of the ordinary and it will have very great repercussions. It will above all truly mobilize our hearts, our creative capacities, and our efforts toward creating works which are worthy both of our traditions in which we take pride, and also of the present-day Soviet and world reader, since our literature is respected throughout the world."

The program outlines the different commissions on individual genres which participated in the congress, showing video of meetings in progress, and naming the head of each commission, but not providing any of the speeches.

In another speech, poet Andrey Voznesenskiy says: "Dear comrades, how concentrated, painfully felt, and confessional our congress is today! Every speech sounds like a story of a life. Why do readers turn their back on some of our books? There are many reasons, but the main thing is that people want openness for literature. True, people already know about the monstrous force of evil, lawlessness, corruption, and hypocrisy. They would like an authoritative commission of respected writers to be set up to look into manuscripts which have failed to get published for a long time. It is no secret nowadays that a writer spends about 10 percent of his life writing his book, and 90 percent pushing it. That applies to wordly wise old hands, but what about the young?"

The dramatist Viktor Rozov appeals from the rostrum for a return of the spiritual factor, while the writer Valentin Rasputin speaks from the rostrum about the northern rivers diversion scheme and the state of Lake Bayal.

From the rostrum, the writer Vladimir Karpov, subsequently elected first secretary of the writers union on the final day of the congress, notes the recent anniversary of the start of the Great Patriotic War, and reminisced about his return from the war: "It seemed, after the war, that life would be resplendent. Unfortunately quite the reverse took shape! We graduated from our institute, and we not only became writers but we were scattered all over the place on campaigns and in little groups of different kinds. At this congress, speeches have dealt not just with justified criticism of shortcomings in organizational work and our creative faults, but many people had stored up personal grievances. However, difficult though it may be, it is necessary to surmount them. No one will come and eliminate the shortcomings in our life and creative affairs. That is something only we can do. As we approach the final stage of our congress, when decisions are going to be made, I would like us to again recall that we are of like mind, and that the main thing is that we have gathered here to find the correct ways of performing the fine tasks, which are an inspiration to us all, and set us for by life, the party, and the destiny of our people."

The voice-over then lists, and the video shows, representatives of the different union republics addressing the congress.

The program ends with writer Sergey Baruzdin, who says; "I would like to note that at this congress we did not just discuss literature. Writers displayed their high level of civic maturity. We discussed economic, social, and cultural problems which the country is tackling today." The poet Musmay Karim reveals that he is "going home in a good working mood. Not only did we discuss a lot here, but we thought about a lot of things, we thought a lot." Finally the writer Yevgeniy Nosov says: "Personally, I'm going home with a desire to work, because we have uncovered topics and problems which cry out to be dealt with."

NOVYY MIR CRITICIZED FOR PUBLISHING 'DRAB' LITERATURE

PM061628 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 9

["Abbreviated version" of speech by Boris Mozhayev (Moscow) in 26-27 June debate at Eighth USSR Writers Congress]

[Excerpt] At our plenums and congresses you hear the same refrain: Our literature is drab, drabness must be combatted. Mostly this is said by the editors of journals -- both "fat" and "thin" journals -- and leaders of the writers union, who lead both journals and publishing houses. It is understandable, I suppose: Drab literature does not appear out of the blue, it is supplied by those "fat" journals and publishing houses. They have only themselves to blame, as the saying goes.

Let us look specifically at journals. Let us begin with NOVYY MIR. For 3 consecutive months the pages of that journal were crammed with drab prose: Kozhevnikova's story and Edlis' novel, which I am ashamed to call a novel. I shall be kind to Edlis: He is not a bad dramatist. But this is his first major prose work, and first attempts never turn out right. But I cannot understand the leaders of such a journal, with such traditions! If something is not ready, not finished off, it should not be published. Vladimir Vasilyevich Karpov, the journal's chief editor, did a disservice to Edlis, the author of the novel, and insulted the readers. Perhaps the editorial portfolio was empty? I happen to know that at that time three novels had been turned down: one by Vladimir Dudinstev, one by Vasiliy Roslyakov, and my own novel -- the second volume of "Husbands and Wives."

You must not talk about drab literature in general but about drab works of literature.
[passage omitted]

Aleksandr Nikolayevich Krutov, Mikhail Dmitriyevich Kotilevskiy, Vladimir Romanovich Mikhaylenko, Vladimir Yuryevich Sokolov, and Yevgeniy Grigoryvich Shmatrikov -- workers of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting;

Lev Vasilyevich Chernenko and Vladimir Ilich Itkin -- workers of TASS.

FURTHER ON PROCEEDINGS OF 8TH WRITERS CONGRESS

Lizichev Address

PM301335 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jun 86 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[TASS report: "Fulfilling a Noble Mission; at the 8th USSR Writers Congress"]

[Excerpts] The creative debate which has unfolded at the Eighth USSR Writers' Congress is imbued with a sense of responsibility for the fate of Soviet culture and the spiritual climate in society. On 25 June the congress continued its work in Moscow.

Soviet writers, the speakers noted, are faced with the task of more fully and vividly portraying people who exemplify the high standards of socialist morality, mature thinking, and the advantages of the Soviet way of life. The Communist Party, which acutely and exactly raised the issue of increased social reinforcement from literature and art at its 27th Congress, expects commitment to the party from the master of the pen.

Speaking about the improvement of the social climate, the speakers emphasized the undisputed fact that living, thinking, and writing about life has become more interesting. It is no accident that the country's creative life has become noticeably more active. The debate about the writer's place in the social order has become more pointed, responsible, and ultimately more intelligent. Works have already appeared which are in step with the spirit of the times, awaken people's consciences, and demand that the reader summon up his sense of civic duty. Rising above the transient circumstances of the daily life, the writer today must discern the political meaning and ideological essence of every phenomenon.

The renewal carried out by the party is a great boon of our time, delegates noted. We are seeing many things with new eyes, and much that has been previously written now seems timid, shallow, smoothed over. The restructuring which is currently under way in all spheres of life applies to the writers' organization as well. Analyzing the creative activity of the union, the speakers noted that it suffers from bureaucracy and stage management, which serve no one and counter creative interests. The congress must sum up what is currently taking place in writers' thoughts and in their manuscripts and elect a truly effective board.

The attention of many speakers was focused on problems pertaining to the development of criticism as a means of shaping taste, developing the sense of truth and beauty, and giving expression to national consciousness.

Addressing the congress delegates, Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, noted that in our country's history the "man at arms" has always occupied a worthy place. Literature has given us brilliant examples of the Bolshevik soldier and sailor storming the ancient, decaying system; it produced Vasilii Chapayev [story by D. Furmanov about the legendary civil war hero] and Pavka Korchagin [N. Ostrovskiy "How the Steel Was Tempered"] during the civil war period and a whole galaxy of fighters who forged a path through the incredible difficulties of the Great Patriotic War to win the cherished victory.

Today, in the peactime eighties, a number of good books have also been written about people who are discharging with honor their noble duty as defenders of the motherland or servicemen doing their international duty.

But let us be frank: The time in which we live, the army's responsibility for the future of peace, the beauty and greatness of the spiritual image of the Soviet servicemen, and his difficult, intensive military labor deserve more attention and greater interest from the country's best literary forces.

Also among the congress delegates, A. Lizichev went on, are writers who have been front-line soldiers, who underwent the baptism of fire during the war. Many of them have given us an invaluable heritage of eyewitness accounts about its soldiers. We treasure the sacred truth about the war from the mouths of those who experienced the trials and tribulations of frontline life themselves and thus acquired the moral right to describe its grim days and nights honestly, convincingly, and from the position of socialist realism. They witnessed what was most important -- the patriotism of the Soviet people -- and they recorded their heroism in their tales.

The Great Patriotic War is not just history to us. Esteemed comrades, with the help of your truthful and graphic accounts, the present generation can effectively feel, understand, and interpret the greatness of the older generations' feat can see the inseparable link, the dialectic unity, between the heroism of the wartime years and the present day, can take pride in the combat traditions, and can emulate the heroes' example.

It is also pleasing to note that we have an excellent young generation of writers who artistically interpret the heroism of the past in their own way, from present-day positions. We expect them to continue the chronicle of the wartime years.

A. Lizichev emphasized that there was an inseparable link between the memories of the past and the concerns of the present. Once again, I would like to draw your attention to two circumstances: During the postwar years, new generations have grown up which have not experienced war. In their view, peace is the normal state of society. This can, involuntarily, lead to complacency, to underestimation of the real threat of war.

Second, mankind now faces a most acute problem: the choice between war and peace. The threat hanging over civilization, over the very existence of life on earth has never been more acute. The same applies to the ideological struggle between the forces of war and progress. However, a real possibility to preserve and strengthen peace exists today. Our party and government are doing all they can in this respect. The USSR Armed Forces are a mighty factor in curbing the aggressive aspirations of imperialism. In this context the military-patriotic education of the population, and in particular young people and, of course, army and navy servicemen, assumes a special significance. It is impossible to overestimate the role of literature in this nationwide and partywide task.

There is hardly any need to convince anyone that the artistic depiction of today's Army and Navy is a great and honorable task. At the same time, a close look at the works about the defenders of the motherland and their difficult military labor indicates that this fertile creative soil is neither fully cultivated nor produces an exactly abundant harvest. Among the topics which could capture writers' imaginations are the enhanced social role and responsibility of military labor in the conditions of the increased threat of war; the development of the interrelation between the individual and the collective; the constant process of renewal of hardware and arms and consequently the increased intellectual content of military labor; one-man command and efficient execution of orders, the moral and psychological training of servicemen to enable them to cope with the difficulties of military service, and others.

Today excellent people are serving in our Armed Forces. Multinational collectives live as one friendly family in the Army and the Navy. This, too, is a field where writers could apply their talent. Since the war, a galaxy of outstanding Heroes of the Soviet Union has grown up in our country whose feats are comparable to those of the front line. The lives of the motherland's servicemen currently serving in the DRA are full of examples of a high-minded fulfillment of duty. They are an inexhaustible source of interesting destinies and amazing examples of fidelity to military and international duty, love of the motherland, and comradeship-in-arms.

Or take Chernobyl.... Our anguish, anguish at what has happened. Yet, at the same time, it fills us with pride in the Soviet people, including servicemen, who faced the danger without fear. I saw our servicemen working to eliminate the consequences of the accident in the most dangerous areas. Believe me, they too are heroes. They are worthy of your attention.

Of course, it is impossible to write about life in the Army and Navy from an ivory tower. The Army must be seen. It is extremely important that the writer himself feels and understands the inspiring motives for the glorious military deeds performed daily by our soldiers and sailors, commanders, and political personnel. Only what they have seen and experienced can result in truly creative writing which the reader will understand and believe.

I have pleasant memories of a visit to our Transbaykal Military District by a group of writers from Siberia and the Transbaykal region, which included Valentin Rasputin. There were no long discussions, and the detachment of writers was immediately sent to work among the troops, where skills are forged, where yesterday's schoolboys grow into soldiers. With what energy, what creative enthusiasm did those writers set to work in the units! I remember what fruitful results this trip bore for both us and them. Furthermore their articles were published not only in the central press but also in the district newspaper. An example to be learned from and copied!

Incidentally, the work of writers who contribute to the Army and Navy press deserves our full approval. Writers' contributions to the journal SOVETSKIY VOIN and the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA are frequent and carry much weight. But do not forget, Comrades, that your contributions would also be welcomed by district, group, and fleet newspapers which have a wide readership.

As you can see, A. Lizichev said in conclusion, there are plenty of questions waiting for your attention. Their positive solution will contribute to the enrichment of both artistic creation and military and patriotic work in the country and in the Soviet Armed Forces.

The speakers discussed the problem of the depiction of the contemporary hero with interest, frankness, and self-criticism. Life demands a decisive orientation toward the present and its vital needs, because it is easiest to change people's way of thinking on the kind of material that related to our present-day reality.

However, according to sociologists, only one-third of young men and women acknowledge the influence of literature on the development of their moral and political views. This is causing concern, V. Mishin, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, emphasized. Nor can it hardly be regarded as normal that many writers' organizations have a negligible intake of young people.

The following spoke in the debate on the USSR Writers Union Board report and the union Central Auditing Commission report: S. Mikhalkov; A. Chakovskiy; S. Zalygin; Yu. Bondarev; N. Gribachev; F. Kuznetsov; G. Baklanov (Moscow); B. Oleynik; Yu. Mushketik (Ukraine); D. Granin (Leningrad); M. Tank (Belorussia); U. Umarbekov (Uzbekistan); G. Tsitsishvili (Georgia); M. Slutskis (Lithuania); and R. Gamzatov (Dagestan).

Greetings to the 8th USSR Writers' Congress were read aloud by Lyubomir Levchev (Bulgaria) and Lisandro Otero (Cuba).

The creative discussion was continued at commission sessions on problems of prose, poetry, drama, literature for children and young people, and literary criticism.

The congress continues.

Markov Report Criticized

PM051350 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Jul 86 p 9

["Abbreviated version" of speech by Yulian Semenov in 26-27 June debate at 8th USSR Writers Congress]

[Text] The board's report can hardly satisfy the delegates. It is amorphous and lacks inner dynamism. The board's report cannot satisfy them either because the Credentials Commission's documents cry out openly about the tragic situation of young people in our creative union. That is what ought to be sounding the main note of alarm. Ours is a congress of old men and women, or, at best, of middle aged people. And this at a time of acceleration and intensification!

Our critics, who should be working above all else on these alarming issues, have a poor knowledge of the younger generation's problems; they create kings of literature who, on examination, prove to be sham and their books, published in huge print runs, are the main source of secondary raw materials.

The report speaks timidly about the need to improve links with the book trade and with readers. But how is this to be achieved in practice, not in word only?

In our country palaces and clubs belong to the people: But more often than not they are used as dance halls. Yet here is a real opportunity to organize monthly readers' discussions, poetry competitions, and prose writers' speeches -- that is the only way to help us understand the reader's true and not supposed interest.

[Paragraph continues] It is in our country in particular, where the most popular newspaper is that of the writers' union, that it is possible and necessary to print open, honest, monthly lists of the most widely-read books, by both Soviet and foreign authors, without juggling the figures or engaging in literary overreporting, to take issue with these books, to criticize them if they deserve it, and to prove objectively to the reader his mistake, if he really is wrong, whereas to disregard the people's real interest and ignore their opinion for the sake of literary fashion is unworthy!

The practice of fixing book print runs nowadays persistently ignores readers' interests.

Everyone knows how much pulp literature has to be published for every Akhmatova or Shukshin! But pulp goes on being published. This is yet another example of the opposition to new things that have been emerging in our country since the April plenum. Book print runs are fixed by the Union of Writers and the State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, while the Gosplan and the Ministry of Finance, which are interested in hard cash for the state treasury, are excluded from this process. Not to mention the reader himself.

I should like to make a few specific suggestions. First, since we have difficulties with paper and since young writers find it hard to get published we should ask for permission to produce young writers' books by photocopying them.

And we should ask for them to be paid for these publications as for printed books.

Second, I support Academician Likhachev's proposal [for the creation of Saltykov-Shchedrin and Chernyshevskiy museums in Leningrad to form a museum complex including the already existing Nekrasov and Dobrolyubov museums] but would add to it a point about designating the Leningrad-Moscow highway a Radishchev national monument.

Rasputin Interviewed

PM091424 Madrid EL PAIS in Spanish 30 Jun 86 p 27

[Pilar Bonet dispatch: "Valentin Rasputin: 'It Is Better To Return to Caves Than To Build Nuclear Power Plants'"]

[Excerpts] Moscow -- "I believe that it is better to return to the caves than to build nuclear power plants in such a way that our earth continues to be destroyed," 49-year-old Siberian ecologist and writer Valentin Rasputin stated in an interview with EL PAIS, conducted immediately after the 8th USSR Writers Union Congress, which he attended as a delegate and at which ecological problems, including the Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident arose. [passage omitted]

Rasputin is more optimistic about the future of Soviet literature than about the future of ecology. A new leadership body (an Office of the Secretariat) has emerged from the writers congress, and "has received extensive powers in publishing policy." The secretariat, composed of eight people including Sergey Zaligin, the pioneer of ecology among the writers, will concern itself not only with administrative matters but also artistic matters. "There is talk of publishing those authors such as Marina Svetayeva, Anna Akhmatova, Boris Pasternak, and Nikolay Gumilev, who cannot be excluded from our literature and who are now in a situation of clandestinity."

According to Rasputin, a "fairly extensive" anthology of the poet Gumilev, shot as a counterrevolutionary in 1921, will be published in Leningrad. Rasputin believes that it is necessary to publish "the complete works" of this poet, who was the founder of the Acmeist movement, and also Zamyatin (author of a forerunner of Orwell's "1984"), and Vladimir Nabokov, the author exiled in the twenties, "without whom Russian literature cannot be imagined." "It is still difficult to say that real prospects of publication there are, but they are greater than in the past."

There was talk at the congress of the publication of the novels of Anatoliy Pristavkin and Vladimir Dudintsev, "which have been circulating for some time among the publishing houses." According to Rasputin, Anatoliy Karpov, the new first secretary of the Writers Union, spoke from the congress rostrum in favor of the publication of Dudintsev's novel. It deals with Trofim Lysenko, the "inquisitor" of the world of science in Stalin's day. Karpov, a military writer, has relinquished the editorship of NOVIY MIR -- the USSR's most prestigious literary journal, whose new editor has not been announced.

Of the three writers congresses in which Rasputin has taken part (5 years elapse between congresses), the latest was "the most open," since "whoever wished to do so spoke, and nobody examined or edited the speeches. And strong things were said."

The recovery of the living emigres seems more contentious than that of the deceased "accursed authors." "It is not just a political issue but also one of morality and order," said Rasputin, who expressed his wish to meet with emigre novelist Viktor Nekrasov.

Rasputin denied that he is a "fuddy-duddy," as his detractors maintain. "Before moving forward, it is necessary to defend what we have. To move forward solely by technical means is not progress; it is destruction. If the choice between living and dying arises, I am prepared to go to the caves, provided that I live."

VOROTNIKOV CHAIRS RSFSR MINISTERS MEETING

PM091546 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 2

[Special correspondent report: "At the RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] A routine session of the RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium discussed topical questions of the work of soviets in the sphere of economic and cultural building.

A Krasnoyarsk Krayispolkom report was heard on its organizational work in the implementation of voters' instructions to deputies of the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets and the kray soviet of people's deputies.

After a discussion of social issues, the Presidium outlined additional measures to improve medical services for the republic's rural inhabitants in the 12th 5-Year Plan. Certain other questions were also discussed, and corresponding decisions adopted.

The session was chaired by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

WRITERS UNION CONGRESS DISCUSSIONS REVIEWED

PM151529 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Jul 86 pp 1, 2

[Unattributed article: "Time for Renewal" -- first two paragraphs printed in boldface italics]

[Excerpts] More than 2 weeks have already passed since the conclusion of the Eighth USSR Writers Congress. The delegates to the congress have scattered all over the country, returning to their daily duties and primarily to manuscripts that had been put aside for the time being.

But arguments about the results of the congress and the questions raised at it are not abating within writers' circles, and, generally, among the creative intelligentsia and the broad public. Why? Because that was indeed an unusual congress, differing in many respects from the kind of congresses held in the past.

The extremely high level of frankness, "confessional nature," and principledness can, as delegates themselves emphasized, be described as the main distinguishing feature of the conversation which took place at the Eighth Writers Congress. They spoke of painful matters. They spoke passionately and ardently, unafraid of the occasional polemic sharpness or excesses [perekhlest], and without constantly glancing over their shoulders, as had happened in the past, at the "house editor." They spoke without sparing self-esteem, often offending one another quite perceptibly, automatically bringing to mind Sholokhov's words: "...We writers love to criticize one another. Can it be otherwise? Otherwise, we would get God knows what kind of false ideas about our own importance..."

It is in no way mandatory to share every single one of the opinions expressed from the congress rostrum, especially in view of the fact that many of them were in internal conflict with one another and were explained and corrected in the course of the writers' discussion. And this is what is mainly remembered: the fact that a real discussion took place, that the clashes of positions revealed primarily the interests and needs of literature and society as a whole, rather than personal or group ambitions (even though, to be frank, the latter were also voiced).

The conversation centered on the main point. On how to implement in deeds, rather than in words, the profound restructuring of social life and social awareness to which the party urges us all. On how writers and the artistic intelligentsia can participate in the process of the intensification and acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development. On the artist's mission in the contemporary world which is split by contradictions and brought to the very brink of the thermonuclear abyss through the malicious intent of the imperialist militarists. About Soviet literature's patriotic and international duty, its "worldwide responsiveness," and its already traditional striving to be always in the front ranks of the battle for peace, justice, friendship among peoples, and social progress.

This is why people, both in the Great Kremlin Palace Hall and in the halls where section sittings took place, deliberated not only about the fate of the novel or of lyrical poetry, but also about the fate of Lake Baykal, Lake Onega, the northern rivers, and villages "in decline." They argued not only about the problems of literary criticism or dramatic art, but also about urgent questions of demography, social policy, and the conservation of our entire spiritual and cultural heritage. They spoke not only about the need to overcome formalism and departmentalism in the Writers Union's work, but also about the fact that bureaucracy, red tape, and institutional indifference, which have expanded to become an enormous social evil, are like a barrier across the road to the affirmation of the principles of social justice and the norms of communist morals.

Speaking with a sense of legitimate pride and understandable civic gratification about our gains and victories and about how much has been done in the country since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, the delegates nonetheless focused attention in their speeches mainly on how much still remains to be accomplished and on matters which generate serious anxiety and at times even alarm. It was this that constituted an application of the lessons of the 27th party congress, which illuminated with Bolshevik straightforwardness not only the successes -- which in any case are obvious -- but also the instances of inertia in the economy and the negative trends in the social, spiritual, and cultural spheres and in people's moral awareness and behavior. [passage omitted]

There was a conversation about what the Writers Union should be like in the new historical conditions, about the moral character and dignity of contemporary Soviet literary figures. It is not surprising that these questions emerged closely interconnected at the congress: After all, it is not outsiders but the writers themselves who are in charge of the organizational, administrative, and economic work in our creative union, and therefore much depends on their spiritual and businesslike qualities, their intelligence and competence, their breadth of vision, and their skill at offering prompt assistance to their comrades.

Substantial and largely justified complaints were voiced against the Writers Union leadership, because the processes of bureaucratization, of implanting a "departmental" spirit, and of replacing real action with endless coordination and parade-ground ostentation -- all of them condemned by the party as signs of unsuitable style of work -- have not, of course, bypassed our own creative organization. At the same time, as Askhat Mirzagitov noted, earning the delegates' support, "to overturn all and everything, to expunge one's past while blaming the supposedly bureaucratized authorities, thus evading all personal responsibility, is, to say the least, not serious, but rather, demagogical." It is much more important -- and here we quote Ales Adamovich -- "to build into the inner workings of the Writers Union a punch card of changes which would govern the future leaders' line of behavior," and to thoroughly think out the structure of elected writers' organs and their membership.

In this respect, the delegates' proposals boiled down to the further all-around democratization of the Writers Union. There was talk, in particular, about the need to enhance the role of the USSR Writers Union Board and its Auditing Commission, to institute strict accountability of writers organization leaders to "rank and file" literary figures, to eliminate the practice of "life secretaryships" and decision-making behind closed doors, and to conduct all organizational and creative work in an atmosphere of publicity, comradely equality, and mutual understanding. The Secretariat and its Bureau which were elected at the first postcongress plenum of the USSR Writers Union Board have been ordered to think out and implement measures aimed at establishing within our union an atmosphere which would be favorable for successful and effective creative work.

In actual fact, as it was emphasized at the congress, it is not only the union leadership but also all its members that must be concerned with the establishment of such an atmosphere of mutual trust, respect, mutual demandingness, and exactingness. "No one will come to eliminate the shortcomings in our life and creative affairs," Vladimir Karpov said. "We will have to do this ourselves."

Of course, an enormous role will have to be played here by literary and artistic criticism and all the literary press.

It is indicative that, in one way or another, almost all speakers at the congress touched upon the problems of literary criticism and spoke about the fact that it is high time for it to cast off equability and sycophancy, to perform more actively its functions as researcher and organizer of the literary process in the country, to combat with party principledness and esthetic vigilance the manifestations of mediocrity, hackwork, time-serving, and antihistoricism, and to propagandize widely and consistently the best examples of Soviet prose, poetry, dramatic art, and journalism.

Literary criticism owes a great debt to literature, it was noted at the congress. It was, however, also noted that quite a few excellent masters are working in literary criticism today, whose sharp and accurate words enjoy deserved respect among both writers and readers. This means, delegates said, that it is necessary to galvanize the work by our literary criticism "shop" and to provide literary criticism with conditions in which it would perform its professional duties with maximum efficiency and without feeling inferior in comparison with other categories and genres of literature.

This means that the editorial offices of literary publications, including of course LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, must restructure their work in line with the demands of the time, enhance the ideological and artistic standard of their publications, improve the practice of mutual relations with the authors' aktiv, and take the opinion of the mass readership more widely and more consistently into account. [passage omitted]

VICTORY MEMORIAL DESIGN CRITICIZED AS 'POMPOUS'

LD151130 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 15 Jul 86

[Text] The Soviet public has strongly criticized the design of the memorial to victory to be built in Moscow. The memorial was to embody the Soviet people's heroism shown in crushing the Nazis in World War II. However, in the course of public discussion, which involved about 10,000 people, many described the would-be memorial as a pompous structure. The Moscow affiliation of the Union of Artists suggested that the construction be suspended and that another contest for the best design be carried out. The suggestion met with general approval.

We are obliged to devote constant attention to questions of further improving the trade unions' structure so as to ensure that it fully accords with the production principle.

Certain operational measures are required in connection with the transfer of national economic sectors to a two-tier management system and the creation of new science-and-production associations and intersectorial scientific sectors.

Taking into account the new edition of the Program and Statutes approved by the 27th party congress and the Law on Labor Collectives, the need arises for corresponding amendments in the Trade Union Statutes. Analogous work with the sector statutes must also be done by trade union central committees.

Thus, the reports and elections and the preparations for the trade union congress are to be an important new step in the development of trade union democracy and socialist democracy in general -- without which, as was pointed out at the 27th CPSU Congress, the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development is inconceivable and impossible.

Comrade Shalayev expressed confidence that the preparatory work for the congress will be carried out in an organized manner and to a high standard. Guided by the ideas of the 27th CPSU Congress and the party's instructions, we will arrive at the next USSR trade union congress with a clear-cut action program for Soviet trade unions -- a program well verified in practice and enriched with progressive experience of reorganization, a program of their practical participation in the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development and in the struggle to broaden and strengthen international cooperation in the interests of peace and social progress.

PRACTICES OF KIRGHIZ WRITERS UNION CRITICIZED

PM161235 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Jul 86 p 7

[Own correspondent Aleksandr Samoylenko article under the rubric "In the Country's Writers' Organizations": "Alienation: Unprecedented Reportage from the Kirghiz Writers Union"]

[Text] Frunze -- On the surface, the situation following the Seventh Kirghiz Writers Union Congress 5 years ago looked irreproachable: Literary figures worked fruitfully, their works were being published on a large scale, and they were fully determined to implement the tasks set by the congress. The Writers Union's activity was being extremely positively evaluated in the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee and plans were in hand to build an apartment block for writers, to open a literary museum and a literary publishing house, to build a creativity center...

Five years went by... Having landed in Frunze, I decided to visit the theater, tour the literary museum, and call at the new literary publishing house before I had my conversations at the Writers Union about the life and work of the republican writers organization between its congresses.

I did not find any literary museum; it was nonexistent just like 5 years ago. Nor did I succeed in seeing any performances of the plays entitled "Long-Distance Train" [Poyezd Dalnego Sledovaniya] by M. Baydzhiev, "The Night of the Divorce" [Noch Razvoda] by K. Akmatov, or "The Day Lasts Longer than a Century" [I Dolshe Veka Dlitsya Den] by Ch. Aytmatov -- they had been cancelled from the repertoire of republican theaters... The republic was still without a literary publishing house.

...That was a distressing time for us both. But Zh. Mamytov, secretary of the Kirghiz Writers Union Board, who was elected only a year ago at a Writers Union plenum, must have found it more difficult than I did. After all I was only asking the questions while he had to answer them.

Zholon Mamytovich told me what had happened at the Writers Union on the day before my arrival. While sorting out the heaps of paper left behind by T. Askarov, former first secretary of the Writers Union Board, his assistant came across six greeting messages, including one from the USSR Writers Union. All of them had been sent to T. Askarov 4 years ago for presentation to Kirghiz People's Writer T. Sydykbekov, winner of the USSR State Prize, on the occasion of his 70th birthday. But the first secretary "forgot" the greetings messages in his desk because the person celebrating the jubilee was not one of "his" people....

I recorded five tape cassettes in the course of my meetings with Writers Union officials and leading Kirghiz writers. These recordings contain indignation, grievances, and anguish for their writers organization.... And a passionate desire to establish a businesslike atmosphere within the Writers Union, to tackle at long last the acute problems which Kirghiz literature has been facing for a long time now. Virtually all of them spoke about a single issue -- about the web of "strange" events, appalling facts [ubiystvennyye fakty], and acutely irreconcilable relationships...which had been woven by Askarov and his "team."

However, let us begin at that time in the spring of 1981 when the famous Kirghiz prose writer T. Kasymbekov surprisingly started having frequent meetings with poet S. Maymulov. Tolegen Kasymbekovich had never, not even at party meetings, concealed his critical attitude toward T. Askarov's style of leadership and his manner of dealing with people. Nor did he make a secret of it in conversations with Maymulov.

Soon enough he was summoned by Askarov. The first secretary's "comrades in arms" were in the office, and so was... Maymulov who started reading from a notebook about what had been said where and to whom by Kasymbekov about Askarov. It emerged that "colossal work" had been done, and that Maymulov's "file" contained dozens of writers' surnames, listing against each name details of what, where, and to whom...about Askarov.

By that time he had already been leading the Writers Union for 10 years. To be more precise, commanding it, having turned into the writers' boss. His high official positions (he was also chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet) and the fact that he was liked by high authority somehow elevated Askarov above the other writers and offered him reliable protection against criticism and the exacting attitude of his fellow writers. He developed a lack of concern and a dangerous sense of contentment. Had it not been for that, Tendik Askarovich would have definitely perceived his own dangerous internal contradiction (or the split of his own personality): The critic Askarov could not tolerate criticism. There was nothing reprehensible within the framework of his official influence: Achievements, flourishing, growth -- yes, indeed! But, by its very nature, the creative environment contains all kinds of problems, and they can be resolved only publicly, fully in accord with the principles of morals and democracy. But Askarov could not be bothered to maintain contacts with his colleagues on an equal footing. As soon as he detected any disagreement or someone's intention to express his own point of view, he immediately started applying pressure: "This is the Central Committee's opinion! Do I take it that you are against it?!" thus creating the impression that he was the only one guided by party interests.

This demagogic stance by the chief automatically turned his subordinates (this was indeed the role he had assigned to writers) into people who were supposedly ideologically immature and incapable of understanding something that was known only to him.... Having toured Naryn Oblast's Kochkorskiy Rayon, prose writer K. Saktanov, chief of the Current Affairs Section [otdel publitsistiki] of the journal ALA-TOO, wrote a feature in an attempt to present a socioeconomic picture of the rayon. The material contained stories about working people and good words about their successes and achievements. But the feature contained something else, too. The writer could not have failed to see that drunkenness, economic mismanagement, and abuses still existed in the rayon,... The journal's issue containing the feature was printed and... killed. The issue was later released, but no longer containing K. Saktanov's feature. Soon afterwards the author himself was dismissed from work "for political immaturity" (I quote from the order's wording), any blocking moves having been prevented in advance at a special session at the Kirghiz Writers Union at which T. Askarov and his "comrades in arms" accused the writer of passion for alien ideology, of dangerous thinking, of desiring to denigrate... what (or whom) did K. Saktanov denigrate? In order to understand this it is necessary to call everything by its proper name. The point is that Kochkorskiy Rayon is the homeland of T. Usubaliyev, former first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, and, in view of this, it was deemed impossible that either drunkenness or economic mismanagement could have existed in the rayon. This was the essence of T. Askarov's "Central Committee line" and writer K. Saktanov's "political immaturity." All this happened a few years ago (and all these years K. Saktanov lived with the label of an ideologically unreliable writer), and only now has an investigation been launched into this monstrous incident, an investigation which has revealed the people who were responsible. A by no means insignificant role in it was played in particular by B. Karagulov, member of the USSR Writers Union and chief of the republican Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press at the time,

Gradually, and without noticing it, Tendik Askarovich lost his healthy outlook on life and, in view of the fact that -- as the Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress noted -- a spirit of unprincipledness and servility held sway in the republic, he was forced to grade writers according to this defective law. He became a small cog in a machine that was alien to a really civic-minded writer, and the drive belt of this machine started twisting him, crushing his will and principles, and destroying his literary talent.... Actually, Askarov did not object too much to the new turn his life was taking, and the role of being an intimate immediately started paying dividends -- awards, honorary posts, carte blanche to make a decision on any issue....

Tendik Askarov did not forget those who had failed to pander to him, either. Having taken care of the congress, he descended upon the republic's leading writers who were simply removed from the Writers Union. That was the time when K. Akmatov's and M. Baydzhiev's plays were deleted from the theatrical repertoire.... The local press carried devastating articles about their creative work.

Particular attention was given to Kasymbekov. Askarov prohibited publishing houses from publishing Tolegen Kasymbekovich's latest historical-revolutionary novel "Rebirth" [Vozrozhdeniye], twisted around his little finger all the commissions that turned up in response to letters from the writer, and then got hold of the manuscript copies and locked them up in his personal safe. For 2 years. That was the time when Kasymbekov, in desperation, applied to the court which, without any difficulty, ruled that the author's rights had been most crudely violated. But Tendik Askarov, from the height of his position as chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet, pressured the court: If the novel is not to be published, let the author return the advance payment to the publishing house. A marshal of the court turned up at Kasymbekov's home to make an inventory of his property. Matters did not progress as far as confiscation; certain people managed to prevent it. And times were changing in the wake of the CPSU Central Committee plenum....

...A final proof copy of "Rebirth" lay on the table while T. Kasymbekov and I spoke about this preposterous incident, about the Writers Union's affairs, and about the fact that restructuring is finally under way within the republican writers organization and that much work remains to be done. Tolegen Kasymbekovich glanced at the book now and again. He had waited a long time for this moment -- 5 years! Written in 1981, the novel saw the light of day only 2 months ago.

That was how Askarov lived and worked, holding onto his seat in the narrow and, to put bluntly, rather stagnant small world of his titled confederates. And he did not notice how time was passing. He had produced no real books. Not in the mood for writing. He attributed that to official commitments and other seemingly proper reasons. But the reality was different. The fact was that the process of moral and civic decadence was actively under way. That was why he was no longer capable of creating something honest, something to meet the needs of literature and the readers. The question of the lack of personal creative ability loomed up before him in all its painful obviousness. And the way of thinking which had become normal for him made Askarov draw the simple conclusion: Arrange matters so that works by other, talented people are not published. Give free rein to mediocrity. Let titles and prizes go to the merely average. They are no competition. Against the background provided by them, he could remain outstanding for a long time, even without creating anything.

Meanwhile, the life of mainstream literature in the republic was taking its own course. Writers were traveling in the republic of their own accord and were discussing their urgent problems between themselves. And they were engaged in their main work -- writing books. Good books.

In May this year at the Kirghiz Writers Union Board plenum the republic's writers unanimously relieved T. Askarov from his duties as first secretary owing to shortcomings in work. He hastened to depart from within the Writers Union walls, moving on to other work, but the writers invited him to their party meeting. Leafing through the transcript (Askarov was severely reprimanded along party lines and had his service record endorsed), I read passages from the speeches by communist writers and thought to myself that this must have been a fateful day in Askarov's life. A day when he had to settle the account presented by literature, his fellow writers, and life itself. A day when truth triumphed, a day which could have restored the vision of a writer who had become entangled in affairs that were alien to real literature.
[paragraph continues]

And I would have believed that the party meeting did have that effect on writer Askarov, had it not been for the ease with which he admitted all his mistakes and expressed readiness to abandon at once everything that had been the norm of his life and style of behavior in the past, a readiness to apologize to all and everyone, and his persistent pleas not to be judged too harshly, to be forgiven.... All this is indicative of yesterday's typical practice of liberal and indulgent attitudes, particularly toward everything that has provided the subject of these notes -- a practice which today is being decisively eradicated at all levels in the republic, including the writers circles. The time for accountability has come. For everyone. The time be held strictly to account....

K. Akmatov, T. Sydykbekov, and T. Kasymbekov were elected to the USSR Writers Union Board by the Eighth USSR Writers Congress. The Sovetskiy Pisatel Publishing House has plans to publish T. Kasymbekov's novel "Rebirth." Performances of plays by K. Akmatov and M. Baydzhiev and of the dramatized version of Ch. Aytmatov's "And the Day Lasts Longer than a Century" are being included again in the repertoire of republican theaters. The Kirghiz Writers Union and the appropriate offices are examining the question of awarding honorary titles to literary figures who really deserve them. But the implementation of total justice requires not only the recognition of services by those who tolerated injustice and were involved in it.

Postscript. The above material was written back in May, but I did not submit it to the editorial office at that time; the Eighth Kirghiz Writers Congress was less than a month away, and it was important to see how the republic's literary figures would manage, without outside "interference," to analyze the situation prevailing within the writers organization, what conclusions they would draw, and how principled they would be in evaluating the guilt of those who, for years on end, implanted in the Kirghiz Writers Union the principles of authoritarian and bureaucratic leadership and created an atmosphere of mutual alienation and division into "us and them" in terms of personal loyalty and parochialism.... On the eve of the congress I spoke with Ch. Aytmatov, new chairman of the Kirghiz Writers Union Board, about the fact that too much time and effort had been wasted on petty intrigues only incidental to literature, on demagoguery, and cheap passions, and that the republican writers organization must restructure itself immediately and rise to a fundamentally different and qualitatively new level of organizational and creative activity.

To a large extent this did occur. For the first time in many years, in the opinion of the majority of Kirghiz writers, everything was called by its proper name: Mediocrity was called mediocrity and success -- success. At long last, really talented writers heard good words spoken about them; everything that had to be said was also said about the persons without talent who had tirelessly exploited literature as a source of personal benefits and all kinds of distinctions. Yes, much was done, indeed. But by no means everything. Those who essentially split the Kirghiz Writers Union from Kirghiz literature, who replaced accurate ideological and artistic criteria with personal and subjective evaluations, and who turned the writers organization into some kind of distribution center for "sticks" and "carrots," are still prospering.

Lessons must be learned from the past, moral and civic lessons, lessons for the future. It is for this purpose that I have written this reportage for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's traditional rubric "In the Country's Writers Organizations." A reportage that is, to put it bluntly, unprecedented.

Comrade L.N. Snovskiy, CPSU member and chief of the USSR Gosplan Machine Tool Building Department, was also subjected to the same party accountability for the indiscipline he had shown in fulfilling the 18 February 1980 CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution and for downgrading without authorization the schedules established by directive organs for the manufacture of experimental mockups and control series of progressive forging and pressing equipment.

CPSU members Comrades O.L. Zinchenko, USSR first deputy minister of the electrical equipment industry, and Ye.B. Smirnov, USSR deputy minister of instrument making, automation equipment, and control systems, were reprimanded for their indiscipline in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions and for frustrating the targets for the manufacture and delivery to the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry of new sets of digital program controlled electric drive systems and other equipment for use with forging and pressing machines.

The party committees at the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, and the Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems were instructed to step up controls and increase the demandingness shown toward Communists in the apparatus for the strict observance of party and state discipline and for the fulfillment of targets set by directive organs for the creation and production of progressive forging and pressing machines and components.

WRITERS UNION SECRETARIAT, BUREAU MEET

PM240926 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 23 Jul 86 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Following the Congress' Instructions: At the USSR Writers Union Board"]

[Text] A session of the USSR Writers Union board secretariat bureau took place 15 July under the chairmanship of G. Markov.

The session discussed practical measures to implement the decisions of the Eighth USSR Writers Congress. It was noted in the speeches of Ch. Aytmatov, G. Baklanov, Yu. Bondarev, V. Bykov, S. Zalygin, and V. Karpov that the country's literary people could play a significant role in the implementation of the psychological, moral, and socioeconomic restructuring and in Soviet people's active struggle for a qualitatively new condition of our society and contribute to socialism's creative potential. The speakers pointed to the need to concentrate the main attention on ensuring that literature develops in accordance with the scale of the renewal taking place in the country.

It was stressed that the union's elected organs and its staff apparatus must play an active part in this great work. The USSR Writers Union board secretariat must constantly improve the style of its activity and seek and introduce into practice new organizational and creative forms of work. The country's writers' organizations must work in such a way that every writer is aware every day of the attention of his elected organs toward the literary person's main task -- that of creating works of art.

The high level of frankness, the principled approach, and the commitment to the future of literature and its creators which marked the Eighth USSR Writers Congress also characterized the atmosphere of the first postcongress session of the USSR Writers Union board secretariat, held 16 July under the chairmanship of V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers Union Board.

On the agenda was the draft plan for the USSR Writers Union's work in the second half of 1986.

"The new social climate in Soviet society and the transformations which the party has begun and which the whole people support also require a new hero -- an active hero who leads others," V.Karpov stressed in his introductory address.

"At our eighth congress," he went on, "in full accordance with the spirit and mood of the 27th party congress, we said frankly and directly everything that we want to say and deemed it necessary to say about shortcomings in our writing life and work. The time has come to answer to this difficult question must be found by the 'collective intelligence' -- our secretariat. Its main efforts must be focused on those avenues which stimulate and organize creative deeds above all."

In the course of the secretariat's discussion, proposals were put forward on strengthening writers' links with life and reinforcing the atmosphere of principledness and organization among writers and the sense of responsibility for the results of creative work and for social behavior.

Particular attention was drawn to the need for active involvement by the USSR Writers Union board secretariat in resolving creative questions and for the entire elected aktiv of writers' organizations to be brought into this work; priority is given to the expansion of democratic, collegial principles in the activity of the Writers Union.

New steps were outlined to strengthen the creative and organizational forms of links with the country's other creative unions and cultural institutions.

It is planned to implement a series of measures to improve the activity of the USSR Writers Union Foreign Commission, the All-Union Bureau of Propaganda of Artistic Literature, the USSR Literary Foundation, the A.A. Fadeyev Central House of Literary Workers, and other organizations under the union's jurisdiction.

The USSR Writers Union board secretariat expressed confidence that the country's literary workers will respond with concrete deeds and talented new works to the decision of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Eighth USSR Writers Congress.

The session was addressed by M. Alekseyev, N. Gribachev, S. Baruzdin, A. Salynskiy, R. Rozhdestvenskiy, O. Suleymenov, Ye. Yevtushenko, V. Telpugov, S. Mikhailov, A. Voznesenskiy, D. Pavlychko, Ch. Aytmatov, P. Nikolayev, N. Gilevich, A. Dementyev, V. Rozov, M. Shatrov, Yu. Drunina, B. Oleynik, and Yu. Verchenko.

On the proposal of the USSR Writers Union board secretariat bureau, the following were appointed part-time secretaries [osvobozhdennymi sekretaryami] of the USSR Writers Union board: G. Borovik, Yu. Gribov, N. Gorbachev, Ye. Isayev, Al. Mikhaylov, P. Proskurin, A. Salynskiy, K. Skvortsov, and Yu. Surovtsev,

G.Markov, chairman of the USSR Writers Union board, spoke to conclude the secretariat session.

V.A. Stepanov, sector chief at the CPSU Central Committee Culture Section, took part in the work of the USSR Writers Union board bureau and secretariat.

WRITERS BOARD LEADER KARPOV INTERVIEWED

LD252336 Moscow Television in Russian 1430 GMT 25 Jul 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Following the Eighth Writers Congress, we present an interview with Vladimir Vasilyevich Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers Union Board:

[Karpov] We all remain under the impression, of course, that a great, frank, and much-needed exchange took place at the Eighth Writers Congress. The exchange took place, and now the question is -- what next? What next -- that question must be answered by deeds, first of all: to continue criticizing negative aspects, sort out and rake through what has not been completed and the errors, to fight relapses of bureaucracy. The main thing that must be taken into account, in our opinion, is the new social and public atmosphere, which has changed and is continuing to change. At the moment, the full truth will be combined and contained in the way of which writers already are heroically fighting for the implementation of those decisions elaborated by the 27th congress, and our eighth congress. Somebody fighting, somebody putting life right, somebody who leads those people behind him, somebody with initiative, somebody who draws others together -- that is, it seems to me, a hero who was born in our time, and he must come into the foreground.

A few days ago, the first session of the post-congress secretariat took place, at which we talked about what I've already mentioned and about our future plans. Well, specifically, a good many thoughts were expressed quite fully, that the secretariat should deal with more creative issues, and that has already been included in the very structure of our working secretariat. It was expressed at the congress that the secretaries -- the so-called working secretaries -- could perhaps be made mobile somehow; one of them has worked a year or two, and somebody could relieve them. We are carrying out such an experiment. Specifically, drama secretary Afanasiy Salynskiy has begun his job. He has Rozov and Shatrov with him and they will not only work together daily, but at some point, Rozov may relieve Salynskiy for a year, or Shatrov will relieve Rozov. We want to try this way of working as well, and time will tell.

At the moment, we have put together a plan up to the end of the year, to the end of 1986 -- I'm not going to read it, you understand yourself there's a great deal in it -- but at the basis of it lies once again the creative issue, creative matters.

CRITICS BACKS YEVTUSHENKO CALL FOR FRANKNESS

PM281010 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 8 Jul 86 p 3

[Nina Velekhova article under the rubric "Direct Speech": "No Tolerance for Vanity" -- uppercase passages printed in boldface; first two paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA KULTURA introduction]

[Text] Nina Aleksandrovna Velekhova is a famous theater critic and author of books on Soviet theater and dramatic art: "Okhlopkov and the Street Theater" [Okhlopkov i Teatr Ulits] "When the Curtain Rises" [Kogda Otkryvayetsya Zanaves], "Silver Trumpets" ("Artists") [Serebryanye Truby Artisty], and others.

Nina Velekhova constantly writes in the press on topical issues of theatrical art and today speaks again on a sore subject.