

APPROVED FOR RELEASE: 2007/02/08: CIA-RDP82-00850R000100100037-9

23 OCTOBER 1979

(FOUO 14/79)

RF

1 OF 1

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/8728

23 October 1979

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

(FOUO 14/79)



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NOTE

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

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

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

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

For further information on report content call (703) 351-2938 (economic); 3468 (political, sociological, military); 2726 (life sciences); 2725 (physical sciences).

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

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/8728

23 October 1979

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS
(FOUO 14/79)

CONTENTS

PAGE

NATIONAL

Book on Present Political Systems Reviewed
(L. B. Volkov, et al.; OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI,
SERIYA 1, PROBLEMY NAUCHNOGO KOMMUNIZMA, No 4,
1979) 1

REGIONAL

Books on Kirgiz and Tatar SSRS Reviewed
(OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI, SERIYA 1, PROBLEMY
NAUCHNOGO KOMMUNIZMA, No 4, 1979) 6

Equalizing the Standard of Living in Kirgiz, by
A. N. Vinogradov
Book on Siberian Tatars Reviewed, by
A. F. Tsyркun

Development of Armenian Dissident Movement Reviewed
(E. Oganesyan; POSEV, No 7, 1979) 14

- a -

[III - USSR - 35 FOUO]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NATIONAL

BOOK ON PRESENT POLITICAL SYSTEMS REVIEWED

Moscow OBSHCHESTVENNIYE NAUKI, SERIYA 1, PROBLEMY NAUCHNOGO KOMMUNIZMA in Russian No 4, 1979 pp 120-126

Review by L. B. Volkov of the book POLITICHESKIYE SISTEMY SOVREMENNOSTI (OCHERKI) by F. M. Burlatskiy, G. N. Manov, V. G. Kalenskiy, et al, USSR Academy of Sciences, Izdatel'stvo gosudarstva i prava, Moscow, Nauka, 1978, 253 pages/

Text The monograph which was assembled by a collective of authors (edited by Professor F. M. Burlatskiy and Professor V. Ye. Chirkin) is composed of five chapters.

The brief introduction to the book tells how various political systems of today are studied in it in accordance with the existing types of societies as systems of socialistic, capitalistic and developing nations. The book has made an attempt "to more widely show the methodology of studying political systems which reflect new potentials which arise under the conditions of a scientific and technical revolution" (page 4).

The first and second chapters are devoted to the features of fundamental ideas and methods of studying political systems. The authors study the political system of any society as a complex formation which insures the existence of a society as a single body which is centrally controlled by a political power. Up to the present the functioning and development of this formation, as a rule, is divided (state, law, administration and so on) with an emphasis on discussing the institutions and not analyzing interrelations among all elements of a single integrated system of political relations. There has been very little work done in studying the behavior of people in the system of these relations. The Marxist dialectic systemic analysis of these relations intends to study the functions "as an element of the development of the system" (page 6). It also supposes a consideration for the specifics of a social system in comparison with a biological or cybernetic, as well as specifics of a political system. It assumes the study of conflict as a unity and struggle of contradictions and it intends to pick out the main factors of change of political systems of economics and the social structure of society.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The study of the characteristic traits of a political system on the basis of the dialectic systemic approach, as the book indicates, allows one clearly to delimit it from the economic and spiritual system having picked out a number of its particular features:

- 1) A political system, as opposed to other systems, attains the greatest power in society;
- 2) This system is determined by the economic, social and cultural structures of the society;
- 3) It possesses relative independence and a high degree of activity which is determined by the "presence of a power mechanism, capability and right to be in charge of the resources for the entire society" (page 9);
- 4) It is concentrated on the tasks of governing, and although in the process of management other systems are also drawn in, "it becomes a manifestation of its essence only for the political system" (page 9).

Of particular importance for understanding what is presented in the work on the approach is the more precise definition of the idea of "function" which has been defined in Soviet and foreign literature in more than one way. Defining the latter as a characteristic of substance, which becomes manifested in work, the authors list the basic functions of a political system:

- 1) Determining the goals and tasks of the society (developing programs for its vital activity primarily in accordance with the interests of the ruling or managing classes);
- 2) Mobilization of resources in order to attain the established goals;
- 3) Integration of all elements of the society on the basis of the goals;
- 4) Distribution of wealth in the society "primarily in accordance with the interests of the ruling and managing classes" (page 10).

With such an approach, the study of politics as a whole and in its individual aspects (social, economic, cultural areas and so on) becomes particularly significant.

As criteria for determining the elements of political systems, the autonomy of these elements and the presence of "specific tasks, roles, functions, standards, traditions, and stereotypes" were selected in the book (page 12). The political elements which were selected in accordance with the specified criteria composed four groups: political structure (or political organization); political and legal standards; political relations; political culture.

What concerns the interrelations of the political system and the social and economic sphere, the authors analyze the thesis of the classics of Marxism--Leninism and indicate "the groundless attempt of certain bourgeois authors to

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

describe the matter as though Marxism leads the entire process of political development to a direct and immediate dependency on production relations. Along with the defined influence of economics, other various factors have a tremendous influence on all areas of social life, particularly on such an active part as the political process. These factors include class structure, the national composition of the society, its ethics, sense of justice, ideology, culture, political traditions, international situation and others" (page 19). In particular, the spiritual culture comes forth as a most important factor of influence on the political relations and political struggle and to a great extent determines the methods and means of functioning political institutes and the goals themselves.

The central point of the theory of the political system is the idea of power which is revealed as "a real capability to realize its will in social life, and bind it, if necessary, to others; the political power as one of the most important manifestations of power is characterized by a real capability of a given class, group, individual to exercise his will which is expressed in politics and law" (page 26). The concept of political power is considerably broader than the idea of state power.

As regards the state as an institute of a political system, its way of governing, political regime, functions in a political organization of society, as it is noted in the work, no light can be shed on these questions "without considering political relations, the role of the parties, other social organizations, political traditions, ideology, mass consciousness and so on" (page 34). As a result of this, the "inadequacy of the treatment of the state only as an apparatus of public power" (Ibid) became clear. In accordance with the sociological idea of the state, its format also must be studied sociologically, that is, as principles of state organization (political structure), which express the true existing ties between the social structure and the institution of public power. From this standpoint the idea of democracy is interpreted as "the main idea of the science of government" (page 35). Democracy is the "ideal form of government structure owing to which it becomes a definite objective valuable item" (Ibid.). But apart from such ideal forms, there were always other types of political ruling structures and representations of class interests under which even the majority classes were removed from participation in government management, were deprived of the possibility to influence State resolutions and to control the government. It is possible to establish autocratic, oligarchic or democratic structures of political power under a monarchy and republican forms of government. By itself a republican form of government is not identified with democracy and often served as a mere cover for an oligarchic or individual dictatorial power. On the other hand, a monarchy is also not always identified with autocracy and often is presented as quite a stable type of bourgeois democracy. Considering these observations, the book studies the questions of correlating the forms of State, types of government and the political regime.

In further studying the morphology of a political culture, the authors include in it types of the political process, stereotypes of political

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

behavior, political roles, political traditions and other "means of organizing political life (page 43), as well as political attitudes, accomplishments, religious beliefs, political directions, political values and ideals, that is, factors which motivate political activity. In the book communicative and significant functions of a political culture are picked out; the first of which serves the political interaction of members of the society, and the second is tied in with the title, naming and evaluating features in order to determine their place "in the overall context of a social experience" (page 48). The authors put the question of political consciousness and its relations with the activity of the groups and individuals into the frameworks of the general study of a political culture. Political consciousness is "a fundamental link and a totally realistic point in the process of political rule" (page 49).

The fourth chapter is devoted to the fundamental features and tendencies of the development of a political system in a socialist society. Governing a socialist society relies on the political power and is realized through a specific social structure--the political system of the society. In this way, it has the characteristic of a social and political government.

Political power and a political system are not identical but are mutually related social phenomena. "There is no and cannot be a stable political power without a corresponding political system" (page 98). According to the authors, a political system is the birth of power and its incarnation. In the book the political system of socialism is characterized as a flexible, dynamic and efficient social mechanism. The political system of a socialist society is not confined by only formal and informal organizations. It also includes rules, traditions and standards of social and political life, on which to a great extent its stability depends. "In the life of the society, traditions of socialist democracy are important. They reflect Lenin's ideas on the more and more broad and effective participation of the working masses in managing the affairs of the society" (page 99). In the development of a political system of socialism, the political culture of the wide spread working masses, which as the authors write, is expressed in a deeply conscious, active relation of the citizens towards politics is of no less importance.

In characterizing the perspective future improvement of governing the society and the development of democracy under socialism, the authors oppose contrasting government and democracy. They underscore that further increasing the social effectiveness of a political system must be accomplished on the basis of combining two aspects: professionalism and democracy. In connection with this, and particularly it is noted that under socialism the scientific and technical revolution by no means weakens the democratic basis of the power structure. Under the conditions of a socialist society, the scientific and technical revolution promotes raising the level of education in the construction and function of all links of the power structure without exception and it promotes "the complete and effective blending of science, politics and democracy" (page 112).

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The fourth chapter is devoted to some of the aspects of the features of a political system of modern capitalism. At the base of the political organization of a bourgeois society is the political power structure of monopoly, as the chapter indicates. It dominates in the political organization within the framework of which there is a struggle of classes, parties, organizations and so on. The basic link of this structure is the government which is characterized by a tendency to strengthen bureaucracy, ruling power and by reducing the real amount of power of the parliamentary institutions. At the same time, in the political system of a capitalist society the structure of political parties plays an important role. As the book indicates, the increase in the role of the political parties is caused by both attempting to adapt the general election right to the tasks of the monopoly and by the attempt, with the help of the parties, to manipulate the people, and finally, by attempts to lead the activity of the masses into the areas necessary for the monopolies and contrast them, with the help of a party system, to the front of communist and working parties.

In the fifth chapter the question of the political systems of developing nations is treated. The authors give the general features of the systems indicated: the revolutionary character of their emergence; the combination and interlacing into the political systems of the old and the new, of traditional elements, institutions which reflect the influence of capitalism, and elements determined by the influence of the system of socialism (for example, government planning); the unclear expression "one class character of a political power"; the particular feature of the role of the government connected with the development of a state structure of the economy and the task of solving the problem of the scientific and technical revolution, as well as with the fact that in a political system the army usually plays an important role and the parties are given a secondary place.

However this external, and in many ways formal community of characters, is less important than the features connected with one or some other path of development which is chosen by the countries--with an orientation towards capitalism or with an orientation towards socialism. From this point of view, the features of the political systems of individual developing nations are detailed in the work.

COPYRIGHT: INION AN SSR

8714
GSO: 1800

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

REGIONAL

BOOKS ON KIRGIZ AND TATAR SSRS REVIEWED

Equalizing the Standard of Living in Kirgiz

Moscow OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI, SERIYA 1, PROBLEMY NAUCHNOGO KOMMUNIZMA in Russian No 4, 1979 pp 100-106

Review by A. N. Vinogradov of the book REGIONAL'NYE PROBLEMY VYRAVNIVANIYA UROVNEY ZHIZNI GORODSKOGO I SEL'SKOGO NASELENIYA by A. M. Moldokulov, Kyrgyzstan, Frunze, 1978, 105 pages

Text The book consists of a preface and five chapters.

The first chapter is "The Objective Necessity and Practical Means of Equalizing the Urban and Rural Population's Standard of Living Under Socialism." The idea of "standard of living" is a broad social and economic classification which is influenced by the kinds of property used as a means of production, the type and class essence of the economics and social relations, culture and so on. The Marxist-Leninist concept of raising the standard of living not only means providing the people with an adequate amount of material wealth, but also satisfying their social, spiritual and moral needs.

The further strengthening of the material and technical base for agriculture and the gradual merging of the two forms of property for production resources into a single common property promote carrying out the tasks of equalizing the urban and rural standard of living at the stage of mature socialism. On the whole in the USSR the level of real incomes for kolkhoz workers in relation to the rural income of workers and employees increased from 75 percent in 1965 to 85 in 1976 per family member (page 11). Moreover, the introduction of guaranteed labor wage on the kolkhozes, a single system of pension and social insurance, more rapid rates of increasing real incomes for kolkhoz workers, the capability for workers, employees, kolkhoz workers to equally use social funds for consumption was significant.

The differences in the standards of living between rural and urban populations are greater in those areas where the proportion of rural population is relatively high, the prevalence here of cooperative and kolkhoz property determines certain differences in comparison with the cities on the level of production development as well as in the distribution of newly created

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

products. In Kirgiz over 60 percent of the population lives in rural areas (the total for the USSR is 39 percent). The rate of growth for the urban population due to the migration from the rural areas is not significant and the absolute number of those working on agriculture farms as opposed to other republics is not decreasing but increasing.

The second chapter is "The Problem of Equalizing the Level of Earnings for the Population." Increasing salaries for the rural population is promoted by the inclusion of those working at home and on subsidiary farms into social production, improving the distribution of industrial branches with consideration given to the sex and age composition of labor resources, the approach of enterprises to the source of labor power and so on. The employment of labor resources in Kirgiz in agriculture is higher than in other republics of Central Asia, but somewhat lower than the Union average level. The proportion of those unemployed in public production and studying in rural areas is somewhat greater than in the cities of the republic (in recent years it has even increased in individual cases). This is explained by the greater proportion of children in kolkhoz workers' families (high rates of growth for the rural population continues in the future also) and the low mobilization of the rural population. Although the absolute number and the proportion of young people who are leaving their native village has a tendency to be increasing, the working class of Kirgiz continues to increase because of the migration of the urban population from other areas of the country. It is the author's opinion that the researchers who feel that the reason for the low mobility of the rural population is having many children and being unprepared for work in industrial branches is incorrect. The rural population of Central Asia, primarily the young people, basically has a complete or not complete secondary education, which easily allows them to transfer to work in industrial branches. However, such a transfer in a certain way is held back by the fact that in the city housing and other conditions are not readily available.

In Kirgiz the number of workers and employees living in rural areas increased by 16 percent for 1971-1976 (to a certain extent this is connected with the reorganization of the kolkhozes and sovkhoses), and the proportion of kolkhoz workers in the overall number in the rural population decreased from 46.1 percent in 1971 to 43.6 percent in 1975. In 1976 49,000 kolkhoz workers, living in rural areas, were constantly busy in industry, transportation and in enterprises of the interkolkhoz associations. However, for 1960-1975 the proportion of those working in industry located in rural areas decreased from 15 percent to 13.1 percent with an absolute increase in their number (page 15-16).

For 1970-1975 in Kirgiz the salary in the families of workers and employees increased by 16 percent, and for the families of kolkhoz workers, the earnings from the kolkhozes increased by 24 percent. The portion of wages on the kolkhozes in the combined income of the kolkhoz workers increased from 39.5 percent in 1953 to 47.3 percent in 1975, while the income received in state and cooperative organizations (including pension, grants, benefits), increased from 9 to 23.5 percent. In 1975 the income from subsidiary farms, which were

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

having the tendency of decreasing, comprised 27.5 percent of the combined income in kolkhoz workers' families, and in the families of workers and employees it was 7.8 percent (page 25-26). The differences in the wages for kolkhoz workers and the workers and employees in the republic are less than in the nation as a whole.

In Kirgiz, as in all of the USSR, solving the problem of equalizing the income level of rural and urban populations supposes the approach of the salary of kolkhoz workers to the level of sovkhov workers' wages, and subsequently having it reach the level of industrial workers' salary. This primarily requires an increase in the productivity of labor in agriculture on the basis of growth in the power available and funds available, and the improvement in the structure of fixed capital. For 1970-1976 in the republic's industry, the productivity of labor increased by 31 percent and in agriculture--by 8 percent. This is partially connected with the deficiencies in the deliveries of industrial products to the countryside. Thus, according to the data of the interbranch balance sheet, the deliveries of industrial goods to agriculture sites in the country for 1966-1972 increased by a factor of 2.7, and in Kirgiz--by a factor of 1.8 (page 31). The classification of workers greatly influences the salary level. For 1965-1975 the number of mechanical experts in the republic increased by 35.9 percent, with an increase of 7.9 percent of those working in agriculture. At the same time, the proportion of classified personnel in agriculture, particularly among women, was insignificant.

The social consumption funds play an important role in equalizing the per capita income. On the whole in the country, the proportion of public funds in the combined income for workers as well as kolkhoz workers has a tendency to increase and grow closer. The volume of public funds depends upon the growth and distribution of the national income. In Kirgiz the increase in the national income for 1970-1975 comprised 27.8 percent with a 12.5 percent growth in the population. During 1965-1975 the payments and services from the public funds increased by a factor of 2.8 (from 357.5 to 998.9 million rubles). According to the data of the budget surveys of the Kirgiz SSR Central Statistical Administration, the proportion of social consumption funds in the combined income of industrial workers' families of the republic for 1976 amounted to 10.9 percent, and in kolkhoz workers' families it was 13.5 percent. These figures were one-half and two-thirds as much as the corresponding All-Union figures. Expenditures from public funds for social and cultural measures were five-elevenths as much as for the USSR as a whole, which is explained by an inadequate development of the area of services in the republic (page 43).

The author feels that to agree with the proposals of individual economists to establish the level of expenditures for social and cultural measures for the union republics in such a way that it depends on the extent of the national income created by them "not only weakens the economic integration between union republics, but can also damage it" (page 45). Under such an approach, the republic specializing in the production of raw materials will try to develop a more profitable industrial processing branch (for example,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

in bringing out cotton and fiber, the proceeds are less than in producing finished fabric), which would lead to an inadequate utilization of the republics' capacities, which are based on the raw materials of other areas. "Therefore, it is more proper if economic unity insures both the solidarity of division and exchange. Only in this manner can the level of the utilization of social consumption funds in various areas be equalized" (page 46).

Chapter Three is "Problems of Equalizing Consumption." In Kirgiz the monetary income of the people for 1976 increased in comparison with 1960 by a factor of 3.7. The real per capita income of the people for 1965-1976 increased by 65.3 percent, while the sale of foodstuffs increased by 64.3 percent (page 49). The proportion of the money spent for food in the workers' families decreased from 49.4 percent in 1965 to 36.7 percent, in the kolkhoz workers' families it decreased from 50 to 43.6 percent. In 1975 the average annual consumption in the republic compared to the average All-Union figure was: for meat--67 percent, dairy products--56 percent, sugar--75 percent and so on (page 50-51). These differences are partially determined by national traditions and in part by the sex and age composition of the population. "At the same time, in supplying the republic's populace with food by calorificity in individual types of foodstuffs, consumption by rational standards is not attained" (page 51).

In comparison with families of workers and employees, the families of kolkhoz workers consume 35.1 percent less meat products, 28.3 percent less dairy products, and 25 percent less eggs; however, they consume 13.7 percent more baked goods and 39.1 percent more fruit. In 1976 the workers and employees consumed 60 percent of the meat intended for sale through State and Cooperative trade, 18 percent on the market and 19 percent from subsidiary farms. Kolkhoz workers bought 47 percent of the meat from subsidiary farms, 19 percent was purchased in State trade, 6 percent on kolkhozes and 25 percent in kolkhoz markets. Almost the same correlation of sources of consumption payment is true for other types of agricultural foodstuffs (page 54-55).

The consumption of all types of non-foodstuffs in the republic has a tendency to increase and almost exists on the Union level. In 1975 the amount of expenditures for the purchase of social amenities in the families of kolkhoz workers was 34 percent less than in the families of industrial workers (page 60). One of the reasons for such a situation is the inadequate development of trade in non-foodstuffs in agricultural areas. The proportion of expenditures among kolkhoz workers for the purchase of non-foodstuffs among individuals in the overall expenditures of the family for these goods was 13 percent in 1975 (for urban dwellers it was less than half as much), and it decreased during the Ninth Five-Year Plan by 3 percent (page 61).

The fourth chapter is "Problems of Equalizing the Services Rendered to the Populace." In 1976 the expenditures for education in Kirgiz were greater by a factor of almost 8 than in 1950; however, in calculating the per pupil and student expenditures, they have not yet reached the All-Union level. In 1975 94.2 percent of those finishing eight grades continued their education in secondary school.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Although during 1939-1970 the number of people having an incomplete higher, incomplete secondary and secondary education increased in the cities of Kirgiz by a factor of 16; in the rural areas it increased by a factor of 22. The number of persons having a higher education in the countryside was one-third as much as that and the number of persons with unfinished higher, secondary and incomplete secondary education was 43.6 percent less than in the city (page 67). Such a difference is primarily explained by the inadequacy of secondary schools in the rural areas.

In the 1977/78 academic year there were 37 secondary vocational and technical schools in the republic where 22,300 persons studied. In 17 of them, located in the rural areas, working personnel were trained in 50 specialized fields (page 71).

In the republic of the total number of students, the proportion of workers' children increased from 26.7 percent in the 1968/69 academic year to 32.9 percent in the 1976/78 academic year; for those of kolkhoz workers--from 20.5 percent to 25.5 percent with a decrease in the proportion of employees' children from 52.8 percent to 41.6 percent (page 72).

For 1970-1975 the number of doctors provided for the rural population increased by more than a factor of 2, although it is significantly lower than in the city. Differences in providing doctors and beds are equalized to a certain extent by the fact that a large portion of the rural population (for 1974--27.2 percent) is cared for in urban hospitals (page 77-78). The elimination of sparsely populated areas promotes an improvement in medical services.

There are no particular differences between the cities and the countryside in providing living space. In recent years in the rural areas, the rate of construction was greater than in the city. However, in the rural area individual construction is prevalent which has a negative influence on the budget of rural inhabitants.

The volume of social services per capita in Kirgiz is steadily approaching the All-Union level. For 1960-1976 the number of enterprises for social services in the republic increased by a factor of 2.5, in the rural area--by a factor 3, and the volume of services rendered rose accordingly by a factor of 7.4 and 23.1. However in the countryside it was still ten-nineteenths as much (page 93). The proportion of kolkhoz workers' expenses by individuals was fairly high for repair work (in 1975 from 26 to 32 percent of the overall volume of corresponding expenditures), although they did not have a tendency to decrease (page 94, Table).

In Chapter Five "Some Problems of the Economic Development of Kirgiz and Their Influence on the Improvement of the Well-Being of the Population" the author notes that by the measure of the development of specialization, and the increase in mutual dependence between regions when satisfying the needs of the population often is carried out at the expense of other republics and areas, the significance of the further improvement of inter- and inner-republican economic ties increases.

COPYRIGHT: INTON AN SSSR

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Book on Siberian Tatars Reviewed

Moscow OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI, SERIYA 1, PROBLEMY NAUCHNOGO KOMMUNIZMA in Russian No 4, 1979, pp 116-119

[Review by A. F. Tsyrukun of the book SOVREMENNYE ETNICHESKIYE PROTSESSY SREDI SIBIRSKIKH TATAR by N. I. Tomilov, Iomsk, Izdatel'stvo Tomskogo Universiteta, 1978, 208 pages]

[Text] The modern Siberian Tatars are the ethnic heirs of the ancient Turkic heathen population of Western Siberia of which a considerable portion belonged to the Siberian Tatar khanate before the arrival of the Russians. The main area of this settling--the region from Tyumen' and Tobol'sk to Tomsk and Kemerovo--is not solid: the Tobol'sk-Irtys'hs'k, Barabinsk and Tomsk Tatars are the fundamental ethnic groups of the Siberian Tatars who are territorially divided by the surrounding Russian settlements. The total number of people in 1887 was 75,200; in 1926 it was 118,300; in 1959 it was 147,100; and in 1970 it was 191,200 persons.

Before the revolution the ethnic processes among Siberian Tatars developed in several directions: the consolidation of the Turkic heathen population of the central portion of Western Siberia into large territorial and ethnic groups, the partial consolidation of these groups into a broader ethnic community of Siberian Tatars, their approach to the newly arrived Volga and Ural area Tatars, as well as to the surrounding Russian population. Before the revolution the Siberian Tatars did not make up a single ethnic group and were only a very weakly integrated ethnic community. The mass relocation to Siberia by Russian and later also by Volga and Tatar inhabitants led to the weakening of inter-group ties of the original Tatars and to their coming closer to the newly arrived inhabitants. The author disputes the opinion that there was a consolidation of Siberian Tatars occurring among the Volga area inhabitants within the framework of the formation of a Tatar bourgeois nation. Kazan' had more of a religious and enlightened role than one of an economic center.

During the first ten years of Soviet power, certain tendencies for the consolidation of Siberian Tatars into a single ethnic community were preserved--the dialects grew more similar, differences in cultural and living standards among the groups of Siberian Tatars were reduced, local ethnic entities were forced out, and the name "Siberian Tatars" itself was spreading. But their wide territorial scattering and the intensified process of the ethnics of the inhabitants and increased similarity between ethnic groups (particularly with the Volga Tatars and Russian) "did not lead to the consolidation of internal ties...and practically eliminated the significance of the processes of internal consolidation for Siberian Tatars for the present and future" (page 151).

The author writes that it is incorrect to consider that the Siberian Tatars have now consolidated with the Tatar nation and now comprise part of it. The unity of their ethnic origin (their ancient Tatar community), literary language and the ethnic entity ("Tatars") are not at all decisive indicators.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The absence of the total of the indicators of an ethnic community which is the only one for all Siberian and Volga area Tatars, thus far does not allow them to be completely identified and united into one nation. At the same time, the developing processes of consolidation for Siberian Tatars with Volga area and Ural area reached a level where the dialects of Siberian Tatars entered into the system of the modern Tatar language. A definite layer of common phenomena manifests itself in the traditional and everyday living culture. In the Siberian Tatars' consciousness the idea of their kindred to the Volga area and Ural area Tatars and so on is growing stronger. As a result "at the present time Siberian Tatars are completely included into the Tatar ethnic community on the ethno-linguistic level, apparently, as its particular regional ethnic community and they are part of all the USSR Tatars" (page 103).

In the last decade the process of drawing together Siberian Tatars with the surrounding Russian inhabitants is developing faster. This process is manifesting itself through bilingual Tatars, the adaptation of many Russian and All-Union cultural aspects, and through an increase in mixed marriages and partial assimilation of individual Russian groups. This direction of ethnic processes is growing stronger and becoming primary.

At the present time, from 74.95 percent to 64.44 percent of the people have a command of the Tatar language, from 61.5 percent to 77.28 percent of the Siberian Tatars have a command of the Russian language: that is, bilingualism is wide spread. At the same time, in 1970 88.2 percent of the Siberian Tatars (including 94.6 percent of the rural inhabitants) considered their native language to be Tatar, which indicates that for a long time it will play an important role.

In the cities the processes of growing closer and blending on an inter-ethnic level are considerably more intense. Here the local Tatars which make up the majority blend in with Volga area Tatar groups. The process of drawing closer among the city Tatars and Russians which leads to the breakdown of endogamy and to the assimilation of sections of the Tatars by the Russians which is natural and progressive is developing with greater intensity than in rural areas.

The territorial factor significantly influenced the development of ethnic processes among Siberian Tatars. Their widespread settling and relatively few numbers are not favorable for internal consolidation. In the future the ethno-cultural processes among them will continue separately in individual ethnic groups.

The definite process of a comprehensive internationalization, consolidating inhabited areas with a mixed national composition, increasing the role of the new generation in the life of the Siberian Tatars, particularly the Siberian Tatar villages, the disappearance of vestiges in relation to women in the Tatar circles, raising the cultural and educational level of the Tatars from various social and professional groups, and the eradication of religious superstitions are the main factors insuring the intensive approach

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

of Siberian Tatars to the other peoples of the USSR and primarily to the Russians. "This process is part of a general ethno-political integration which is developing as a result of the interaction of nationalities and nations in our country" (page 154-155). This process is most clearly reflected in the area of culture and everyday life of the Siberian Tatars. While during the first decades of Soviet power, the influence of everyday life and spiritual culture of the Volga area Tatars played an important role in the process of transforming the cultural and everyday living aspect of the Siberian Tatars, recently the influence of Russians on the entire country-wide aspects of culture and everyday life prevails.

At the same time individual traditional elements in the families and social customs and rites, national ideas and religious beliefs, and the folklore of the Siberian Tatars are being preserved. In the area of everyday family life as well as in the spiritual culture of Siberian Tatars, traditional characteristics preserve the more firm positions than in the material culture, although there is also present here a tendency towards weakening the ethnic specificity.

On the whole, Siberian Tatars "apparently...among other fundamental ethnic formations of Western Siberia are more strongly included, at the present time, by the processes of ethnic integration with other groups" (page 157).

COPYRIGHT: INION AN SSR

8714
CSO: 1800

13
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

REGIONAL

DEVELOPMENT OF ARMENIAN DISSIDENT MOVEMENT REVIEWED

Frankfurt/Main POSEV in Russian No 7, 1979 pp 28-32

[Article by E. Oganesyanyan: "Armenian Dissidence"]

[Text] The Munich Institute for Armenian Problems has published in Armenian a book entitled "Voices from the Motherland" in which the author, Levon Mkrtchyan, has collected and analyzed materials on Armenian dissidence over the last 15 years. I have prepared the present article for the Russian reader on the basis of this book and from the stories of dissidents who have immigrated from the USSR.

Dissidence is called dissidence as this form of thinking differs from the forms which are acceptable and to the liking of the authorities. The history of dissidence begins simultaneously with the history of power and authority in Soviet society. And Soviet dissidence arose along with Soviet power and, in running through the Gulag Archipelago and sometimes in bypassing it, has come down to our times.

If the dissident movement is viewed as a manifestation of different mindedness, that is the dissemination of ideas not approved by the authorities, then this manifestation has occurred through three channels: Samizdat, Tamizdat and open protests. All three forms for the manifestation of dissidence in Armenia began 15-17 years ago. At that time, in 1962, during the period of the flourishing of national self-awareness, the book of Magda Neyman "Armyane" was revised, reprinted, photographed and distributed. This book provided an authentic history of Armenia and was written with great sympathy for the Armenian people. At the same time the residents of Yerevan found in their post boxes leaflets with nationalistic appeals and Samizdat newspapers such as "Paros" ("Beacon") and "Yerkunk" ("Ventures").

And in 1965, a large demonstration was held in Yerevan involving virtually all the population of the Armenian capital. The demonstration was so impressive that the police did not dare to prevent it, and the authorities did not dare to order the police to do this. Moreover, during the evening government meeting in the capital's opera house, when the demonstrators

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

broke in, the members of the government fled, leaving the people to the charge of the Catholicos of all the Armenians (the head of the Armenian Church, editors), and in the name of God he began to calm the excited Komsomol members.

In truth, the demonstration was timed for the 50th anniversary of the genocide of the Armenians in Turkey, and formally did not have an anti-Soviet nature, but in the process of the demonstration, Turkey moved into the background. On Lenin Square the demonstrators demanded that the monument to Lenin be removed, in shouting: "Why should a monument to this person stand in Armenia which he sold out to Turkey and Azerbaijan?"

All these events which occurred in Armenia 15 years ago were very stormy, but they were not supported in the West and for this reason they were easily suppressed. They were not supported for two reasons. In the first place, because these first Armenian dissidents did not have contact with those who would send on such information to the West. These ties appeared much later, when the dissidents themselves were in prison and there became acquainted with the Jewish and Russian dissidents. Secondly, because Armenian dissidence of those times had a purely local national nature and did not fit into the overall struggle for "our and your freedom," "for the rights of man," and for democracy. It was strictly Armenian and in this quality was of interest neither to the West, to the Russians, to the Jews, or even to the overseas Armenians who, in investing all of their sparse forces into the anti-Turkish struggle, could not invest anything in the struggle on the Soviet front.

At present, when Armenian dissidence, due to contacts with the human rights movement, has adopted forms which are more acceptable for the West and certain circles, it has become better known and has come to have greater support. But still the beginning to this movement was made by people the names of whom are known to few and who unstintingly fought under conditions of complete isolation from the outside world. And we may begin the history of Armenian dissidence with them.

On 26 November 1961, in Warsaw, the Polish catholic newspaper KIERUNKI published an article by the Polish art historian Bogdan Genbarski entitled "A Letter to My Old Turkish Friend," in which the author with great sympathy referred to the Armenians and proposed forms for solving the Armenian problem. In January 1962, this same journal published an article by another Polish author Genrich Batowski, and this was written in reply to the Genbarski article and had a clearly anti-Armenian nature. The author felt that the Armenian problem had already been settled by Soviet power. And then, in June of the same year, the same magazine published an article by the historian from Soviet Armenia, Nikos Karapetyan entitled "No, You are Mistaken, Genrich Batowski!" Then this article was reprinted by many foreign newspapers. Soon thereafter its author was deprived of all scientific titles as well as his positions. For what reason? The justification was simple: "Karapetyan on the questions of the history of the Armenian people has shown

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

a nationalistic approach instead of a class approach." Naturally, we cannot give Karapetyan's article which was very extensive. We would merely point out that the deviation from the class approach was in the fact that the author sharply criticized Lenin's policy in the Caucasus, beginning with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and ending with the "great friendship of Lenin--Ataturk." In order to show how sharp his criticism was, we have merely to give one excerpt from his article:

"The boundary which was established for Armenia in 1921, on the one hand, meant the confiscation of the right to a sovereign existence from the Armenian people, and on the other, meant the justification and support for the policy of genocide."

And this was about Lenin!

The next document which I would like to mention is the letter of 2,500 Armenians from the Nagorno-Karabakhskaya Autonomous Oblast sent to Khrushchev. In this letter, the inhabitants of Karabakh, in describing the intolerable Armenian-Azerbaijani relations, asked Khrushchev to include the Karabakhskaya Oblast as part of Soviet Armenia as this oblast was 80 percent populated by Armenians and historically had always belonged to Armenia. The letter also pointed out that a declaration to transfer Karabakh and Nakhichevan' to Armenia had been signed in 1920 and had been proclaimed at a ceremony of the Baku Soviet. But under the treaty with Turkey, Nakhichevan' was turned over to Azerbaijan, and in 1923, Karabakh was.

After this letter, persecution began in Karabakh. Virtually all the leaders of the oblast were removed from their posts, arrests followed, but what was even worse, Armenian and Azerbaijani relations deteriorated further. The "friendship of Soviet peoples" devolved into drawn daggers.

Subsequently events in Armenia developed in the following manner. After the large demonstration in Yerevan in April 1965, the secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee Kamshalov, at a meeting of the youth organizations in Moscow, stated that the events in Yerevan were related to the nationalistic tendencies of the Armenian youth and that these tendencies had been inspired in the youth by a handful of the intelligentsia which was contaminated by anti-Soviet views and wanted to separate Armenia from Russia.

And then, on the eve of the 24th Congress of the Armenian Communist Party, at one of the meetings of the party aktiv of the city of Yerevan, the poetess Sil'va Kaputikyan gave a report in which she criticized the statements of the secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee Kamshalov on the Armenian events. Her speech was completely devoted to the national problems and its main thought was that the events in Armenia had been related to an increase in the national self-awareness of the people, and not to the propaganda of a handful of intellectuals. She emphasized that the party should not complain of the youth and not persecute it, but rather understand it and endeavor to satisfy its aspirations. She concluded her speech with the following bold statement:

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

"Comrades, the nationality question is a complicated one. History knows many examples when various governments, without being able to solve the nationality problems, perished. The almost 50-year existence of the USSR has shown that the Leninist nationality policy has been useful in creating a multinational state, but at the same time many national questions are still not resolved. For this reason I feel that the central bodies of our party should be more soundly concerned with the national problems."

Although the speech of Sil'va Kaputikyan was published in many foreign newspapers, she was not subjected to serious persecution. Of course, she fell out of favor, and temporarily she was not permitted to travel abroad, but still her fate was not what usually happened in similar instances. And at present she again is traveling abroad and is writing little articles which please the authorities.

At the same time, in the Samizdat, there appeared a letter from the CPSU member Ye. G. Ovanesyan sent to the CPSU Central Committee. The letter was published in POSEV (28 October 1966), and I will not take it up in detail. I would merely point out that it dealt with the anti-Armenian views of certain consultants of PRAVDA who, as the author wrote, depicted lies and injustice as truth. In particular, a certain Ikenitskiy was sharply criticized as on the pages of PRAVDA he had voiced anti-Armenian views. During the same period in Armenia manuscripts were circulated which sharply criticized the entire Leninist nationality policy in the Transcaucasus. And these works were written on a high scientific level and with a profound historical and political analysis of events. This showed that the authors of the manuscripts were prominent historians and literary figures of the republic. Their names were known to everyone, but no one said them out loud.

Generally, the dissidence of this period, that is, 1964-1968, could be described as universal dissidence, dissidence that was national and in official-age terms, solid. Those who "dissented" were leading scientists, writers, artists, and even certain members of the departments of the Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party. This all-encompassing nationalism appeared everywhere. Thus, the rule was introduced in the Academy of Sciences that for receiving an academic degree in any area of science, it was essential to pass examinations in Armenia. And children were not registered at the Civil Registry if their parents had given them non-Armenian names such as Nikolay or Eduard. The musical collectives began to perform forgotten Medieval Armenian music (basically church music). The youth began to get married in churches. Many books appeared out of the historic past of Armenia. In the theaters plays were given on historical subjects. Armenian coins appeared at home. We were hissed at when we spoke in Russian at meetings. Parents began to send their children to Armenian schools.

All of this could not help but alarm Moscow. Initially the first secretary of the Central Committee, Zarubyan, was removed, and then, for the first time in all the history of Soviet power, a Russian secretary of the Central Committee and minister of the KGB [State Security Committee] appeared in

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Armenia. And since the dissidence derived from the "solid" strata, it was relatively easy to stop it: some were intimidated, some were persuaded, others were punished, some escaped abroad, and others shut up. But then the baton of dissidence was picked up by the youth from the "solid ones" and they followed their own youthful path which knew neither fear nor caution.

Initially the youth followed the national path set by the elders. But soon thereafter contacts with the dissidents of other republics gave a more international cast to its movement. Recently a member of the Group for Assistance in the Fulfillment of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR, Lyudmila Alekseyeva, presently living in the United States, told how the "Chronicle of Current Events" treated the national and dissident movement in Armenia. Her story relates to the last stage of dissidence in Armenia and is a continuation of my tale. She stated that the first news on Armenia in the "Chronicle of Current Events" appeared in May 1970 and it was received not from Armenia but rather from a Mordovian camp where there were six Armenians at Camp Point No 3. Subsequently, in the 16th issue of "Chronicle" information was published on the political trials in Yerevan at which 12 participants of the national movement in Armenia were convicted.

The first Yerevan trial was held in February 1969, the second just a year later, in February 1970, but the "Chronicle" announced them in October 1970, that is, with a great delay. And this was because there were no direct contacts between the editors of the "Chronicle" and Armenia. Information on Armenia was received only through the political camps.

The oldest of the persons convicted in Yerevan in 1969 was Babayan, a participant of the Patriotic War who at the moment of the trial was 54. The youngest was a 30-year-old design engineer named Gyunashyan. The defendants were accused of setting up an anti-Soviet organization which disseminated leaflets with appeals to create an independent Armenia and of preparing a journal VO IMYA RODINY [In the Name of the Motherland] totaling 343 copies.

In February 1970, five 20-year-old participants of the Armenian national movement were convicted in Yerevan. Three of them--Ayrikyan, Asatryan and Khachatryan, were students, and two of them--Navasardyan and Barsegov--were workers. The defendants were charged with organizing an illegal group in 1967 the purpose of which was to study the history of Armenia, the struggle for the purity of the Armenian language and for the unification of Armenia, the western portion of which is presently in Turkey, and Karabakh in Azerbaijan.

After these trials for 3 years the "Chronicle" did not receive information about Armenia. Only in 1973 was word received on a series of political trials which occurred in Armenia in 1973-1974.

From December 1973 through November 1974, nine cases were tried in Armenia at which 18 persons were condemned for periods from 6 months to 10 years. These were cases involving members of the National United Party of Armenia

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

which had as its aim the holding of a referendum on the question of secession of Armenia from the USSR. (At one time this party was supported by the NTS [the anti-Soviet organization].) The founder and leader of the party, Paruyr Ayrikyan, previously had already served 4 years in the Moldovian camps. Released in March 1973, 11 months later he was rearrested and sentenced to 7 years in the camps and 3 years of exile. Ayrikyan refused a lawyer and in his speech of defense stated that as before he shared the goals and the program of his party. In his final speech, Paruyr Ayrikyan said:

"I know that as long as there is no independent Armenia my place is in a prison cell. Only the very weak fear words and reply to a word with a fist. Your attitude toward me shows the weakness of your ideology. This is not my last word. Long live a free and independent Armenia!"

The Ayrikyan trial became known in Moscow and Tat'yana Khodorovich and Yuriy Orlov arrived in Yerevan for the trial.

The members of the National United Party of Armenia continued their struggle also in the political camps. In February 1976, Ashot Navasardyan refused to go to work demanding that in Armenia a referendum be held under UN supervision for legalizing the National United Party of Armenia. In addition he demanded that the Armenian political prisoners be moved to camps on Armenian territory.

In the autumn of 1976, Paruyr Ayrikyan was moved for 3 months to Yerevan. Ashot Navasardyan was brought here from near Perm'. Both were promised reduced sentences if they rejected their party. Ayrikyan outright refused this and was returned to the camp. Navasardyan signed a paper of denunciation and gained his freedom. Azat Arshakyan was released from the camp at the same price. The others continued to serve their sentences.

In the political camps, the participants of the Armenian national movement became acquainted with and friends of the political prisoners of other nationalities. Paruyr Ayrikyan, along with the editor of the magazine VECHER [Assembly], Vladimir Osipov, and the editor of the UKRAINSKIY VESTNIK [Ukrainian Herald], Vyacheslav Chernovol, drew up a Statute of Political Prisoners in the USSR. In addition to an improvement in the quality of food, housing and the abolishment of humiliating punishment, they demanded that the political prisoners be kept on the territory of their national republics, the elimination of forced labor, and so forth. And when the Armenians demanded the legalization of their party, this demand was supported by the political prisoners of other nationalities, having stated that they would go on a hunger strike.

However the National United Party of Armenia did not establish ties with the human rights movement. The Armenian Group for Assisting in the Fulfillment of the Helsinki Agreements appeared independently of the national party. It was founded by the economist Eduard Arutyunyan, the deacon Robert Nazaryan

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

and the student of the polytechnical institute Samvel Osyan. Later the group included the workers Ambartsum Khachatryan and Shagen Arutyunyan, both members of the national movement. The Armenian Helsinki Group announced a declaration which proclaimed its aims and provided several announcements on the violation of rights of Armenian residents. One of the announcements was addressed to the Belgrad Conference, and contained facts on the suppression of the national Armenian culture, discrimination against the Armenian language, and so forth.

In December 1977, two members of the Armenian Helsinki Group, Robert Nazaryan and Shagen Arutyunyan, were arrested. Nazaryan was accused of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, and sentenced to 5 years in the camps and 2 years of exile, while Arutyunyan was condemned under an accusation of "malicious hooliganism."

Seemingly, these activities of the youth which were followed by persecution, the political trials in Moscow, and all the political tension which reigned in the nation and which had begun to be reminiscent of 1937 should have finally eradicated dissidence among the "solid ones." But evidently this is not the case.

In September 1977, one of the foreign newspapers published a letter by a well-known Armenian writer, a member of the CPSU, and member of the board of the USSR Writers Union, Sero Khanzadyan, in which the author again raised the question of transferring the Nagorno-Karabakhskaya Oblast to Armenia. Along with this letter which was directed to Brezhnev, the newspaper published a commentary on it by an unknown author (from the style and profound knowledge it is obvious that the author is a prominent personality).

From these two documents it follows that at present a true slaughter of the Armenian intelligentsia is occurring in Karabakh. According to unsubstantiated data, the murder of the Azerbaijani minister of internal affairs and his deputy (see POSEV, No 8, 1978--editor) was related precisely to these events. In direct affirmation of this story would be the fact that the announced name of the murderer--Muradov--could be Muradyan, since this name is widely found both among the Armenians and among the Azerbaijani. Only the first name of the murderer could disclose the secret of his nationality, but precisely his first name is carefully concealed. Moreover, Shchusha, the prison chief of which was the murderer, is located in Karabakh. However, regardless of the correctness of this story, the fact remains the fact that Armenian--Azerbaijani relations are strained to a maximum.

Thus, along with the so-called human rights movement, within Armenian dissidence there continue to mature purely national ideas which at some time can burst forth and, if they receive the appropriate support, can become very dangerous for the Soviet leadership.

At present there is a certain decline in Armenia of active resistance to the regime. This decline, as was related by persons who have recently left Armenia, is related to two factors.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The first and probably the main reason is the execution of Stepan Zatikyan and his two comrades, Saven Bagdasaryan and Akop Stepanyan. It is not that this execution has intimidated the dissidents. Simply the not completely comprehensible and unexamined action by Zatikyan somewhat troubled the Armenian dissidents and introduced confusion in their ranks.

But possibly the bomb was destined for another uninhabited place and by accident exploded in the subway while being carried. Possibly Zatikyan and his comrades were not involved in this at all (a number of witnesses saw them at the time of the explosion in Armenia). This is all far from clear, the authorities have carefully concealed all the circumstances of this case, and for this reason I as yet am unable to make any estimate of this event. However, the innocent victims in the Moscow subway could not help but cast a shadow on the other dissidents, and this could not in some way psychologically help but impede their activity.

The second factor for the decline is related to events in Lebanon where 260,000 Armenians live, or around 10 percent of the nation's population. Lebanon is called the second Armenia, because there the Armenians, as nowhere else in the world, have been able to organize a national life. For a long time the Armenians succeeded in maintaining neutrality in the Lebanese conflict, but at the beginning of this year they were subjected to attack by Palestinian detachments and this ended with high losses on both sides. The public of the USSR and Armenia did not respond to this in any way as Armenians were being killed by the allies of the USSR and with Soviet weapons. But when the Armenians were attacked by the Lebanese Christians, demanding from them participation in the conflict on their side, the Armenian intelligentsia in the USSR immediately raised a protest against this. In the given instance the very Armenian government acted as the expressor of Armenian interests, and this in a certain sense impeded the ardor of the nationally thinking youth, particularly as Moscow supported this protest. In such an instance it is somewhat inconvenient to act against the government.

This, incidentally, was the case with the first actions which, as I said, were related to the demands of condemning the genocide of the Armenians. The government built a monument to the victims of the genocide, the press officially condemned this genocide, and these actions immediately ceased having a dissident nature.

Thus, in Armenia at present there is a certain decline in the dissident movement as here it has not so much a human rights nature as a national character, that is, it is a question not so much of defending the rights of individual citizens as it is defending the national rights of all the Armenian people.

And the defense of these rights is much more complicated.

COPYRIGHT: Possev-Verlag, 1979

10272
CSO: 8044/1764

END
21

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY