

A RAND NOTE

N-2472-AF

**The Soviet Population Policy Debate:
Actors and Issues**

Murray Feshbach

December 1986

**Prepared for
The United States Air Force**

RAND

40Years 1946-1986 PROJECT AIR FORCE

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

PREFACE

The RAND Corporation has conducted a study of "Economic Decisionmaking and Soviet Power in the 1980s" under the sponsorship of Project AIR FORCE and in association with the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Headquarters United States Air Force. The project examined the possible directions of Soviet economic policy choice, looking at the interaction between central economic policy formation and decisionmaking on the one hand, and major sectoral resource allocation problems on the other.

As the Soviet Union headed down a second postwar demographic curve in the 1970s, population policy came to be seen as a major factor in economic growth. Soviet leaders from Brezhnev down proclaimed the need to change from an extensive model of growth based on a plentiful supply of labor and capital, to an intensive model based on productivity increases. But the transition proved much more problematic than expected, largely because of the barriers to productivity growth in the Soviet economic system itself. Moreover, such startling social phenomena as declining life expectancy, rising infant mortality rates, sharply increased alcoholism, and other signs of the deterioration of public health standards directed attention to other aspects of the Soviet state's neglect in the area of population policy.

This Note examines the successful campaign since the early 1960s to revive demography as a science and as a foundation for population policies and traces the connections between expert discussions and policy decisions. It should be of interest to those concerned with Soviet demographic problems as a principal issue of Soviet economic growth policy and with the history of science in the USSR. Because this study describes the tactics Soviet scholars use to direct attention toward complex and sensitive issues, it should therefore also interest those concerned with Soviet policymaking.

The author, Dr. Murray Feshbach, is Research Professor of Demography, Center for Population Research, Georgetown University. He is currently on leave, serving as Sovietologist-in-Residence in the

office of the Secretary General of NATO. This Note is an edited condensation, prepared by Nancy Nimitz, consultant to The RAND Corporation, of a considerably longer original version.

SUMMARY

Soviet demographic research centers were abolished in the 1930s, probably because further scholarly study of population processes would have embarrassed the Stalin regime. For roughly 20 years demography remained in limbo. The first census after World War II was in 1959. It was shaped by a deeply conservative official who rejected scholarly proposals to include questions useful for determining the causes as well as the facts of population change. Nevertheless, the census results opened the way for the revival of demography as a science.

Revival was sparked not by leadership interest (invisible until 1967) but by the activities of a Moscow State University professor, D.I. Valentey. He was the first to propose formally in 1961 that demography is a multidisciplinary effort to understand population patterns, not just a statistical exercise in recording them. In 1961 he managed to establish an advisory Population Problem Group within the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education, with members recruited from the USSR Academy of Sciences and government agencies as well as universities. This group and its lineal descendants became a forum for the direct transmission of information and programs across bureaucratic lines. The groups were also empowered to hold conferences at which participants of various disciplinary specialties could advance their views.

Overt Party interest in the possible usefulness of a science of demography first appeared in a 1967 decree on the social sciences. By 1971 the Party acknowledged the need for accurate demographic predictions as inputs to long-term plans; by 1976 it was calling upon demographers to develop policies for countering adverse demographic trends; by 1981 it was enacting such policies. These changes in Party support surely reflected a deepening awareness of the major demographic problems revealed or impending: falling birthrates (and hence aging of the population), rising infant mortality, high regional fertility and birthrate differentials, rising mortality rates among working age males, declining growth of the working age population, real labor resource

shortages in particular areas, low migration patterns and low urbanization in high-fertility regions, etc.

As Party concern deepened, growth of new demographic organizations shifted from the Ministry of Higher Education to the USSR Academy of Sciences, and later to the government structure itself. But while demographic studies have proliferated, there is still no research institute at the national level that is wholly devoted to demography. Perhaps this reflects the political sensitivity of the subject in a country with sharp ethnic differences in population growth. Alternatively, the leadership may regard a multichanneled approach as the best way to avoid a dangerous concentration of authority over a multidisciplinary science (which demography was recognized to be by the end of the 1960s).

Multiplicity of research centers and diversity of opinions within each center have probably tended to reduce the role of institutions and enhance the importance of individuals in shaping policy. In the numerous conferences convened since 1965 to discuss demographic problems, issues have been debated face to face by scholars who speak for themselves rather than for their institutions. Utterances of this kind have a pungency often lacking in collective recommendations. The channels (including personal ties) by which individual or collective recommendations reach the levels where new policies are authorized remain obscure, but there is no doubt that demographers have been heard.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
SUMMARY	v
TABLES	ix
Section	
I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	1
Historical Background to 1959	2
Evolving Scholarly and Leadership Concerns	3
The Pattern of Institutional Growth	6
The Marketing of Ideas	9
Endnotes to Section I	11
II. VALENTEY AND THE HIGHER EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM	12
Early Institutional Development (1962-1967)	12
Debate over the Scope of Demography	14
Later Institutional Development (1968-)	18
Establishing Policy Connections	20
National and Regional Policy Issues	22
Endnotes to Section II	36
III. THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES SYSTEM	41
Scientific Council on Socioeconomic Problems of the Population	41
Institute of Sociological Research	47
Institute of Ethnography	49
Institute of Economics	50
Institute of State and Law	52
Institute of Economics of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences	55
Endnotes to Section III	59

IV. THE PARTY AND GOVERNMENT	64
The Party	64
Gosplan	65
Goskomtrud (State Committee on Labor and Social Problems) .	66
TsSU (Central Statistical Administration)	67
Health Institutions	69
Endnotes to Section IV	79
 V. CONCLUSIONS	 83
Avoidance of Monolithic Authority	83
The Strong Role of the Individual	84
Direct Involvement of Demographic Science in Policy Issues	 85

TABLES

1.	Benchmark Dates	4
2.	New or Expanded Institutions	7
3.	Active Individual Participants	10

I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Population matters have become part of the Soviet leadership's agenda after many years of apparent lack of concern. This Note traces the activities of individuals and organizations publicly involved in the renaissance of demography that began in the early 1960s. The aim is to see how demographic issues have been raised and argued at the expert level. Since channels of communication to the leadership level are not public, the reasons for time lags between expert judgments and overt policy decisions remain conjectural. It is clear, however, that expert recommendations have resulted not just in more research but ultimately in some legislation. Someone is listening.

Does expert authority derive more from institutional affiliation or from the force of the individual voice? By what mechanisms are new ideas marketed? In the absence (to this day) of a national institute of demography, how is research in many locations coordinated across jurisdictional lines? What cues from above are used by individuals and organizations to legitimize their research activities? Such questions are pertinent not only to demographic controversy but to debates throughout the social sciences, including the complex field of economic management. Therefore, even tentative answers may be of broad interest, especially since demography is itself becoming a complex field touching on most of the factors that affect the physical wellbeing of the population.

The source materials for this study are Soviet monographic, journal, and newspaper publications, as well as internal small-circulation documents and information acquired on personal visits. The framework for exposition is a shifting compromise between two stories--the evolution of institutions and the evolution of issues. Sections II, III, and IV nominally deal with institutions in the higher educational system, the Academy of Sciences system, and the Party/governmental structure, respectively. But since the revival of demography proceeded through debates among (as well as within) these aggregates, the exposition is unavoidably tangled, with actors from Sections III and IV popping up in Section II, and the same issue recurring more than once.

The rest of this section aims to provide a guide through the tangles and background material common to all institutions. The history of neglect from the late 1930s through the 1950s is followed by overviews of developments from the 1960s to 1985: the evolution of scholarly and leadership concerns, the formation of new institutions, and common methods of marketing ideas.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO 1959

Between 1917 and 1950 Soviet population trends were sharply affected by one demographic catastrophe after another. After the Soviet regime took power there were population losses due to the aftermath of World War I, epidemics between 1917 and 1923, emigration of the Whites, foreign intervention, civil war, famine in the early 1920s, collectivization, another famine in the early 1930s, the concentration camps and purges of the late 1930s, war with Finland, World War II, and another famine in 1946-1947.[1] The direct losses, birth deficits, and distortions in the age-sex composition of the population because of these events were enormous.

Two prewar institutions of demography, in Kiev and in Leningrad, were abolished by the late 1930s (see Table 1). Especially the Kiev Institute, directed by the eminent demographer M.V. Ptukha, had a distinguished reputation. For whatever reason--reluctance of the leadership to have deep scholarly examination of population processes, or (less likely) lack of interest--demography went into limbo.

The preliminary steps toward its revival came after Stalin's death in 1953. His successors needed to assess the demographic consequences of the catastrophic 1940s and of postwar changes in fertility, mortality, and migration patterns. This required a new census; but first the format of the census had to be decided, including the extent to which it should rely upon sampling to provide data for research on the causes and consequences as well as the facts of population change. These matters were debated in conferences held in 1954 and 1957, and the narrow views of Pod'yachikh, head of the Census-taking Administration in TsSU (the Central Statistical Administration) prevailed. At the 1957 conference he ran roughshod over opposition to TsSU's questionnaire on

such matters as migration, native tongue, and fertility. Nevertheless, the fairly successful conduct of the January 1959 census was the indispensable condition for the reemergence of demography as a science.

EVOLVING SCHOLARLY AND LEADERSHIP CONCERNS

The first issue that preoccupied demographers was the scope of demography as a field: Was it a narrowly statistical exercise or a multidisciplinary effort to interpret and perhaps influence population trends? This question was largely resolved by the end of the 1960s in favor of a broad definition that has continued to expand. The main substantive concern of the 1960s was with falling birthrates and regional difference in fertility.

During the 1970s scholars devoted increasing attention to rising mortality among infants and working age males, the relation of health care to population trends, labor resource issues, and the delicate question of regionally differentiated population policies.

This last matter was at least temporarily resolved in the early 1980s in favor of differential policies. The 1980s also saw increasing emphasis on the family as the unit whose decisions must be influenced in order to alter unfavorable trends.

Compared with the rich public record of scholarly interests, early evidence of leadership concerns is skimpy or ambiguous. According to Soviet writer V.I. Perevedentsev, the 23rd Party Congress in 1966 identified the unsatisfactory demographic situation over the preceding five-year plan period as one of the most important reasons for the decline in rates of economic growth.[2] The published record of the Congress contains no such reference. According to another commentator, V.V. Bondarenko, the 1966 Congress gave a virtual endorsement to demographic studies of composition of the population, influence of the social environment, migration, marriage rates, fertility, mortality, and life expectancy.[3] Again, this is not plain in the published record. Either the transcript of the Congress proceedings was incomplete, or vague hints were interpreted to support what demographers wanted to study anyhow.

Table 1
BENCHMARK DATES

Prewar centers of research

- 1919-1938 Kiev Institute of Demography (Ukrainian Academy)
- 1930-1934 Leningrad Institute of Demography (USSR Academy)

Postwar precursors of revival

- 1953 Stalin's death
- 1954 Conference on the Law of Large Numbers
- 1956 First postwar population estimate published
- 1957 All-Union conference of statisticians
- 1959 First postwar census (Pod'yachikh format)

Revival of demography as a multidisciplinary science

- 1961 Valentey's first book on population problems
- 1965 First demographic conference (Tashkent)
Beginning of debate in *Literaturnaya gazeta* on
approaches to population problems
- 1966 23rd Party Congress
First Ukrainian republic conference
Kiev conference
Moscow conference
- 1967 Conference on population geography
All-Union conference on population questions
Party/government decree on further development of
the social sciences
- 1968 Cheboksary conference (regional population issues)
Yerevan conference (regional population issues)
All-Union conference of statisticians
- 1969 Conference on demography and demographic statistics
(resolution of the Pod'yachikh/Valentey debate)
- 1970 Second postwar census (a comprehensive morbidity
survey was conducted simultaneously)
- 1971 24th Party Congress
First All-Russian conference on labor utilization
- 1973 Kiev conference (new: mortality issues)
- 1974 Conference on demographic legislation
- 1975 Kiev conference (including mortality and health issues)

Direct involvement of demographic science in policy issues

- 1976 25th Party Congress
Conference on population problems and the 25th Party
Congress
Conference on labor resource issues
Tbilisi conference

- 1977 Beginning of debate on medical demography
All-Union conference of statisticians
 - 1978 All-Union conference on labor resources
Vilnyus conference on family matters
 - 1979 Third postwar census (confirming unfavorable
mortality trends)
Brest workshop on managing population processes
 - 1980? Moscow conference on problems of medical demography
 - 1981 26th Party Congress
Conference on population problems and the 26th Party
Congress (family as focus of policy; regionally
differentiated policies)
Dushanbe conference (regionally differentiated
policies)
 - 1982 Riga conference on nationality issues
Kiev conference
 - 1983 Announcement of quinquennial population surveys
Beginning of renewed debate on demography in *Pravda*
 - 1985 First quinquennial population survey (5 percent sample)
-

Clearer evidence of leadership interest is provided by the joint Party-government decree in 1967 on further development of the social sciences.[4] One of the five branches of social science was economics, within which "socioeconomic research in the field of demography" was one of 12 priority areas. The decree directed TsSU (the Central Statistical Administration), Gosplan (the State Planning Committee), and the USSR Academy of Sciences to prepare a Plan for the Conduct of Sociological, Economic, and Demographic Research for the period 1968-1972, and to develop a "scientifically based system of statistical data necessary for economic, sociological, demographic and other research." In effect, the Party was asking to be shown the practical significance of population debates to such national problems as labor resources, health, and national defense.

At the 24th Party Congress in 1971 the one direct reference to demographic issues was to the need for "scientific forecasting of the population." By the 25th Party Congress in 1976, the call was for expansion of research to develop "effective demographic *policy*" (emphasis added). The 26th Party Congress in 1981 identified specific areas of authorized policy relating to: aid to newlyweds and to families

with dependent children, housing and living conditions, child-care institutions, working conditions for women, expansion of part-time work and work at home, and partially paid leave for women to care for children. Legislation on these matters was enacted shortly thereafter.

THE PATTERN OF INSTITUTIONAL GROWTH

Institutional evolution falls into three phases. Until 1967 growth was concentrated in the higher educational system (see Table 2). After the 1967 decree on the social sciences, the USSR Academy of Sciences began to create its own organizations to deal with population problems. From the mid-1970s on--that is to say, after demographic research was expected to help develop new policies--growth was concentrated in the government structure.

One type of institution in Table 2 may need some explanation. Scientific councils are advisory and coordinating bodies attached to one agency (say, Minvuz, the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education, or the USSR Academy of Sciences, or the State Labor Committee) but recruiting their members from academic and government specialists across all concerned agencies. While they lack internal research capabilities, scientific councils have broad powers to allocate research responsibilities, hold conferences, disseminate conference resolutions, and sponsor publications. They are called upon to provide inputs to planning documents and other government matters. In sum, they are often influential institutions, not just committees where inconvenient issues may conveniently be buried.

For the most part, Table 2 omits institutions without at least components (laboratories, departments) dedicated specifically to demographic questions. However, important contributions have been made by individual scholars from other institutions--for example, the Institute of State and Law in the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Table 3 identifies the institutional affiliation of some active individual participants in demographic debates, whether or not their institutions appear in Table 2.

Table 2

NEW OR EXPANDED INSTITUTIONS

Year	Higher Educational System		Academy System	Government and Other
	Minvuz	MGU		
1962	Population Problem Group			
1963	Coordination Council on Population Problems	Research unit on population authorized		Demographic research unit in TsSU ^C Research Institute
1964				Demography section in Moscow House of Scientists
1965		Population laboratory		
1966			Dept. of Demography in Institute of Economics (Ukrainian Academy)	
1967		(plus)		Reorientation of Goskomtrud ^d toward labor resources
1968	Population Section (in Scientific-technical Council)	Dept. of Population (in Economics Faculty) =Center for the Study of Population Problems	Scientific Council on Socioeconomic Problems of the Population (USSR Academy); Scientific Council on Nationality Problems (USSR Academy); Institute of Sociological Research (USSR Academy)	
1974				Demography Dept. in TsSU ^C Research Institute

1975		Scientific Council on Social Hygiene and Organization of Public Health (Academy of Medical Sciences)
1976	Dept. of Demography authorized in Institute of Sociological Research; Scientific Council on Family Problems (USSR Academy)	Family research section in Soviet Sociological Association Family research sections in both houses of Supreme Soviet Inclusion of of pension-age labor in concerns of Goskomtrud ^d
1978		Scientific Council on Labor and Social Problems (Goskomtrud ^d)
1980	Functioning Dept. of Demography in Institute of Sociological Research	Research Laboratory on Medical Demography (RSFSR Ministry of Health)
1982		Dept. of Social Planning and Population in Gosplan ^e
1983		Upgrade of Census-taking Administration to Census and Population Survey Administration in TsSU ^c

^aMinvuz = Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education.

^bMGU = Moscow State University.

^cTsSU = Central Statistical Administration.

^dGoskomtrud = State Committee on Labor and Wage Problems (1956-1967), State Committee on Labor Resource Utilization (1967-1976), State Committee on Labor and Social Problems (1976-).

^eGosplan = State Planning Committee.

THE MARKETING OF IDEAS

A glance back at Table 1 will show that conferences figured prominently in the development of demographic debates. Such meetings are a convenient way of advancing discussion of controversial matters for several reasons. The viewpoints expressed immediately reach the peers who attend the meeting. Conference papers may later be published, thus reaching a wider audience, but issues too sensitive for publication can be presented and argued face to face. Conferences with multiple sponsors may bring together as many as a thousand academic, government, and Party specialists. The convening of conferences can be timed with the hope of exerting maximum influence on such upcoming events as Party congresses. Conferences called soon after congresses are useful for getting the latest word on official positions out to the troops. Resumes of conferences usually appear in small print in the back pages of specialized Soviet journals, where they are easily skipped over by western students of Soviet affairs. They are worth reading.

More obvious channels of communication include monographic books, newspapers, journals, and collections of papers reporting research on demographic topics. Noteworthy here is the explosion of new publications that began in the late 1960s. In 1969 the Demographic Department of the Ukrainian Academy's Institute of Economics began issuing a series of Demographic Notebooks. Also in 1969 TsSU's publishing house Statistika formed an editorial group for demographic literature. In 1970 a Minsk research group began issuing a series of irregular periodicals on population and labor resources. In 1971 the Demography Laboratory of TsSU's Research Institute began a series of publications directed particularly to fertility issues. In 1973 the Population Section of Minvuz authorized Valentey's Center for the Study of Population Problems (Moscow University) to begin issuing the *Sbornik narodonaseleniya* (Population Collection) series on a roughly quarterly schedule.

Retrospective bibliographies issued by Valentey's Center show a total of 1,756 items (including dissertation abstracts and papers in conference volumes) for 1972-1975, and 2,079 items for 1975-1978.

Table 3

ACTIVE INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANTS

Arutyunyan, Yu. V. Institute of Ethnography (USSR Academy of Sciences).
Ata-Mirzayev, O.B. Problem Laboratory for the Study of the Population of
the Central Asian Union Republics (Tashkent University).
Bednyy, M.S. Research Laboratory on Medical Demography (RSFSR Ministry of
Health).
Bondarenko, V.V. Institute of Economics (Ukrainian Academy of Sciences).
Borisov, V.A. Center for the Study of Population Problems (MGU). Later:
Institute of Sociological Research (USSR Academy of Sciences).
Boyarskiy, A. Ya. TsSU Research Institute.
Burnashev, E. Yu. Center for the Study of Population Problems (MGU).
Galetskaya, R.A. Scientific Council on Socioeconomic Problems of the
Population.
Katkova, I.P. I Moscow Medical Institute (Sechenov Institute).
Kharchev, A.G. Institute of Sociological Research (USSR Academy of
Sciences).
Khorev, B.S. Center for the Study of Population Problems (MGU).
Kiseleva, G.P. Institute of Sociological Research (USSR Academy of
Sciences).
Kostakov, V.G. Scientific Research Economics Institute (Gosplan).
Kostin, L.A. Goskomtrud (see Table 2, note d) and Scientific Council on
Labor and Social Problems.
Kozlov, V.I. Institute of Ethnography (USSR Academy of Sciences).
Kvasha, A. Ya. Center for the Study of Population Problems (MGU).
Lisitsyn, Yu. P. II Moscow Medical Institute (Pirogov Institute).
Litvinova, G.I. Institute of State and Law (USSR Academy of Sciences).
Manevich, Ye. Institute of Economics (USSR Academy of Sciences).
Merkov, A.M. Academy of Medical Sciences.
Perevedentsev, V. Institute of World Trade Union Movements.
Piskunov, V.P. Institute of Economics (Ukrainian Academy of Sciences).
Pod'yachikh, P.G. TsSU Census-taking Administration.
Ryabushkin, T.V. Institute of Sociological Research (1976-1983).
Scientific Council on Socioeconomic Problems of the Population
(1976-).
Rybakovskiy, L.V. Institute of Sociological Research (USSR Academy of
Sciences).
Serenko, A.F. I Moscow Medical Institute (Sechenov Institute).
Smirnov, A.I. Department of Social Planning and Population (Gosplan).
Later: staff of the USSR Council of Ministers.
Sonin, M. Ya. Institute of Economics (USSR Academy of Sciences).
Steshenko, V.S. Institute of Economics (Ukrainian Academy of Sciences).
Urlanis, B. Ts. Institute of Economics (USSR Academy of Sciences).
Valentey, D.I. Population Section (Minvuz) and Center for the Study of
Population Problems (MGU).
Volkov, A.G. TsSU Research Institute.

ENDNOTES TO SECTION I

- [1] From Murray Feshbach, *The Soviet Union: Population Trends and Dilemmas*, Vol. 37, No. 3, Population Reference Bureau, Inc., Washington, D.C., August 1982, pp. 6-7.
- [2] D.I. Valentey et al. (eds.), *Zakony i zakonomernosti razvitiya naseleniya*, Moscow, 1976, p. 31.
- [3] V.F. Burlin and V.V. Bondarenko (eds.), *Tezisy dokladov pervoy respublikanskoy nauchnoy konferentsii po demografii*, Statistika, Kiev, 1966, p. 3.
- [4] Among other places of publication, see *Voprosy filisofii*, No. 9, September 1967, pp. 3-12.

II. VALENTEY AND THE HIGHER EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

After the results of the first postwar census of population (January 1959) became available, interest in population matters had a renaissance among scholars and among government officials. Much of the activity was sponsored by the USSR Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education (Minvuz) at the initiative of one professor of Moscow State University, Doctor of Economic Sciences Dmitri Ignatiyevich Valenty. His advocacy of the issue, whether fanned by ambition or not, influenced the agenda, the actors, and the institutions in the next two decades.

As noted in Section I, the format of the 1959 census reflected the narrow views of Pod'yachikh, head of TsSU's Census-taking Administration. Valenty's 1961 book *Problemy narodonaseleniya* (Population Problems) was the first to formally propose that the science of demography is more than just demographic statistics, that it is a broad range of issues that cannot be explained by statistics alone, that there is a need to develop a unified, integrated approach.

EARLY INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT (1962-1967)

The Population Problem Group

In September 1962, explicitly based on the initiative of Valenty, a joint problem group was formed by the Scientific Technical Councils of the USSR and RSFSR Ministries of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education. Institutionalization of the population issue into a problem group gave Valenty and his associates a framework within which they could initiate discussions of his agenda, hold conferences to "spread the word," and fight with Pod'yachikh over the scope and coverage of demography. Creation of the group was later called the opening event in population studies: "From this moment on the rehabilitation of demography actually began; a restoration that reminds one to a certain degree of the famous legend of the Phoenix arising from ashes and returning to life." [1] By April 1963 several hundred university and academy scholars and government staff members were on the rolls of the group.

The Coordination Council on Population Problems

On April 23, 1963, at the initiative of some members in the Political Economy Section of the Scientific-Technical Council, the Collegium of Minvuz converted the Problem Group into a Coordination Council on Population Problems.[2] The change was more than just a change in designation.[3] The new council had authority to supervise population training and research in all Minvuz faculties. The courses offered to demography students were required to include theoretical problems of population, critique of bourgeois theories, the process of population growth and changes in its structure, issues of settlement, migration, determining methods for rational labor resource distribution, and so forth.

The Council membership included not only educators involved in training students but also staff members of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institutes of Economics, Ethnography, and Geography. In addition, the Central Institute of City Building as well as staff members of Gosplan and TsSU (which by that time had a Department of Demography, created in 1963) also had a representative on the Council. Apparently the Council served as a forum for transmission of programs, concerns, and information within and across various agency and bureaucratic lines, from the university to the academy to government units. Later other university research units were added.

Soon after the foundation of the Council in 1963 a proposal was endorsed to create a "scientific base" within the university system to perform specialized population research. And then, to quote a Soviet figure closely involved, "finally" in 1965 such a unit was created at Moscow State University.[4] The Soviet writer's impatience with Minvuz's delay beyond 1963 in creating its own organization comes through very clearly. (In contrast, the demography laboratory of the TsSU Research Institute was apparently both authorized and formed in 1963). The first Scientific Director of the Problem Laboratory of Population (its initial designation) not surprisingly was Valentey. By early 1967, Valentey also was the chairman of the Coordination Council, giving him another institutional structure through which he could advocate his position.[5]

One of the important functions granted the Council was the authority to convene conferences. Between 1965 and 1974 it convened 15 such conferences and symposia,[6] which provided a forum to discuss issues, to do battle with clear opponents such as Pod'yachikh, and to define the scope of demography at a national as well as regional levels of concern. The Council apparently was classified bureaucratically as a voluntary organization--a group of persons involved in a particular matter banding together but with authority limited to conference-holding and giving advice.

DEBATE OVER THE SCOPE OF DEMOGRAPHY

Tashkent Conference (September 1965)

The first conference was held in Tashkent, the capital of Uzbekistan. Valentey asserted that it was more than just a regional meeting because it provided an opportunity for the participants to exchange their experiences of applying various scientific approaches (i.e., their fields of specialty) to the question of the scope and coverage of the field of demographic studies.[7] The conference devoted "special attention" to the multi-dimensional (*kompleksnyy*, the buzz word of Valentey's drive) resolution of population issues "only under conditions of complete consideration of the specifics of local geographic, demographic, historical, nationality and economic conditions." [8] "Research on the reasons for regional population growth differentials is of serious significance."

In the conference resolutions many agencies were explicitly requested to expand their support of research on population issues, including the USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, the republic Academies of Sciences, and the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR. Moreover, the republic councils of ministers were urged to create population commissions in their republics as a "consultative and coordination organ for practical recommendations on population questions." [9] The first of many such appeals was issued to create an Institute on Population Problems. What was not stated was that Valentey undoubtedly expected to be selected the director of any such institute.

In an obvious attack on Pod'yachikh, the paragraph of the conference resolutions addressed to TsSU made four "requests." The first was for TsSU to expand sample population surveys and even to publish the results. The second sought publication of data on "small territorial units and population points"--a recognition of Soviet diversity (*mnogoobraziye nashey strany*). The third point related to TsSU's propensity to retain control over access to information (a constant to this day); it advocated providing a "wider range of systematic material to scientific personnel." And fourth, an even more direct attack on Pod'yachikh's record of ignoring the recommendations of outsiders: "When conducting the next census of population to take more widely into account the proposals of scholars working in the field of population problems." This attack did not go unheeded by the recipient of the broadside.

The Literaturnaya gazeta Debate (1965-1966)

Soon after the Tashkent conference an open debate began in the pages of *Literaturnaya gazeta*, largely but not entirely devoted to agonizing over Marxist-Leninist population approaches in light of the World Population Conference's debate (held in Belgrade in August 1965) on family planning policies.[10] The first article on 23 November 1965 by Boris Urlanis of the Academy of Sciences' Institute of Economics asked for a more open, less dogmatic approach at international meetings to population policies related to family planning. The narrow economic determinism underlying the position of Pod'yachikh and others (population growth is simply a function of the mode of production) had to be adjusted. To Urlanis this approach had become too detached from reality; population problems do exist and require demographic policy analysis and decisions. The next article by Yaropolk Guzevatyy (on 30 November) opposed dogmatic, simplified understandings of population issues at home--the Pod'yachikh constraint of limiting discussion to population statistics only and excluding analysis of the determinants and consequences of the trends revealed in the data.

Pod"yachikh responded on February 22, 1966, affirming his opposition to the new interpretations on family planning policies expressed by Urlanis, and endorsing the position taken by the Soviet delegation at the United Nations, which he undoubtedly framed. Gerasimov appeared next, on March 3, 1966, criticizing Pod"yachikh's stand and giving his own endorsement of family planning. Strumilin, the economist of much repute, provided a conservative response on May 28th. Finally on June 11, 1966, Arab-Ogly, the sociologist, gave a reasoned description of both sides of the debate on family planning, although his article implicitly endorsed the anti-Pod"yachikh position by not opposing the "conscious direction" of population processes. As western observer James Brackett notes, by this time the Soviet Union may already have modified its position when its representative supported a resolution at the World Health Organization's meeting in May regarding family planning and health.[11]

Kiev Conference (October 1966)

The line between the various points of view on the definition of demography was drawn even more clearly at the meeting in Kiev, where Pod"yachikh delivered a blistering attack on the Valentey position and the latter replied.[12] Pod"yachikh tried to turn the tables on his opponents by using some of their words. He asserted that it was premature to address the issue of the scope and coverage of demography because insufficient attention had been paid by economists and sociologists to the study of population issues, that no law of population had yet been formulated, that "certain scientists frequently are of nakedly academic character and often do not use available actual data for deep scientific research and preparation of practical proposals," that there had been only a "scholastic debate about the so-called science of demography," that individual citations from the media in the recent past were misleading and incomplete, and even that the conference at which he was talking was possibly incorrectly designated as a "Conference on Demography."

Moscow Conference (November 1966)

Valentey's opening speech to the plenary session noted that "only in the last few years has there been a serious attempt to define (the subject of) problems of population." [13] Even Pod'yachikh's colleague, A.Ya. Boyarskiy, the author of the first textbook on demography, and then head of the TsSU's Research Institute, also attacked Pod'yachikh by noting that although population obviously could not be studied without statistical data, to limit the analysis just to demographic data was inadequate. [14] Sonin, the well-known labor economist, said that both Pod'yachikh and Valentey were in error, one by being too narrow, the other by being too broad in outlook. [15]

The Denouement of the Valentey/Pod'yachikh Battle

The last phase of the Pod'yachikh and Valentey battle was in the spring of 1969 when Pod'yachikh defended his position and attacked Valentey's views before TsSU's Scientific Methodology Council. [16] He charged that "the Population Studies Center of MGU (Moscow University) recently forwarded to the government a document (*zapiska*) as if it were the result of many years of activity," though it was nothing new (TsSU transmitted similar material several times a year to the government). Pod'yachikh harked back to the March 1954 Conference on the Law of Large Numbers (when a compromise definition of the scope of statistics had been hammered out), and deplored Valentey's attempt since 1961 "to tear [population statistics] from statistics" in an end run around the conclusions of the conference, without any theoretical basis. He considered the putative existence of a science of demography to be illusory, and attacked even his colleague Boyarskiy's textbook (*A Course on Demography*) as not having been discussed sufficiently, contrary to the Central Committee's instructions. He complained that the November 1966 Moscow conference on population (organized by Valentey) had a pre-prepared set of resolutions, one of which endorsed a "science of population." He gleefully noted that the resolution was not adopted because of "sharp objections." He admitted that "the study of population problems has not received enough attention." With a low level of theoretical underpinnings it should be sent back to the drawing board.

Despite this strong attack, Pod'yachikh's position was not supported within TsSU and apparently in other agencies such as Gosplan and Minvuz, which would be concerned with the results of the debate. The effort to define the field of population studies had largely been resolved by shifting from a narrow definition of statistics alone to Valentey's broad definition of interdisciplinary descriptions and analysis. Valentey also succeeded in placing himself at the head of all educational-related institutional units both in MGU and in the Scientific-Technical Council of Minvuz, giving himself a lever with which to influence work on population studies throughout the country within the jurisdiction of the higher educational ministry.

LATER INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT (1968-)

The Population Section of Minvuz

In 1968 the Population Section of Minvuz's Scientific-Technical Council took over the functions of the Coordination Council, again with Valentey as its chairman. Its structure indicates the interconnection between the Population Section and MGU; Valentey used many of his colleagues at MGU to direct each subunit's work.[17] In neither structure was Valentey allowed to create a unit on nationality aspects of population; with the later exception of Tashkent State University, this matter seems to be assigned to the Institute of Ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The various commissions of the Population Section were obligated to "consult with members of problem groups (which they specifically create to work on an issue related to their area of competence), to prepare recommendations for governmental, economic and planning agencies, to pass on doctoral and candidate degree dissertations, to review articles, manuscripts and monographs, and to organize scientific conferences." [18]

By 1975 the Population Section comprised some 500 active members in various university research units, in research institutes of the academy and ministries, and in planning and statistical agencies. It also had 28 support units (*opornye bazy*, presumably field research units) at university departments throughout the country, and 20 support laboratories, sections, or departments in research institutions of

government agencies and the Academy of Sciences.[19] Prominent examples of support units are: Tashkent State University's Problem Laboratory for Study of the Population of the Central Asian Union Republics (headed by O.B. Ata-Mirzayev); the Department of Demography in the TsSU Research Institute (headed by A.G. Volkov); the Central Scientific Research Laboratory of Labor Resources of the RSFSR State Committee on Labor; and the Department of Labor Resources and Demography of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Economics.[20]

Center for the Study of Population Problems (MGU)

The main support unit of the Population Section is the Center for the Study of Population Problems, formed at MGU on 9 April 1968 on the base of the Population Laboratory (created in 1965) and the Department of Population in the Economics Faculty (created in January 1968). Also headed by Valentey, the Center has four functions: (1) to perform research on population problems using its approximately 50 staff members; (2) to teach and prepare new cadres in the field of demography; (3) to coordinate all university research on population problems; (4) to do bibliographic work and act as a publishing house in the field.

The Center's Scientific Council on Population Problems acts as the organization's policymaker, passes on the reports of research activities, discusses important scientific problems, publishes works of Center members, reviews candidate and doctoral dissertations, and offers recommendations on curricula and associated study materials.[21] The Center as a research unit has four sections, roughly paralleling those of the Population Section. Valentey heads one of these, the Department of Theory and Methodology of the Complex Analysis of Population Problems. It conducts research on methodological issues related to "complex analysis" of population issues, as well as the "theoretical bases of population policy in a developed society." [22] Presumably this is a major point of contact for Valentey to convey his interpretations of population policy to the government through Minvuz, and through the governmental members (of Gosplan, TsSU, etc.) of the Population Section.[23]

The Center's educational role within the university system was formulated by Minvuz. It authorized the teaching of demography at all economic faculties of universities and economic institutes where political economy teachers and labor economists were being trained. The Study and Methods Administration for Higher Education of Minvuz approved a "Program for a Course in Demography" for the economic faculties.[24] By the 1974/75 school year, some 130 undergraduate and 25 graduate students were enrolled in the program at MGU. Many of them contributed to the Center's research program.

An important research task authorized by the Population Section and completed by the Center in 1970 is called "Population of the USSR and the World by the Year 2000." It laid out a program of research for the period 1971-1980 to be carried out by Ata-Mirzayev's laboratory and others. The introduction on "Goals and Purposes of the Research and Their Practical Significance" includes the following key paragraph:

The need to develop the subject is based upon the requirements of the directive, planning and national-economic organs for long-term social and demographic forecasting, without which national economic planning is not possible.[25]

A year later, in 1971, the 24th Party Congress reiterated the need for scientific forecasting of the population (see Section I). Clearly, the "practical significance" of demographic research was beginning to be recognized.

ESTABLISHING POLICY CONNECTIONS

Having established the field, organized an institutional structure, and set a pattern of conferences and publications, in the early 1970s Valentey began to link his organization with policymaking. In 1969 Pod'yachikh had accused him of forwarding an unsolicited report to the government. After that point, however, Valentey and his staff at MGU were apparently responding to the expressed requirements of policymakers in the Party and government.

Thus in 1974, perhaps in preparation for the 25th Party Congress, USSR Gosplan, the USSR State Committee on Science and Technology, and the USSR Academy of Sciences jointly ordered the Population Center of MGU, the Tashkent and Latvian State Universities, and the Saratov Polytechnical Institute to do research on the broad theme of "Socioeconomic Problems of Population Reproduction." According to B. Remennikov of the State Committee on Science and Technology, this work had "important national-economic significance and the resulting scientific report was provided to the planning organs." [26] Gosplan also gave MGU an assignment to conduct studies on "Socioeconomic Bases and Methods for Managing and Regulating the Development and Distribution of the Population of the USSR in the Long-Term Perspective," so that Gosplan could evaluate natural growth and migration in the next 15 years. "Recommendations for regulating the processes of natural movement, mobility and population settlement" were also to be prepared.

Minvuz USSR authorized more research in conformance with the resolutions of the 1976 Party Congress. The research program was formulated by the Population Section under the rubric of "Coordination Plan for Scientific Research by Higher Educational Institutions in 1976-80 on Population Problems." [27] Of the nine directions for research, five were directly related to regional issues, one also had a regional thrust, and the remaining three reflected regional differentials in labor resources, student bodies, and medical indicators.

The research program of Tashkent University approved by the Population Section as part of the work on "Population of the USSR and the World by the Year 2000" fits in with the emphasis on regional issues. A limited edition pamphlet was issued [28] whose text specifically addressed the changing structure of the Soviet population by noting that Central Asia was 5 percent of the nation's total population in 1940, 10 percent in 1976, and could be 15 percent by the year 2000. Moreover, about one-half of the growth of the USSR population by the year 2000 would come from the Central Asian republics. Differentials in marital rates, divorce rates, age-specific fertility, age-specific mortality (including infant mortality), low migration

patterns, and low urbanization compared with the rest of the country were characteristics of this unique area (*svoyeobraznyy, unikal'nyy rayon*). The research included detailed examination of socioeconomic problems of growth of the population, regional problems of the territorial mobility of the Central Asian population, regional problems of settlement and urbanization of Central Asia, and demographic processes and problems of the educational system of Uzbekistan and Central Asia.

The research results were to be transmitted to the Uzbek Gosplan and other organizations as each phase of the work was done. Scheduled for completion in 1980, the research could have passed (at least in part) to the national level through various channels in time for consideration in the preparations for the Party Congress early in 1981 and the subsequent legislation that contained regional aspects in implementation.

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL POLICY ISSUES

The 1959-1970 intercensal period was the first in Soviet history that reflected only normal demographic developments. Realization that disturbing trends could no longer be blamed on catastrophes opened the way for debate on how demographic processes might be not just forecast but influenced or managed. In a context of sharp regional differences, this inevitably raised the question of unified versus differentiated policies, or (in the eyes of some commentators) policies that discriminated against some nationalities--traditionally a very sensitive issue to Soviet as well as outside observers.

Early Discussions

Policy issues had arisen at a meeting held in Cheboksary in the Chuvash Autonomous Republic of the RSFSR in May 1968. The conference was nominally addressed to regional characteristics of the population but in actuality dealt also with national issues. Valentey's speech was a precursor to later arguments about unified versus differentiated demographic policies.[29] He described population policy as an element of overall socioeconomic policy, the principles of which should be identical for all republics. However, to accommodate regional preferences and factors,

Demographic policy can be differentiated in accordance with the characteristics of individual areas depending on concrete situations. It encourages births. [But] it is an influence for their reduction in some cases, or for stabilization in others. This, needless to say, does not signify and must not signify interference by the state in the free exercise of the will of families with respect to childbearing.

Whether the Party and government had Valentey's statement in any package of supporting material when they later adopted a regionally differentiated policy is not known, but the reasoning is identical.

In November 1968 another meeting on regional population issues was held in Yerevan. Most of the papers dealt with substantive issues-- changes in life expectancy, fertility, migration, labor force, etc. The sole exception was a paper by Guzevatyy, "Some Questions on Population Theory," which asserted that "until recently many Marxist scholars were inclined to underrate the role of demographic factors in social development." [30]

After a hiatus of several years, the next conference was held in Kiev in December 1973. Valentey's leadoff speech provided an overview of the multidimensional approach to demography. He included military demography, which to him comprehended not only the number of draftable males, but also demographic parameters affecting the military or military economic potential of the country. [31] Valentina Steshenko, head of the Demography Department of the Ukrainian Academy's Institute of Economics (a co-sponsor of the Kiev conference), argued that trends in the USSR and European socialist countries made it urgently necessary to develop a "scientific basis for influencing specific demographic processes." [32] Policies must be designed not only to raise fertility but also to improve the health and increase the work life of the population--goals that may at times conflict. [33] She advocated more theoretical work to have a basis for an "effective demographic policy." [34]

Widening the Audience

In 1973 the thrust of trends in fertility and mortality on the national and regional level began to be discussed in publications for the nonspecialist reader. In July Perevedentsev provided the public with a full exposition of demographic developments in a literary journal.[35] After noting that demographic issues had been under active discussion only in the last eight years, he gave details on the decline in the crude birth rate, the consequent aging of the population, mortality changes, dependency ratios, and so forth. He underscored the regional differentials and throughout the article stressed the importance of demographic behavior in Central Asia and Azerbaydzhan--the high fertility republics with their Muslim origin and traditional large family orientations.

In December 1973 the Lithuanian Communist Party journal published an article recommending the formation of an Interagency Demographic Council.[36] Although important as a symbol of recognition of the problem by a Party organization, the proposal seems to have been premature. Only in the 1980s was there firm movement toward such institutional innovations.

In May 1975 Urlanis wrote in a political-economic journal that it was "now necessary to switch to a more active demographic policy of stimulating fertility," which "must be differentiated, i.e., local, regional, zonal, and so forth . . . especially in such multinational states as the Soviet Union." [37] This article appeared soon after the 1974 World Population Conference (just as the debate in *Literaturnaya gazeta* a decade earlier had been initiated after the 1965 World Population Conference). Its publication in the journal of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations may have been addressed to an international as well as a domestic audience.

In June and December 1975, Perevedentsev continued his exposition of population issues in the literary journal, *Nash sovremennik*, with particular attention to the faults of TsSU's predictions.[38] In June he also published an article for journalists about the issues involved. Besides describing the usual fertility and mortality trends, he gave estimates of their effect on the size of the working age population

(20-59 years of age) in the two periods 1970-1985 and 1986-2000.[39] In brief, there would be a growth of 30 million in the first period and only 5 million in the latter. Moreover, he estimated a net decline in this 20-59 year old population group over the years 1986-1990. He advocated payment of a child care allowance beginning with the second child, a year-long postpartum leave, expansion of child-care institutions, increase in demographic propaganda, and so forth. Much of this list has now been adopted, although only partial pay for the year's leave is currently authorized for women.

After the 1976 Party Congress

A post-congress conference in April 1976 was jointly sponsored by the Soviet Sociological Association and units headed by Valentey. Two Valentey associates, Kvasha and Khorev, spoke in favor of regionally differentiated policies.[40] This meeting apparently also discussed the need for training more demographic specialists, and for extending demographic knowledge to economists, philosophers (meaning Party theoreticians), and physicians.[41]

The January 1978 article by G.I. Litvinova of the Academy's Institute of State and Law[42] must be introduced at this juncture, even though she is not part of the educational institutional structure. Tying her viewpoint to the 1976 Party Congress appeal for an effective demographic policy, Litvinova argued the need to develop an aggregate system of levers in appropriate legal norms. Noting that the issue had become more urgent since a much larger proportion of women work, that working women have fewer children (1.96) on the average than nonworking (2.24), and that there are wide regional differentials in birth rates, she advocated payments for the birth of second and third children, the third receiving the maximum. (In fact the legislation of 1981 provided for payments of 50 rubles for the first child and 100 rubles each for the second and third). In addition, housing priorities for families with two and three children should be concentrated in low birth rate republics. Thus, she advocated a national policy with consideration for local differentials by formation of a central demographic commission (such as in Romania), which would operate on the basis of

unified principles of demographic policy for the entire USSR, with consideration of and attenuation of differences in the demographic characteristics of the populations of the union republics.[43]

By February 1978 Valentey apparently felt strong enough to provide a thorough review of the "exacerbation of the demographic situation".[44] His description of current problems included the reduction of the crude birth rate, family instability, aging of the population, the slowing down of life expectancy growth including no increase for the male portion, high regional birth rate differentials and consequent low rates of out-migration from some rural areas, unfavorable age-sex structures in many cities and certain rural regions, manpower issues related to vocational and skill distributions of the labor force, the existence of real shortages of labor resources in certain areas, and the need for increased labor productivity. He was aware that "no change in the birth rate will be able to influence the balance of labor resources for at least the next four five-year plan periods." [45] Demographic policy

should obviously be aimed at solving those social and economic problems which will face the country at the beginning of the twenty-first century. This is a result of the fact that no matter how high the effectiveness of demographic policy during the Ninth through Twelfth five-year plans may be, we believe that its practical realization will require at least an additional ten to fifteen years due to the known inertia of demographic processes.[46]

In the current period, he continued, more attention could be paid to "problems which make it especially urgent to improve the 'quality of the population'," which he linked to the high rate of Central Asian population growth and low rates in the European part of the country. Low female labor participation rates, as well as the fact that the young people from the Central Asian region would provide nearly all of the increase in labor resources during the following five-year plan periods, must be taken into account.[47]

He also hinted at the depth of the health problem of the Soviet population. "Concern for the health of the population in all age groups from infancy to advanced old age is an important social and economic task." The September 1977 decree on improvement of health care "is an event whose importance is difficult to overestimate both from the overall social point of view and from the point of view of effectively influencing population development." [48]

This review of national and regional issues was designed not only to position Valentey at the forefront of commentators on the population issue, but also to be available for the attendees at the largest conference on labor resources ever held in the Soviet Union. In April 1978, under the co-sponsorship of six major national agencies-- Goskomtrud, Gosplan, the State Committee on Science and Technology, the Academy of Sciences, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, and Minvuz--some 1,000 persons assembled for an All-Union Scientific-Practical Conference on "Basic Directions for Raising the Effectiveness of Labor Resource Utilization in the Light of the Decisions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU." [49]

The Section for the Analysis of Contemporary Tendencies of Population Reproduction and Labor Resources of the USSR discussed "measures related to demographic policy aimed at increasing population growth and optimizing migration and population settlement." [50] Yefim Manevich, of the Academy's Institute of Economics, gave the plenary speech for this section. [51] To address the problems of declining birth rates he suggested housing aid to young families with two or three children, expansion of the capacity of child-care institutions, part-time work, work opportunities at home, extension of leave for women after giving birth, changes in the pension laws, improvement in health, etc. [52] However, he strongly and flatly opposed any differentiation in policy among the republics of the USSR. Explicitly citing statements of Urlanis, Kvasha, and Litvinova advocating a differentiated demographic policy, he made the following rejoinder:

To us it appears that the theory of differentiated demographic policy is wrong in principle. First, it contradicts the general principles of the Leninist nationality policy. I want to remind the advocates of a differentiated demographic policy about the response of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev to the question put by the correspondent of the French newspaper, *Le Monde*: "Do you think that the accelerated growth in the nationality republics can bring about certain structural changes?" L.I. Brezhnev responded: "As regards the growth of the population in one or another republic of our country, this phenomenon does not disturb us. On the contrary, it makes us happy.[53]

Manevich added, however, that migration policy could be differentiated. One of the conference's numerous recommendations was that a Scientific Research Institute on Labor Resources and the Population be created on the foundations of existing research organizations.[54]

Several months later in 1978 a book by a Kazakh demographer, M.B. Tatimov, appeared in Alma-Ata in the Russian language. Like Manevich, Tatimov was very unhappy with any proposals for a differentiated policy. He argued that "a differentiated population policy is by its nature and intent the same thing as a discriminatory policy." [55] Not the usual words one sees in the Soviet press about the implications of a particular policy. (Tatimov continued the discussion even after the 1981 Party Congress that adopted differentiated policies.)

Before the preliminary results of the January 1979 census became available, another major conference was held in Brest in May-June 1979, devoted to "Managing the Processes of Population Development in a Developed Socialist Society." The high level of the participants and the frankness of the reports at this "Workshop Seminar" indicate that this was a very important session in the history of Soviet demographic science and policy. It was attended by 110 persons from Gosplan, the State Committee on Labor and Social Problems, universities, medical institutes, and institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences.[56] The seminar's work was broken down into six major sections, covering most of the problems of the day: (1) status of the program for population development and the demographic situation in the USSR and in individual regions; (2) management of demographic processes (questions of methodology, methods, practice); (3) status and perspectives for the

development of family and marital relations in a socialist society; (4) socioeconomic problems in managing the settlement process; (5) ecological and sociohygienic problems of the population; and (6) problems in managing the development of the population and improvement of the system of socioeconomic planning.[57]

Valentey spelled out the scope of the basic document under discussion--the Complex Program for Long-term Population Development in the USSR--by noting that it covered "fertility, mortality, improvement of the health of the population, protection of motherhood and childhood, improvement in the working conditions and life of women, education (including family training and upbringing), problems in family development (including marriage and divorce processes), migration and settlement of the population." [58] (A year and a half later, most of these topics were cited in the 1981 Party Congress proceedings as needing improvement and management.) The seminar recommended that five-year plans include, in addition, a special subsection entitled "Population and Labor Resources," which would specify tasks for the plan period in the area of population and the composition and utilization of labor resources.

In September 1979, at the Demographic Section of the Moscow House of Scientists (a group that had been meeting since 1964), [59] Chairman Uralnis again referred to the unified versus differentiated policy debate. He noted that in principle policy can be unified for the country as a whole, but for some measures it can be differentiated on the basis of three criteria: (1) parity (order of birth), (2) type of settlement (urban vs. rural), and (3) birth intervals. He advocated measures aimed at raising the birth rate and also reducing the intervals between births. [60] V.I. Kozlov of the Academy's Institute of Ethnography agreed that policy could be unified but it must be designed to have differential effects. It should stimulate the birth rate in low fertility republics.

Uralnis returned to the fray in an article published in January 1980 in the journal of the Academy, advocating efforts to raise birth rates in low fertility regions and reduce mortality in high fertility regions. [61] The latter point may be related to high infant mortality in Central Asia and the "wastage" of a pregnancy by the death of the

child. With reduction in infant mortality perhaps the population of the region would seek to have fewer children.

In the newspaper of the Russian Republic, where there is a gross reproduction rate below replacement, Valentey addressed the goal of increasing birth rates (*Sovetskaya Rossiya*, February 17, 1980). He emphasized the importance of family stability, a major problem in the republic, with large cities having high divorce rates. It is only in stable families, he added, that a second and third child are likely.

Tatimov, the Kazakh demographer, whose 1978 book argued against any differentiated policy, returned to the attack in mid-1980 in the local press. Using the Uighur-language paper to contrast Soviet and Chinese treatment of the Uighurs, he denounced Chinese attempts to reduce Uighur numbers in contrast to the praiseworthy policy of the Soviet Union. In a Kazakh-language paper, issued in October, he advocated continuation of the Kazakh tradition of having many children; he was disturbed by the trend toward limitation of family size.[62] Litvinova, a vocal member of the differentiated-policy school, published again in the journal of her institute an article advocating a regionally differentiated policy as practiced in the multinational Yugoslavian republics.[63]

Reference to regional population differences took an interesting twist later in 1980, when regional leaders began to cite population trends as the basis for seeking more resources. T.N. Osetrov, First Deputy Premier of Uzbekistan, wrote in *Pravda Vostoka* (October 25, 1980) that the republic's housing situation due to population growth was "extremely acute," and that Gosplan should increase its allocation to the republic.[64] The next day, on 26 October, the national paper *Izvestiya* published a speech by K.G. Sadykov, also of Uzbekistan, claiming that unless additional funds were forthcoming, per capita living space would decline by 1985. On the same date, A. Khaydarov, head of trade unions in Tadzhikistan, used rapid population growth as the basis to demand additional investments for light industry in the republic during the forthcoming five-year-plan period.[65] Similarly, demography was used as the basis for policy shifts by spokesmen of Estonia, Moldavia, Kirgiziya, and Belorussia. For example, the Belorussian Gosplan director, V.A. Gvozdev, referred to unfavorable demographic conditions in the republic when asking for more industry to

be authorized for small and medium cities during 1981-1985.[66] Whether any of these appeals succeeded is almost beside the point. Regional differential population developments, be they rapid or too slow, were used in an attempt to influence central policymakers.

The 1981 Party Congress and Its Aftermath

The Basic Directions of the 11th Five Year Plan proposed for approval at the 1981 Congress appeared in December 1980 in the national press. There were references to increased aid to families with children and to newlyweds, improvement in housing and living conditions, better and more child-care institutions, improved working conditions[67] and everyday services for women, expanded use of part-time work and work at home, and introduction of partially paid leave for women to care for children. Most of these issues had been discussed at the conferences and sessions held by the demographers, planners, and labor specialists in previous years. Precisely who wrote what memorandum through what channel to the Party leadership is not known. Probably several channels were used. For example, Minvuz undoubtedly submitted reports on the work of its Population Section and Valentey's Center to the Council of Ministers and thus indirectly to the Party apparatus. Gosplan and Goskomtrud could have been sources of reports, as they were involved at different times and levels in the discussions and workshops described earlier. The Academy of Sciences could have informed the Party and the government of its conclusions through the channel of Ryabushkin's Scientific Council on Socioeconomic Problems of the Population.

The Party Congress heard from Brezhnev and then adopted many of these policies to stimulate the birth rate, to introduce payment for first and later children (by region, starting with the northern reaches of the RSFSR, then all but the south one year later, and the southern tier only in November 1983), to encourage migration from labor surplus to labor deficit regions, and so forth.

Promulgation of several innovative decrees and creation of a number of institutions throughout the country indicates that these issues were reaching Party and governmental agencies at the republic as well as the national level. For example, just before the Party Congress, it was revealed that in 1980 the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist

Party and the Latvian Council of Ministers had issued a joint decree approving several measures "which promote a solution to the demographic problem of stimulating natural population growth" in the republic.[68] In Belorussia the August 1982 issue of the Party journal contained an article calling for the formation of a high-level population commission with "significant" powers, because of low population growth, excessive out-migration of rural young people, and family stability problems.[69]

A post-congress conference in April 1981 was jointly sponsored by the Academy's Scientific Council on Socioeconomic Problems of the Population and the Minvuz's Population Section. Reports were given by the leading academy spokesman Ryabushkin, the leading Minvuz spokesman Valentey, and the leading planning agency specialist on manpower issues V.G. Kostakov of Gosplan's Scientific Research Economics Institute.[70] According to the summary report of the meeting, demographic policy was depicted as a combination of four approaches: (1) It is part of social policy, (2) the family unit is the focus for future demographic policy, (3) demographic policy is concomitantly part of overall state policy and regional differences, and (4) the measures to be adopted must be integrated with other measures (*osushchestvlyayutsya kompleksno*). Again the words are familiar. This formulation defers to the principle of a unified policy by noting that demographic policy is part of social policy. But as the defeated opponents of a regionally differentiated policy had argued, Lenin affirmed that social policy in the USSR must be identical for all. In the end, policy choice was made on the basis of pragmatism rather than preservation of "holy writ."

By June 1981, Valentey and Kvasha could write an article in *Pravda* closely paralleling the basic four points of the April meeting and reiterating its pragmatic justification for a differentiated policy:

Demographic policy must be unified on a country-wide scale. But, of course, the package of measures used must take into account the characteristics of different regions . . . operating on the basis of knowledge of overall patterns and trends with close consideration given to concrete, including local peculiarities.[71]

Still, the fight was not over. Writing in a Kazakh paper in August 1981, Tatimov grudgingly accepted the wording but not the spirit of the new policies. He acknowledged that "The Party has felt it necessary to take heed of the peculiarities of each republic in the demographic development of Soviet society as a whole." But he was disturbed by "a declining population growth rate for Kazakhstan in recent years." [72] About a year later, two Tadzhik authors published an article in *Vestnik statistiki* that bluntly rejected the new policies. Starting from issues of labor resources and their utilization, they expressed total approval to Manevich's viewpoint: "Ye. Manevich has correctly criticized representatives of the so-called differential demographic policy, who suppose it is optimum to encourage the birth rate in some regions of the country but not in others." To underscore the point, they add: "This viewpoint is backed up with reference to the large families, the language barrier, and low mobility of the population of the Central Asian republics. In our view, such an approach is fundamentally wrong." [73] One might expect such strong statements to appear in the Central Asian vernacular press, but it is astonishing to find them in the central Russian-language media.

In September 1981 the academy's Scientific Council on Socioeconomic Problems of the Population convened a meeting to discuss the 1981 Congress decisions in Dushanbe, Tadzhikistan--what might be called baiting the bear in his den. [74] Ryabushkin as chairman of the Council reviewed negative demographic trends in the past decade and observed:

Some scholars speak up against a regional demographic policy as if this can somehow signify an infraction against the rights of individual nationalities or the rights of the inhabitants of individual regions, and so forth. In our view, this is completely wrong. For example, in our opinion, at the present time it is necessary to conduct a policy which would stimulate fertility in those republics where it is still low. Special measures also are necessary in the struggle with infant mortality in those regions where it is still comparatively high. [75]

Holding the meeting in Dushanbe made it clear that the regionally differentiated policy principle had been adopted for the foreseeable future.

In July 1983 an article by two staff members of USSR Gosplan on the field of demography and its needs appeared in *Pravda*. [76] Describing the importance of demography in socioeconomic planning, they declared its omission "simply unthinkable." They concluded that demographers "should be trained most correctly on the basis of a broad political-economic education," and not purely as an economics discipline as had been done for the previous fifteen years. The stress on political as well as economics training brings the field closer to ideological and policy issues than heretofore.

In the first published follow-up to the debate about demographers, *Pravda*'s correspondent in late November 1983 noted the receipt of many letters reflecting the importance of the points made earlier in the year. Thus, city planners did not have sufficient detailed demographic data and capabilities for planning the demand for apartments of various numbers of rooms. It was mentioned, however, that Moscow city planners "only several weeks earlier reported that--as a novel approach--they had approved a 59-apartment building which was designed taking into consideration the demographic situation in the city." [77] The medical demographer Bednyy wrote about the lack of demographers in local agencies as well as republic and union ministries. Others wrote about their absence in planning agencies. Only "dilettantes without knowledge of contemporary demographic achievements" prepare plans for "measures to improve the demographic situation." [78]

Finally, Yelyutin, the Minister of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education of the USSR, reacted to the points made in the November article in a letter to *Pravda* published early in February 1984. [79] Review by the Collegium of Minvuz of the two articles in *Pravda* of June and November 1983 led the Ministry to authorize a two-phase approach to the problem of training and retraining persons to perform demographic tasks. First, demography as a major field would now be offered in the political economy department (as recommended by the Gosplan staff members in July 1983) under its "national economic planning specialty."

As such, therefore, it would have a more applied than theoretical focus. Second, MGU would initiate with the 1984/85 school year, the operation of a "Department for Refresher Training of Specialists in the Field program." [80]

In line with its resolutions on demographic training, the Ministry of Higher Education also submitted a formal request to Goskomtrud to (finally) establish "the occupation of demographer . . . in the list of worker and employee positions." [81]

ENDNOTES TO SECTION II

- [1] E. Burnashev and G. Namestnikova, "Dela i dni demografov," *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 5, May 1966.
- [2] G. Kiseleva, "Ob osnovnykh etapakh razvitiya issledovaniya problem narodonaseleniya v vysshey shkole," in Ye.N. Zhil'tsov (ed.), *Obrazovatel'naya i sotsial'no-professional'naya struktura naseleniya SSSR*, Statistika, Moscow, 1975, p. 100.
- [3] See E. Burnashev, "Tsentr po izucheniyu problem narodonaseleniya Moskovskogo universiteta-10 let," in D.I. Valentey (ed.), *Demograficheskiye aspekty zanyatosti*, "Sbornik narodonaseleniya," Statistika, Moscow, 1975, p. 114.
- [4] Ibid., p. 115.
- [5] See D.I. Valentey, "Problemy narodonaseleniya," *Trud*, February 15, 1967.
- [6] Kiseleva, "Ob osnovnykh," 1975, p. 101.
- [7] D.I. Valentey, "Sotsial'nyye problemy narodonaseleniya. Teoriya i politika--Kollektivnyy trud Sovetskikh uchenykh," in P.I. Bagriy, *Voprosy demografii, Materialy Konferentsii, posvyashchennoy sostoyaniyu i zadacham demograficheskoy nauki na Ukraine, g. Kiev, 27-29 Oktyabrya 1966 g.*, Statistika, Kiev, 1968, p. 36.
- [8] D.I. Valentey et al. (eds.), *Problemy narodonaseleniya. Trudy Vsesoyuznoy mezhvuzovskoy nauchnoy konferentsii, posvyashchennoy problemam narodonaseleniya Sredney Azii (Tashkent, Sentyabr' 1965g g.)*, Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, Moscow, 1970, p. 385.
- [9] Ibid., p. 386.
- [10] Alfred J. DiMaio, Jr., "Evolution of Soviet Demographic Thought: From Marxism-Leninism to the *Literaturnaya gazeta* Debate," in Helen Desfosses (ed.), *Soviet Population Policy: Conflicts and Constraints*, Pergamon, New York, 1981, pp. 157-178; James W. Brackett, "The Evolution of Marxist Themes of Evolution: Marxism Recognizes the Population Problem," *Demography*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1968, pp. 158-173.
- [11] Brackett, "The Evolution," 1968, pp. 167 ff.
- [12] Bagriy, *Voprosy*, 1968, pp. 36-39 and 19-30, respectively.
- [13] D.I. Valentey (ed.), *Voprosy Marksistko-Leninskoy teorii narodonaseleniya*, Moscow, 1969, p. 53.
- [14] Ibid., p. 66.
- [15] Ibid., p. 93.
- [16] P.G. Pod'yachikh, *K obsuzhdeniyu na zasedanii N.M. Soveta TsSU SSSR. Statistika naseleniya, nauka o narodonaselenii i nauka demografiya (o novykh popytkakh likvidatsii statistiki, kak obshchestvennoy nauki)*, Moscow, 1969, mimeographed.
- [17] Within the Population Section, Valentey heads the Permanent Commission on Questions of Theory and Methodology of the Complex Analysis of Population Problems and Critique of Bourgeois Theory. This allows him to formalize his broad interpretation of the scope of population research and simultaneously provides for critique of the bourgeois approach. Thus he clears the organization with the Party. The interlocking directorate set up by Valentey for himself with other individuals from different

faculties and institutions is demonstrated by the unit heads of the other components of the Population Section. The permanent Commission on Questions of Labor Resources was headed (originally) by V.N. Yagodkin, then of the Political Economy Faculty of Moscow University and later with a Party post in the Moscow city government. The Commission on Population Settlement Questions (*rasseleniye i poseleniye*) is headed by the well-known geographer, B.S. Khorev, also a member of Valentey's faculty. On a more pure demographic approach, the Commission on Reproduction and Structure of the Population is headed by A.Ya. Kvasha, an economist/demographer (son of the late renowned economist Ya.B. Kvasha, of the Institute of Economics). The Permanent Commission on Social Hygiene was headed first by A.M. Merkov, and after his death by A.F. Serenko, of the Ministry of Health's Semashko Institute; Serenko's replacement is not known. Later, in October 1967, a Permanent Commission on Socio-Legal Questions of Demographic Issues was created, originally headed by Ye.M. Vorozheykin, who is also believed to have died since; the current head may well be G.I. Litvinova, also of the Institute of State and Law to which Vorozheykin was attached. The Commission on Demographic Education is headed by D.L. Broner, a well-known specialist on housing statistics and population requirements at the Moscow Economic Statistical Institute.

[18] G.M. Namestnikova, "Sovetskaya vysshaya shkola i nauka o narodonaselenii," in D.I. Valentey and E.Yu. Burnashev (eds.), *Voprosy teorii i politiki narodonaseleniya*, Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, Moscow, 1970, pp. 17-18.

[19] Kiseleva, "Ob osnovnykh," in Zhil'tsov, *Obrazovatel'naya*, 1975, p. 101.

[20] Among others, see A.Ya. Boyarskiy, D.I. Valentey, and A.Ya. Kvasha, *Osnovy demografii*, Statistika, Moscow, 1980, pp. 262-264.

[21] Minvuz SSSR, MGU, Ekonomicheskii fakul'tet, *Tsentr po izucheniyu problem narodonaseleniya (k desyatiletuyu obrazovaniya)*, Mysl', Moscow, 1975, pp. 4-5.

[22] Minvuz SSSR, Sektsiya narodonaseleniya Nauchno-tekhnicheskogo soveta, Moskovskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet, Moskovskaya gorodskaya organizatsiya obshchestva "Znaniye" RSFSR, *10-letniye Tsentra po izucheniyu problem narodonaseleniya Ekonomicheskogo fakul'teta MGU (1965-1975 gg.) programma rasshirrenogo zasedaniya*, Moscow, 1975, pp. 4-5.

[23] The other three sections are: the Department of Economics of Population and Socioeconomic Development (A.Ya. Kvasha, head; E.Yu. Burnashev, deputy), charged with working on the interaction between socio-economic and demographic processes; Department of Socio-Demographic Problems of Settlements (B.S. Khorev), working on the determination of principles related to population structures in various types of population settlements; and a Section for the Study of Population Problems of Foreign Countries, which was later organized within the Center.

[24] *Programma kursa demografii dlya ekonomicheskikh fakul'tetov gosudarstvennykh universitetov*, Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, Moscow, 1969, 19pp.

[25] Minvuz SSSR, Sektsiya narodonaseleniya Nauchno-Tekhnicheskogo Soveta, MGU, *Tsentr po izucheniyu problem narodonaseleniya, Plan nauchnoy i nauchno-organizatsionnoy raboty (1971-1980gg.)*, *Programma*

- issledovaniya "Narodonaseleniya SSSR i mira k 2000 godu,"* Moscow, 1970, 20 pp.
- [26] B. Remennikov, "O nekotorykh rezul'tatov nauchnykh issledovaniy vuzov, v oblasti narodonaseleniya i o koordinatsionnom plane nauchno-issledovatel'skikh rabot na 1976-1980 gg.," in D.I. Valentey (ed.), *Zhenshchiny na rabote i doma*, Vypusk 21, Statistika, Moscow, 1978, p. 87.
- [27] Ibid., p. 89.
- [28] *Problemy narodonaseleniya Sredney Azii i regional'naya demograficheskaya politika: Programma nauchnogo issledovaniya*, Minvuz of Uzbekistan, Tashkent State University, 1977.
- [29] In G. Kiseleva, *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 8, August 1968, pp. 153-155.
- [30] Adonts and Davtyan, *Materialy*, Yerevan, 1968, pp. 16-17.
- [31] D.I. Valentey, "O sisteme demograficheskikh znaniy," in Akademiya nauk SSSR, Nauchnyy sovet AN SSSR "Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiye problemy narodonaseleniya," and Institut ekonomiki AN USSR, *Metodologicheskiye problemy izucheniya narodonaseleniya v sotsialisticheskoy obshchestve. Materialy Vsesoyuznoy konferentsii g. Kiev, 6-8 dekabrya 1973 g.*, Institut ekonomiki AN USSR, Kiev, 1973, p. 26.
- [32] V.S. Steshenko, "Ob issledovanii osnov demograficheskoy politiki razvitogo sotsialisticheskogo obshchestva," *ibid.*, p. 105.
- [33] Ibid., p. 106.
- [34] Ibid., p. 107.
- [35] Perevedentsev, in *Nash sovremennik*, No. 7, July 1973, pp. 128-148.
- [36] See V. Lukoshyavichyus, "Problemy yestestvennogo prirosta naseleniya," *Kommunist* (Vilnyus), No. 12, December 1973, p. 48.
- [37] See his article in *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniy*, No. 5, May 1975, pp. 106-112.
- [38] See *Nash sovremennik*, June and December 1975.
- [39] V. Perevedentsev, "Demografiya: situatsiya, problemy, politika," *Zhurnal'ist*, No. 5, June 1975, p. 79.
- [40] See D.K. Shelestov, "Izucheniye problem narodonaseleniya--na uroven' zadach, postavlenykh XXV s"yezdom KPSS," *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 10, October 1976, pp. 166-172.
- [41] Remennikov, "O nekotorykh," 1978, p. 91.
- [42] G.I. Litvinova, "Vozdeystviye gosudarstva i prava po demograficheskiye protsessy," *Sovetskoye gosudarstvo i pravo*, No. 1, January 1978, pp. 132-136.
- [43] Ibid., p. 136.
- [44] D.I. Valentey, "Problemy upravleniya protsessami razvitiya narodonaseleniya," *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 2, February 1978, pp. 3-13.
- [45] Ibid., p. 8.
- [46] Ibid., p. 9.
- [47] Ibid., p. 12.
- [48] Ibid., p. 13.
- [49] A. Kotlyar et al., "Rezervy povysheniya effektivnosti ispol'zovaniya trudovykh resursov," *Voprosy ekonomiki*, no. 10, October, 1978, p. 148.
- [50] Ibid., p. 150.
- [51] L.A. Kostin (ed.), *Trudovyye resursy*, Ekonomika, Moscow, 1979, pp. 120-133.
- [52] Ibid., p. 124.

- [53] Ibid., p. 125.
- [54] Ibid. p. 298.
- [55] M.B. Tatimov, *Razvitiye narodonaseleniya i demograficheskaya politika*, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka" Kazakhskoy SSR, Alma-Ata, 1978, p. 74.
- [56] See V. Yelizarov, "Kakim byt' pokoleniyu vos'midesyatykh godov? (Obsuzhdayutsya problemy upravleniya razvitiyem narodonaseleniya)," in D.I. Valentey (ed.), *Podrastayushcheye pokoleniye. Demograficheskiy aspekt*, "Narodonaseleniye," Vypusk 33, Moscow, Statistika, 1981, p. 98; and L. Barabanova et al., "Shkola-seminar po voprosam upravleniya razvitiyem narodonaseleniya," *Ekonomicheskiye nauki*, No. 8, August 1980, p. 116.
- [57] Yelizarov, "Kakim," 1981, p. 99.
- [58] Ibid., p. 100. Valentey's article, "Obshchemetodologicheskiye osnovy kompleksnoy programmy razvitiya naseleniya SSSR v dolgosrochnoy perspektive," *Ekonomicheskiye nauki*, No. 10, October 1979, pp. 52-57, appears to be the text of his opening statement to the seminar.
- [59] *Vestnik statistiki*, No. 3, March 1978, p. 76.
- [60] Ibid., No. 12, December 1979, p. 64.
- [61] "Demograficheskaya nauka i demograficheskaya politika," *Vestnik Akademii nauk SSSR*, No. 1, January 1980.
- [62] See Cynthia Weber and Ann Goodman, "The Demographic Policy Debate in the USSR," *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 7, No. 2, June 1981.
- [63] G.I. Litvinova, "Demograficheskoye zakonodatel'stvo yevropeyskikh sotsialisticheskikh stran," *Sovetskoye gosudarstvo i pravo*, No. 7, July 1980, pp. 67-75.
- [64] See "Regional Leaders Cite Demographic Factors in Appeals for Funds," *FBIS Trends*, 14 November 1980, pp. 19-20.
- [65] Ibid.
- [66] Ibid.
- [67] New legislation providing for prohibition of female employment in some 460 hot, heavy, and hazardous occupations was made effective 1 January 1981 as part of the effort to increase birth rates by excluding women from overtaxing occupations. See Ralph Boulton, "Soviets Force Gritty Women Laborers into More Conventional Roles," *The Washington Post*, January 5, 1981, p. A12.
- [68] See E. Karklin', "Problems of Demography," *Sovetskaya Latvija*, January 24, 1981, p. 3, translated in JPRS, *USSR Report. Political and Sociological Affairs*, JPRS 77732, 2 April 1981, p. 42.
- [69] See S. Pol'skiy, "Demographic Processes and the Role of Science in Controlling Them," *Kommunist Belorussii*, No. 8, August 1982, pp. 72-78, translated in JPRS, *USSR Report. Political and Sociological Affairs*, JPRS 82081, 26 October 1982, pp. 47-53. Also see the excellent summary of this article and related issues by Roman Solchanyk, "Belorussian Party Journal Urges Serious Study of Demographic Problems," in RFE-RL, *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 356/82, September 6, 1982, 6 pp.
- [70] See R. Galetskaya, "Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiye problemy narodonaseleniya," *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 9, September 1981, pp. 153-154.
- [71] "Problemy narodonaseleniya i demograficheskaya politika," *Pravda*, June 19, 1981, pp. 2-3.

- [72] "The Demographic Policy of Developed Socialism," *Sotsialistik Qazaqstan*, (in Kazakh), August 19, 1981, p. 3, translated in JPRS, *USSR. Human Resources*, No. 47, JPRS 79795, January 6, 1982, p. 16.
- [73] R. Mirzoyev and N. Khonaliyev, "Voprosy ispol'zovaniya trudovykh resursov Tadzhikistana," *Vestnik statistiki*, No. 5, May 1982, pp. 25-26.
- [74] See *Vestniki statistiki*, No. 1, January 1982, pp. 60-62.
- [75] See T.V. Ryabushkin, "Demograficheskaya politika v svete resheniy XXVI s"yezda KPSS," *ibid.*, No. 2, February 1982, pp. 3-8.
- [76] Yu. Paleyev and A. Milovidov, "Podskazhet demograf; Pis'mo v 'pravdu'," *Pravda*, 19 July 1983, p. 3.
- [77] A. Kolesnichenko, "Snova o demografe. Chitatel' prodolzhayet razgovor," *Pravda*, 29 November 1983, p. 2.
- [78] *Ibid.*
- [79] "After Criticism: 'Once More on the Subject of Demographers'," *Pravda*, 10 February 1984, p. 2, translated in *CDSP*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 7, 14 May 1984, p. 21.
- [80] In April of 1984, Valentey gave some details about this program. See *Vechernaya Moskva*, 23 April 1984. The curriculum for the retraining program was prepared with the active collaboration of Gosplan USSR, the State Committee for Science and Technology, the Academy of Sciences USSR, and the Minvuz USSR. Instructional periods vary from six months to two years. N. Sazonova, "School for the Retraining of Demographic Cadres at Moscow State University," *Ekonomicheskiye nauki*, No. 7, July 1984, pp. 125-128, translated in JPRS, *USSR Report. Human Resources*, JPRS-UHR-84-026, 18 December 1984, pp. 64-69.
- [81] "After Criticism," *Pravda*, 10 February 1984.

III. THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES SYSTEM

The USSR Academy of Sciences lagged behind the higher educational system (and the Ukrainian Academy) in developing specifically demographic organizations and still has no institute wholly devoted to this field. From 1962 on, individual members of academy institutions served in the Minvuz's Problem Group and its successors (see Table 2). As individuals they also participated in the demographic conferences that began in 1965 (see Table 1). However, only after the 1967 Party/government decree on the social sciences did the Academy create in 1968 its Scientific Council on Socioeconomic Problems of the Population. The Institute of Sociological Research, where the Scientific Council is housed, was also established in 1968 but did not have a functioning department of demography until around 1980.

Among the long-established USSR Academy institutes, the Institute of Ethnography contributes regularly and solidly to questions of national differences in population characteristics. Contributions from other organizations (Institute of Economics, Institute of State and Law) derive less from the research responsibilities of the institution than from the personal interests of individual staff members.

SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL ON SOCIOECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF THE POPULATION

Since its formation in 1968, this Council has been headed by Dr. Timon V. Ryabushkin, an eminent economic statistician. The Council may have been created partly to circumvent Valentey's efforts to upgrade his Center at Moscow University into a national institute of demography.

Over time, the structure of the Council has expanded to include subjects and regional perspectives of growing concern. Subject sections include those for socioeconomic problems of employment, demographic problems of developing countries, medical demographic problems, and family problems. The five regional sections include Azerbaydzhan, Central Asia, Northwest, Ukraine and the Urals.[1] Participants in the work of the Council numbered 150 in 1976 and about 200 in 1980. Since

1976 several books have been published under its sponsorship.[2] The Council coordinates the work of over 70 organizations, including institutes of the USSR and republic academies of sciences, of the USSR and republic gosplans, of TsSU USSR, and university research units. The Council is authorized to approve research programs, hold conferences, and coordinate joint work of the Soviet Academy with the academies of the socialist countries.

Following a pattern adhered to by other Soviet institutions, the Council held a meeting soon after the 1971 Party Congress to disseminate the latter's policy and operational implications.[3] Ryabushkin as the chairman of the Council spoke first, followed by Urlanis of the Institute of Economics and Boyarskiy, then head of TsSU's Research Institute. Ryabushkin stressed regional fertility differentials both as a fact and as a process not completely understood by analysts. Better understanding would allow more exact forecasts of the population and its distribution. Urlanis, the doyen of Soviet demographers, addressed various issues related to fertility. His proposal on postpartum paid leave for ten months essentially was adopted ten years later (with an additional two months of paid and six months of unpaid leave). His suggestion for monthly payments for second and third children became one-time payments for all children, including the first.[4] Boyarskiy, as the principal technician delivering a formal report, spoke about projection methods and relative degrees of accuracy in these forecasts. The projections made at that time (for the years 1970 to 2000) "cannot pretend to be exact and may incorporate errors of 10 to 15 and even 20 percent." [5] He addressed the difficult question in projection methodology of working from projections of the total to estimates of the components or deriving the total as a sum of the parts, and opted for the former method. Use of the cohort component method paralleled the basic method employed outside the Soviet Union. The council resolved to begin active participation in 1972 for a big conference in 1973, to initiate a series of meetings with East European demographers, and to organize a regional section attached to the council, the first being a Section for the Central Asian Economic Region.

At the promised meeting, held in December 1973 in Kiev, Ryabushkin referred to certain "new tendencies in the area under study," including conscious regulation of the number of children by the majority of families, the overall reduction in fertility, the unequal natural increase rate among the different republics and regions of the country, increases in mortality from heart and circulatory diseases and injuries, and a reduction in the growth of the average length of life.[6]

Ryabushkin's references to mortality issues at the Kiev meeting were amplified at an early 1975 meeting sponsored by the Council and the Demographic Section of the Soviet Sociological Association. In his lead-off speech, Ryabushkin noted that the "overall crude death rate coefficient has tended to increase since 1960." He added, and most interestingly, "there was an increase in the age-specific death rates in several ages, particularly among the male population." [7] Health issues were addressed as part of his analysis of the reasons for increases in mortality, with alcohol consumption prominent in his report.

"Consumption of alcohol, in addition to other negative consequences, conduces to a rise in mortality, including also infant mortality." Within the list of measures to be undertaken to counter this phenomenon--including elimination of the material incentives for trade and public dining enterprises to sell alcohol (implemented only in 1985)--there is a need to have an "articulated system of measures directed toward the struggle with drug addiction (*narkomaniyey*) and with the wide distribution of smoking." [8] (This is one of the very few references explicitly separating drugs from alcohol in the broad definition of "narcotic abuse.")

The Urlanis report at the same conference initially praised the improvements in infant mortality over the previous 10-year period, as well as the age-specific death rates in the young population age group. But the rate of reduction had decelerated and there were now "serious disproportions in the male and female mortality dynamics." [9]

The council held a meeting in March 1976 immediately after the 25th Party Congress. [10] This "expanded session" was attended by 150 persons from academy institutes, government agencies, and universities throughout the country. Ryabushkin's introductory speech stressed the

research tasks facing them, and also provided a summary of the types of research projects completed by Soviet demographers in the previous five-year period.[11] Included among their projects were determination of measures needed to optimize level of living and work of mothers to combine work and maternal care; measures designed to "prevent further growth of a series of [unspecified] diseases" and measures to assist in "rationalizing migration processes." Ryabushkin also made many references, according to the summary of his paper, to labor force issues "as new important tasks set by the 25th CPSU Congress for Soviet science, including demography." [12] The "most serious attention" must be given, he stressed, to a series of demographic problems requiring priority study. These problems included "reduction in fertility in a number of republics (first of all in the RSFSR), increase in mortality among males of able-bodied ages [i.e., 16 to 59 years of age, inclusive], stabilization of average length of life indicators, irrational migration flows." [13]

Finally, Galetskaya reported that there was a discussion about unified vs. differentiated population policy. Her summary notes that emphasis was given by the participants to the formation of a "unified integrated demographic policy" but one that would have "lightly differentiated measures in individual republics and economic regions." This compromise solution was close to what eventuated in the policies recommended and adopted at the 1981 Party Congress.

Immediately after another Party conclave (the October 1976 Party plenum at which Brezhnev spoke about the unsatisfactory demographic situation in the country) the Council convened a meeting in Tbilisi, co-sponsored by the Georgian Academy's Institute of Economics and Law.[14] Ryabushkin regretted that population had not been incorporated in the system of concepts and categories expressing the optimum planning mechanism.[15]

The prolific team of Ryabushkin and Galetskaya wrote a book on the "Dynamics and Structure of Population in Socialist Society," in 1979.[16] Of interest is the list of inadequately studied problems, including possibilities for reducing mortality from heart diseases and neoplasm in people under 60, and small-area projection methodology.[17] The conclusion described the work program of the Council and also

thanked leading specialists who helped develop the Integrated Program of Demographic Research: Boyarskiy (TsSU), Bednyy (the RSFSR Ministry of Health), Valentey (MGU), Volkov (also TsSU), Kostakov (Gosplan), and Urlanis (Institute of Economics).[18]

Another meeting of the Council was held in June 1979.[19] The session resolved to create a section on the family with emphasis on the "study of economic, social, and demographic aspects of the family in Soviet society [as well as the] regional and ethnic characteristics in the formation, structure, and life activities of the family." A.G. Kharchev, the well-known specialist on family studies in the Institute of Sociological Research and the chief editor of the institute's journal, was appointed the head of this section.[20]

Galetskaia prepared an interesting summary of the work of the Council in 1980 in which she referred to it as a surrogate for a formal institute on demography:

The Scientific Council coordinates the work of about seventy institutions. There is no Institute of Demography in the system of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. The absence of such an institute naturally raises the role and responsibility of the Scientific Council in matters of activating research on population problems.[21]

Either just before or during the February 1981 opening of the 26th Party Congress in Moscow, the Council held an out-of-town meeting in Lvov. The primary topic was migration problems (to which Brezhnev also paid much attention in his report to the Congress). Ryabushkin gave the basic analytical report on migration patterns from the early 1970s to 1990.[22] Given the amount of attention paid to "migration of the population as an integral component of demographic policy" at this session and at the Party congress, Ryabushkin's report could well have been an input to the Accountability Report of the General Secretary.

While not indicated as such, Ryabushkin's article in the February 1982 issue of *Vestnik statistiki* is probably his lead speech at the Dushanbe conference of September 1981, summarized a month earlier in this journal. He described the transition to a more intensive type of population reproduction associated with "low mortality, especially infant mortality, and a relatively low birth rate."[23]

It should be stressed, in particular, that the struggle against the incidence of disease, premature death, and infant mortality should bring further improvement in the quality of medical services and working, living, and environmental conditions, i.e., everything connected to the health of the population. In the final analysis, it is this which affects the mortality rate indicators, [and] is one of the cornerstones on which demographic policy should be built.[24]

The promised meeting in Kiev was held in late 1982, with at least six sponsors from Moscow and Kiev. Demographers not only from these cities but also from Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia attended the session. Ryabushkin presented a report as head of the Council--the first-listed sponsor of the session. He emphasized the overall social development policy, and the differentiation of measures as a "function of the specific conditions in each region and republic." [25] Much emphasis is given to the "particularly acute question of enhancing the level of reliability in demographic forecasts for the country as a whole, and particularly at the territorial level." [26]

Seven thematic sections were organized at the meeting, the topics of each providing an agenda for population research. The sections and the probable rapporteurs of each section were as follows: (1) "Theoretical Problems of Demographic Policy" (V. Steshenko); (2) "Improving Demographic Policy in the Field of Family Development" (I. Gerasimova); (3) "Demographic Policy in the Field of Strengthening Public Health" (M. Bednyy); (4) "Problems of Reproduction of the Labor Force within the System of Demographic Policy" (V. Onikiyenko); (5) "Urgent Problems of Migration Policy in the USSR" (L. Makarova); (6) "Problems of Resettlement and the Consideration of these Problems in the Implementation of Demographic Policy" (G. Etomov); and (7) "Regional and Organizational Aspects of Demographic Policy: Theory and Practice" (S. Pirozhkov). [27] Although four of the seven rapporteurs were from the Ukraine, the problems addressed were of national scope.

An important meeting of the Council took place in November 1983, devoted to the issues "which arose from the resolutions of the June (1983) Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU." [28] Ryabushkin

noted that the Council and its cooperating institutions had completed the preparation of a "USSR Population, Labor Resources and Health Safety" section for the latest "Integrated Program of Scientific Technical Progress and its Socioeconomic Consequences for the Perspective up to the Year 2005." [29] Several speakers addressed the use of the elderly in the labor force, their health and family considerations. [30]

INSTITUTE OF SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Since its organization in 1968 as the Institute of Concrete (or Applied) Social Research, it has had a troubled history, coming under periodic criticism from the Presidium of the Academy or Party authorities. It paid scant attention to population issues before 1976, when a Presidium decree named "development and application of sociological methods for the study of demographic processes" as a basic task of sociological research. The decree made the Institute responsible for preparing the section on Demography and the Efficient Use of Labor Resources for the long-term planning document "Scientific and Technical Progress and its Socioeconomic Consequences." [31] (Undoubtedly Valentey's group at Moscow University had hoped to receive this assignment.)

Ryabushkin was appointed the Institute's third director in 1976, and in 1977 announced the formation of a Department of Demography, [32] which did not in fact become operational until 1980 or 1981. [33] The Department is organized into three main sectors: population growth (headed by V.A. Borisov), migration (headed by L.V. Rybakovskiy), and socio-demographic problems of the North.

The Institute also has a Department of Family Problems and a well-known specialist in this area (A.G. Kharchev). Studies of the family began to expand in 1976, when the Soviet Sociological Association established a research section on families under Kharchev's direction. [34] In the same year, both houses of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR set up family research sections, and the Academy organized its own Scientific Council on Family Problems. By 1978 family studies were sufficiently advanced to justify conferences in Vilnyus and Kishinev. [35] No doubt the results of research in this area contributed to the emphasis on the family at the 1981 Party Congress.

Early in 1982 the Social Sciences Section of the Academy Presidium evaluated the work of the Institute and found several faults, one of which was neglect of purposeful research on public opinion.[36] Criticism of sociology from other sources followed in 1983, one in the journal *EKO*[37] and one by Academician P.N. Fedoseyev in the Institute's own journal. Fedoseyev noted the increasing importance of demographic policy and the problems it must cope with: "questions of the family, the status of women, fertility, and the health of the new cohorts." [38] He reviewed the role that investigations of public opinion had played in forming policy, and observed that both the methodology of surveys and utilization of their results could stand improvement.[39] Leadership perceptions of the institute's inadequacies were expressed by Chernenko at the June 1983 Party Plenum.[40]

Clearly, Ryabushkin did not move fast enough in addressing the critics' concerns. He was replaced as director of the institute in May or June 1983 by Vilen Nikolayevich Ivanov, a specialist in public opinion surveys. However, Ryabushkin retained his post as head of the Scientific Council on Socioeconomic Problems of the Population.

In his first signed article after becoming director, Ivanov acknowledged the institute's past deficiencies and sketched its future plans, including demographic research. The projected program included: social factors of optimizing fertility; the effect on these factors of national, regional, and local characteristics; the regional dynamics of sex and age structure; social and demographic aspects of the formation of labor resources; the effectiveness of demographic policy; and social aspects of migration.[41]

The institute has apparently survived the latest attack and intends to participate more fully in the demographic research arena. One sign of its accomplishment is the remarkable number of articles on demographic issues appearing in the house journal since 1983; it has become one of the better publications.

INSTITUTE OF ETHNOGRAPHY

Much of the work of this institute in the last two decades has been devoted to a large-scale survey of the ethno-sociological patterns and changes among various nationalities of the Soviet Union. Under the immediate direction of Yu.V. Arutyunyan, a survey of the population of the Tatarskaya ASSR was initiated in 1967.[42] This autonomous republic with large Tatar and Russian nationality populations was selected because its indicators of economic, social, and cultural development resembled those of the USSR as a whole while reflecting quite different national cultures in the past.[43] Soon thereafter the Karelskaya and Udmurtskaya oblasts (also in the RSFSR) were added, as were the Estonian, Georgian, Moldavian, and Uzbek republics. In all, over 30,000 persons in both urban and rural localities were surveyed between 1967 and 1975. The results of these surveys of language ability, contacts with persons of other nationalities, use of leisure time, and social psychology have undoubtedly been utilized by various governmental and Party organizations. The many years of work by Guboglo and Arutyunyan on Russian language ability of non-Russians must have contributed to the discussions before the issuance of major legislation on such training in 1977. Similarly, the work of these two researchers on different nationality attitudes and expectations for future migration from their present location, especially the Moldavians and the Uzbek, must have been taken into consideration in the preparation of the policies enunciated at the 1981 Party Congress. Other issues such as support for families and encouragement of increased fertility could well have utilized the work of Julian Kakhk of Estonia who directed the work on fertility expectations of mixed nationality marriages.

While the Arutyunyan group tracks the changing patterns of ethno-sociological processes, Viktor Ivanovich Kozlov of the Institute has followed the changing numbers of nationality populations of the country, reflecting differential fertility patterns, assimilation and acculturation, urban and rural settlement patterns, as well as past religious affiliations. Kozlov's work complements that of the Arutyunyan group by giving overall numerical results.

The place of the USSR within world population and nationality trends is studied closely by S.I. Bruk, a long-time deputy director of the institute. In addition to those whose work has been very briefly noted here, other scholars (especially the director, Bromley) contribute to an articulate, well-organized, and technically competent group of researchers within the academy's framework.

INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS

The Institute of Economics of the Academy is the primary research institute devoted to domestic economic issues. Very little effort is currently devoted to population problems, the exception being Ye. Manevich, the only survivor of the three major analysts who were concerned with demographic-related issues. Professor M.Ya. Sonin was the principal postwar researcher on manpower. The principal researcher on demographic issues until his death in 1981 was Professor Boris Tsesarevich Urlanis. He helped train most of the now well-known demographers, participated in most of the population debates, and was world-renowned in this field. His repeated recommendation that an institute of demography be reestablished within the Academy was to no avail, but many of his other policy suggestions have been realized. He is a good example of the policymaking influence of an individual whose status was based on his intellectual achievement rather than position within his institution or within policymaking circles.

In a 1965 publication, Urlanis asserted that Soviet population policy was one of laissez-faire toward fertility, that "women should be completely free to decide on the size of their families." [44] Soon thereafter, he initiated the population policy debate in *Literaturnaya gazeta* with his article addressing the differences between neo-Malthusian and Marxist-Leninist approaches to population theory and to population problems in the Third World in particular. He recognized that problems of too rapid growth exist in these countries but opposed universalization of population laws, following instead the Leninist emphasis on "the necessity for a concrete rather than abstract study of population laws . . . with due regard for the historically different forms of social structure." [45]

In a 1970 article in the Party journal *Politicheskoye samoobrazovaniye* he addressed the extreme of too few rather than too many children and criticized the consumerist attitude of young potential parents who postpone childbearing in order to buy cars and other consumer durables. Further, "the practice of the one-child system which exists usually in big cities [of the USSR] should be emphatically rejected from all points of view." [46] For almost the first time among Soviet demographers, he noted the importance of mortality issues in light of the rise in the crude death rate since 1964. He argued the need to bring the levels of male and female mortality closer together by reducing the higher male age-specific death rates. Urlanis targeted three areas to accomplish this: reduction in alcohol consumption (a current Party priority); reduction in tobacco consumption (a bare beginning only achieved so far); and reduction in the number of accidents--whether automotive, alcohol poisoning, or industrial.

At the conference called after the 1971 Party Congress, Urlanis argued that measures beyond those adopted at the Congress were needed to stimulate births. His recommendations (mentioned above in this section) were adopted in modified form in 1981.

In 1972 Urlanis used the Academy's journal to define demographic policy as "a combination of various social, economic and legal measures which exert an influence on the course of population processes, having as their goal the resolution of problems facing the society of a developed socialist economy." [47] After specifically noting regional differences in fertility, he decried the fact that for six-sevenths of the population the birthrate coefficient was 14 per 1,000 population, whereas for the other one-seventh it was 40 per 1,000. He urged an "active and effective demographic policy" to influence the reproductive behavior of the population. [48] The phrase "effective demographic policy" was echoed by the 1976 Party Congress, and the active strengthening of the Soviet family (referred to later in his article) was the underpinning of the population policy elaborated at the 1981 Party Congress.

Urlanis publicly sided with Valentey on the definition of demographic science.[49] In another important article written for the Academy journal in 1980, he expressed regret that the Academy was "connected with demographic science only by the thin thread of the Scientific Council on Socioeconomic Problems of the Population." [50] He also devoted much of this article to responding--generally negatively--to the viewpoint of his colleague Manevich, who had asserted firm support of a unified policy at the time of the April 1978 conference on labor resources.[51] Urlanis repeated his belief in the need for a differentiated policy because "In a number of regions, customs and traditions have been preserved which differ from the customs and traditions found in most other regions. All these conditions and circumstances, imposed one upon the other, create certain differences in the way of life of the people." [52] A "demographic regionalization" is required that would combine areas with similar demographic and geographic conditions.[53]

It is clear that Urlanis foresaw much of the need for and the broad outlines of the policies later adopted. He was, moreover, an independent thinker who was "heard," though through what precise mechanism is not clear.

INSTITUTE OF STATE AND LAW

Until his death about a decade ago, Ye.M. Vorozheykin was the sole legal specialist contributing to population matters. He advocated the utility of legislative acts to encourage increases in the birth rate,[54] though he recognized that the use of the law in attempting to influence the size of a family is "an extremely delicate question." He justified it by reference to Lenin's statement that regulation of population problems by various means is among the state's most important political tasks.[55] Vorozheykin found it useful to cite examples of East European legislative practice as a possible precedent for Soviet enactments. Thus, when he cited (in 1969) the Bulgarian practice of providing one-time payments to parents upon the birth of a child, with the maximum for birth of the third child, he anticipated the measure adopted in the USSR in 1981. Similarly, he anticipated the programs for

giving housing priority to parents with children (newly adopted for young parents) and for part-time work for women (also much more emphasized recently).[56] His recommendations for a reduction in rent for parents with many children proportionate to the size of the family and for advantageous credit terms for necessary consumer items have only partially been adopted in certain credit allowances.

At a meeting on demographic legislation sponsored in 1974 by the Institute's house journal, G.I. Litvinova--Vorozheykin's outspoken successor--criticized existing legislation aimed at encouraging the maximum number of children per family. The "Mother-Heroine" program and the state's monthly family allowance, which commenced with the fourth child's birth and reached a maximum with the eighth, were wrong; "the entire system of legal and economic measures should be directed toward encouraging families with two to three children." [57] Demographic policy of the state should have two basic aspects: first, extending life span and reducing the mortality rate; and second, controlling population dynamics, both natural and mechanical. She refers to mortality concerns before those of fertility and migration. In this, she joined Uralnis, Ryabushkin, and Valentey--and few others--in early public display of concern over the unfavorable mortality trends of the preceding decade.

Litvinova pursued her reference to migration issues in Central Asia at a conference held in 1975.[58] She was one of the few Soviet scholars who specified the language barrier as a major impediment to the movement of Central Asians to Russian-language speaking regions of the country. Accordingly, she noted, compulsory Russian-language study in the nationality schools was needed to assist in overcoming this barrier. Two years later, in 1977, such measures were adopted.

In the debate over unified versus differentiated policies, Litvinova came down squarely on the side of differentiated policies. In a 1977 article she reaffirmed her opposition to existing legislation that encouraged births only in the region where "the demographic situation in the country has long dictated the need for [policy] to be directed toward securing a necessary minimum number of children in the majority of families." [59] Reduction in the number of children would make some of these women more likely to participate in the labor force. She also argued the expedience, in a period of labor shortage, of

starting children in school at six years of age rather than seven (a change initiated nation-wide at the 1981 Party Congress).[60]

In an article published half a year before the 1981 Party Congress, Litvinova described the applicability to Soviet population problems of East European demographic legislation. Again she argued for maximum payment for birth of the third child because "it would encourage a leveling of the birth rate and natural growth indices in the various regions of the country." [61] Application of different rules to different parts of the country was feasible in Yugoslavia and therefore should be in the USSR. In the Yugoslav case, differential child benefit amounts were paid in various republics of the country depending on the size of the birthrate within that administrative unit.[62]

In a follow-up to the 1981 Party Congress, Litvinova and Urlanis (for whom publication was posthumous) provided a major review of the demographic situation in a 1982 article. Presumably Litvinova was the principal author of the article in its final form. She discussed "quality" of the population, which she associated with a family unit of a size that did not place an unreasonable burden on women.[63] She criticized the recent measures for encouraging births as ineffective for the urban population because of housing difficulties.[64] To help reduce the number of childless families she advocated "legal regulation of operations for the artificial insemination of women." (Support to families who may have physiological problems in conceiving children is not usually discussed in the Soviet literature.) Reduction of childless family units would help the number of divorces.[65] On another touchy issue (what would be called elsewhere reverse discrimination) she implied that the existing practice of according advantages for social mobility to local nationalities adversely affected migration as well as overall nationality policy.

Like Urlanis, Litvinova exemplifies the independence of an individual analyst whose views are not determined by institutional attachment.

INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Past glory, personality, and professional rivalry all play a part in the activities of this republic-level institute. Past glory is constantly mentioned. Personality reinforces the drive by Valentina Steshenko, the head of the Institute's Department of Demography, to resurrect the Ukrainian Academy's prewar Institute of Demography. Professional rivalry reflects competition not just between Kiev and Moscow but specifically between the Steshenko and Valentey teams over policy analysis, evaluation, and advocacy.

The First Republic Scientific Conference on Demography was held in September 1966. V.V. Bondarenko's opening speech underscored the importance of cultivating a new attitude toward demographic issues among the scientific community at the republic as well as national levels. Demographic concerns were of growing importance within planning as well as statistical agencies.[66] Probably reflecting local leadership concern with the sharp downturn in fertility within the Ukraine, Bondarenko stressed the necessity of regionally differentiated demographic research. Differentiation was necessary, he stated, in order to understand the "significant irregularity in the development of the processes of population reproduction in separate regions of the country." [67]

Speakers at the September conference also included Steshenko and her husband, V.P. Piskunov. Steshenko urged that measures be taken to overcome the inertia of low birthrates.[68] This suggestion, as well as one to include additional questions on fertility behavior in the forthcoming census of population of the USSR, failed to find approbation at that time. Nonetheless, both issues were addressed a decade and a half later in the questionnaire of the 1979 census and at the February 1981 Party Congress. Piskunov joined the previous speakers in criticizing the content of the then forthcoming census questionnaire and its expected tabular presentation. The proposed format, he believed, would not provide city-related natural increase data, which were essential to any study of occupations, location, and fertility behavior.[69]

Much of the content of the September 1966 republic-level meeting was reiterated at the national meeting held in Kiev one month later. Bagriy's lead-off speech at the meeting, devoted to the status and tasks of "demographic science" (a title noteworthy for its pre-conference siding with Valentey in the debate on the definition of demography), immediately defended the right of a demographic science to exist.[70] He also called for the initiation of a new journal devoted to demographic matters. This suggestion was consummated in 1969 when the first issue of *Demograficheskiye tetradi* (*Demographic Notebooks*) appeared under the co-editorship of Bagriy and Steshenko. A second journal, irregularly issued, entitled (in Ukrainian) *Demografichni doslidzhennya* (*Demographic Research*) appeared in 1970, with Steshenko as the Chief Editor.[71]

Steshenko as usual began her report by praising the past work of M.V. Ptukha and his Demographic Institute.[72] It was only in 1960, she reminded her audience, that training of demographers began in the republic, and not until 1963 were some of these individuals hired for the Department of Statistics of the Economics Institute. Finally, in 1966, a separate Department of Demography was established, with Steshenko as the chief. Turning to measures to encourage fertility, she urged that baby bonuses begin with the birth of the first child and be sufficient to compensate for the potential reduction in living standards of a family.[73]

Steshenko also indicated support for other measures that, to one degree or another, have been implemented in the last decade, approximately ten years after her presentation at the September 1966 conference. These measures, which included extension of maternity leave, provision of better housing for young parents, and provision of part-time work for mothers with small children, were part of Steshenko's package of recommendations for increasing fertility that have been since legislated to one degree or another at the national and local levels.[74] Her recommendation for reduction in prices of children's items, however, has not yet found favor but is likely to be implemented.

Steshenko and Piskunov's positions later shifted toward advocacy of an overall societal approach to necessary socioeconomic measures and away from their former purely demographic approach. In this they became at odds with the Valentey-Kvasha viewpoint.

[I]n socialist society the development of social funds of consumption is the main instrument of solving demographic problems; . . . [We] also think that development of a family allowance system cannot be the main means of achieving the strategic goals of demographic policy in socialist society . . . population reproduction but it cannot be a means of solving the main task of creating conditions for all-round development of individuals.[75]

In 1981, the family allowance system was modified to a structure closer to that suggested by Urlanis, Litvinova, and Valentey; their arguments for such a policy, which Steshenko and Piskunov clearly opposed, apparently were preferred by the leadership.[76] In one rebuttal of the advocates of family allowances before the policy shifted, Steshenko and Piskunov attack Kvasha by name, adding that modern woman "is not a peasant of pre-revolutionary Russia" and would not be content merely to raise children at home.[77] It may be that their stance will be vindicated in the long run and that the initial increase in the crude birth rate following the passage of the pro-natalist legislative acts of 1981 will not long endure.

Piskunov disagreed with Boyarskiy, the former head of TsSU's Research Institute, because he was the first to utilize the French demographers' writings on a demographic optimum for the Soviet situation.[78] Steshenko also was frank in her comments about work and policy proposals of others. In 1976, at the Second Republic Demographic Conference, she criticized the simplistic, superficial, purely statistical approach of others, as did Piskunov when he attacked the "glib demographic paradise [which] is in the form of demographic optimum."[79]

By 1978, a reconciliation seemed to be in order; Piskunov and Steshenko wrote that demographers would have to bridge their differences to arrive at an effective demographic policy, as called for by the 1976 Party Congress.[80]

Three years later, however, Steshenko found it appropriate to attack other advocates who "concentrate attention solely on the negative phenomena of the current demographic development of the country, which artificially isolates these negative phenomena from the overall socioeconomic determination of real socialist demographic processes." [81] This attack has deterred neither of the two scholars she specifically cites at this point (Perevedentsev and Borisov) from frank and open discussions of demographic issues.

In the debate over regional vs. unified demographic policy formation, Steshenko called for a single overarching policy designed to incorporate region-specific modifications in order to achieve the overall goal:

In our view, demographic policy in a socialist society, especially in our country which is characterized by territorial features of demographic development, should be based on a unified demographic strategy. [This strategy should be] oriented toward the achievement of a basic goal, with flexible tactics to the maximum possible degree considering the concrete conditions of one or another specific demographic region of the country. It should be general for all territories according to the strategic goal and regional by the ways and means of its achievement. [82]

Steshenko stressed her belief that isolated measures would not contribute to reaching strategic demographic policy goals. Transformation of the daily life of the population is required. "Demographic tasks are resolved with the assistance of all forms of social policy." [83] In this statement, as well as other articles and books either written or edited by Steshenko, the basic technique is one of independent, frank, and confrontational opinions. Although not always on the winning side of an issue, Steshenko is another example of an individual analyst whose work on demographic matters is a serious contribution to the debates and discussions over policy formation.

ENDNOTES TO SECTION III

- [1] Among others, see especially, L. Degtyar, "Scientific Council for Population Problems: An Important Trend," *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 3, March 1970; and R. Galetskaya, "Nauchnyy sovet Akademii nauk SSSR 'Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiye problemy narodonaseleniya,'" *Obshchestvennyye nauki*, No. 5, September-October 1980, pp. 148-152.
- [2] Including: *Vosproizvodstva naseleniya i trudovykh resursov* in 1976; *Naseleniye soyuznykh respublik* in 1977; *Demograficheskiye problemy sem'i* in 1978; *Regional'nyye osobennosti vosproizvodstva i migratsii naseleniya* in 1980; and two books listed for 1981 publication and not available to my knowledge--*Netrudosposobnoye naseleniye: sotsio-demograficheskiye aspekty* and *Trudovyye resursy i zdorov'ye naseleniya*. See Galetskaya, "Nauchnyy," 1980, p. 149.
- [3] R. Galetskaya, "Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiye problemy narodonaseleniya, Glavnyye napravleniya," *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 3, March 1972, p. 150.
- [4] Ibid.
- [5] Ibid.
- [6] Ye.M. Yunakova, "Demografiya: printsipy, zadachi, metodologiya," *Vestnik Akademii nauk SSSR*, No. 6, June 1974, pp. 109-110.
- [7] See R. Galetskaya, "Demograficheskaya politika: yeye napravleniya. Problemy narodonaseleniya," *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 8, August 1975, p. 149.
- [8] Ibid., p. 150.
- [9] Ibid.
- [10] R. Galetskaya, "Glavnyye napravleniya izucheniya sotsial'no-ekonomicheskikh problem narodonaseleniya," *Vestnik Akademii nauk SSSR*, No. 8, August 1976, pp. 127-130. Common to each summary is reference to "directions"--i.e., *napravleniya*, in Russian, which may be a device to stimulate the Party's issuance of "Basic Directions" before a Party Congress is convened and five-year plans are discussed and adapted.
- [11] Ibid., p. 128.
- [12] Ibid.
- [13] Ibid., p. 130.
- [14] R. Galetskaya, "Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiye problemy demografii," *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 3, March 1977, pp. 142-144; and V.P. Tomin, "Regional'nyye osobennosti vosproizvodstva i migratsii naseleniya," *Sotsiologicheskiye issledovaniya*, No. 2, April-June 1977, pp. 201-204, summarizing the same meeting.
- [15] Galetskaya, "Sotsial'no-", 1977, p. 201.
- [16] T.V. Ryabushkin and R.A. Galetskaya, *Dinamika i struktura naseleniya v sotsialisticheskoy obshchestve*, Statistika, Moscow, 1979, 224 pp.
- [17] Ibid., p. 9.
- [18] Ibid., p. 219.
- [19] See Ye. Kogan, "Sessiya Nauchnogo soveta AN SSSR 'Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiye problemy narodonaseleniya,'" *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 1, January 1980, p. 155.

- [20] Ibid.
- [21] Galetskaya, "Nauchnyy sovet..." This was one of a series of reports on the functions and activities of various councils.
- [22] R. Galetskaya, "Problemy migratsii naseleniya," *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 7, July 1981, pp. 158-159.
- [23] T. Ryabushkin, "Demographic Policy in Light of the XXVIth Party Congress," *Vestnik statistiki*, No. 2, February 1982, p. 3.
- [24] Ibid., p. 7.
- [25] A.G. and T.G., "Problems of Demographic Policy in Socialist Society (An All-Union Scientific Conference)," *Vestnik statistiki*, No. 3, March 1983, p. 66.
- [26] Ibid.
- [27] Ibid., p. 68.
- [28] N. Koroleva, "Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiye problemy narodonaseleniya," *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 4, April 1984, p. 154. In addition to the usual attendees, representatives of Goskomtrud USSR, TsEMI USSR, NII Truda, RSFSR city and union republic scientific, educational, and planning agencies were in attendance.
- [29] Ibid.
- [30] Ibid., pp. 154-155.
- [31] T. V. Ryabushkin, "Twenty-Fifth CPSU Congress and Future Objectives in Sociological Research," *Sotsiologicheskiye issledovaniya*, No. 2, April-June 1977, pp. 3-13, translated in JPRS, *Sociological Studies*, No. 2, April-May-June 1977, JPRS 69609, 15 August 1977, pp. 1-14. Material is from page 7 of the translation.
- [32] See T. V. Ryabushkin's article in *Sots. issled.*, No. 2, April-June 1977, p. 8.
- [33] D. K. Shelestov, *Demografiya: istoriya i sovremennost'*, Finansy i statistika, Moscow, 1983, p. 162, fn. 2; L.L. Rybakovskiy (ed.), *Problemy vosпроизводства i migratsii naseleniya, Razdel I*, Issued by the Academy of Sciences USSR, Institute of Sociological Research, Soviet Sociological Association, 1981, p. 5.
- [34] Called the "Commission on Questions of the Work and Personal Services for Women and the Protection of Motherhood and Childhood." See Murray Feshbach, "Demography and Soviet Society: Social and Cultural Aspects," Occasional Paper No. 23, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Colloquium Paper, February 19, 1981, p. 20.
- [35] See the editorial article, "Vazhnaya problema Sovetskoy sotsiologicheskoy nauki," *Sotsiologicheskiye issledovaniya*, No. 2, March-April 1979, p. 9. Also see the article by A.V. Sosnovskiy, "Uchenyye i predstaviteli obshchestvennosti obsuzhdayut sotsiologicheskiye problemy sem'i," *ibid.*, No. 1, January-February 1979, pp. 213-216, for a brief description of the statements made by various scholars and others at a meeting on family problems held in Vilnyus and a later meeting in Kishinev.
- [36] See "In the Social Sciences Section of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR," *Obshchestvennyye nauki*, No. 4, July-August, pp. 145-149, translated in JPRS, *USSR Report, Political and Sociological Affairs*, No. 1, 1289, JPRS No. 81524, 12 August 1982, pp. 10-14.
- [37] V.I. Gerchikov and R.V. Ryvkina, "The Sociological 'Triangle',"

- EKO, No. 3, March 1983, pp. 80-102, translated in JPRS, *USSR Report. Economic Affairs*, No. 1056, EKO: *Economics and Organization of Industrial Production*, JPRS 83699, 16 June 1983, pp. 57-70.
- [38] P.N. Fedoseyev, "Povyshat' rol' sotsiologicheskoy nauki v reshenii problem kommunisticheskogo stroitel'stva," *Sots. issled.*, No. 2, April-June 1983, pp. 5-8, especially p. 7.
- [39] Ibid., p. 9.
- [40] Reported in the central press on 15 June 1983, pp. 1-3, in *Pravda* and *Izvestiya*, among others.
- [41] V.N. Ivanov, "Let Us Raise Sociological Science to the Level of Present-Day Tasks of Social Development," *Sotsiologicheskiiye issledovaniya*, No. 4, October-December 1983, pp. 3-9. Many of the same points are made in an interview with him in *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, December 23, 1983, p. 2.
- [42] The first article by Arutyunyan describing the survey was published in 1969, as Yu.V. Arutyunyan, "Konkretno-sotsiologicheskoye issledovaniye natsional'nykh otnosheniy," *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 12, December 1969, pp. 129-139. Several major articles and books have appeared since that time utilizing the materials of the surveys. These include his own, *Sotsial'noye i natsional'noye (Opyt etnosotsiologicheskikh issledovaniy po materialam Tatarskoy ASSR)*, Moscow, 1973; L.M. Drobizheva, *Dukhovnaya obshchnost' narodov SSSR. Istoriko-sotsiologicheskiiy ocherk mezhnatsional'nykh otnosheniy*, Mysl', Moscow, 1981; and M.N. Guboglo, *Sovremennyye etnolyazykovyye protsessy v SSSR. Osnovnyye faktory i tendentsii razvitiya natsional'no-russkogo dvuyazychiya*, Nauka, Moscow, 1984. A remarkable array of articles also can be cited--in short form--that utilize the results of this longitudinal, wide-ranging, broad scope survey. Among these are, by date of publication: S.I. Bruk and M.N. Guboglo, in the April 1974 issue of *Istoriya SSSR*; Yu.V. Arutyunyan, in the January-March 1979 issue of *Sovetskaya etnografiya*; Yu.V. Arutyunyan and L.M. Drobizheva, in the January-February 1981 issue of *Sotsiologicheskoye issledovaniye*; Arutyunyan and Drobizheva again, in the July 1982 issue of *Istoriya SSSR*; G.P. Vasil'yeva, in the September-October 1982 issue of *Sovetskaya etnografiya*; I.S. Gurvich, in the November-December 1982 issue of the same journal; and so forth.
- [43] Yu.V. Arutyunyan, "Etnosotsiologicheskiiye aspekty internatsionalizatsii obraza zhizni," *Sovetskaya etnografiya*, No. 2, March-April 1979, p. 4.
- [44] B.Ts. Ulanis, *Marxism and Birth Control*, United Nations, New York, 1965, p. 2.
- [45] B.Ts. Ulanis, "Suchestvuyut li problemy narodonaseleniya," *Literaturnaya gazeta*, November 23, 1965, p. 11.
- [46] B.Ts. Ulanis, in *Politicheskoye samoobrazovaniye*, No. 1, 1970, translated in JPRS, *Translations on USSR Economic Affairs*, No. 113, JPRS 50378, 23 April 1970, p. 36.
- [47] B.Ts. Ulanis, "Aktual'nyye problemy narodonaseleniya--demograficheskaya politika v SSSR," *Vestnik Akademii nauk SSSR*, No. 9, September 1972, p. 60.
- [48] Ibid.
- [49] B.Ts. Ulanis, "Demografiya kak nauka," in *Naseleniye i trudovyye*

- resursy, Seriya Narodonaseleniya, vypusk, Statistika, Moscow, 1973, pp. 79-89, passim.
- [50] B.Ts. Urlanis, "Demograficheskaya nauka i demograficheskaya politika," *Vestnik Akademii nauk SSSR*, No. 1, January 1980, p. 41.
- [51] For another expression of Manevich's views, see his article in *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 8, August 1978, p. 40: "It is well-known that the demographic policy of the USSR is unified and is applied to all the union republics, independent of their past and present birth rates and population growth."
- [52] Urlanis, "Demograficheskaya," 1982, p. 42.
- [53] Ibid., p. 43. Urlanis notes that he first made this proposal in March of 1966 at a meeting of the Moscow *Dom uchenykh*, in a report entitled "Pressing Problems of Demography in the USSR." Pressing perhaps to him, but the regionalization of demographic policy was not adopted until 15 years after his talk.
- [54] Ye.M. Vorozheykin, "Dinamika narodonaseleniya i pravo," *Sovetskoye gosudarstvo i pravo*, No. 9, September, 1969, pp. 23-25, 29.
- [55] Ibid., pp. 24-25.
- [56] Ibid., p. 31.
- [57] "Pravovye aspekty demograficheskoy politiki," *Sovetskoye gosudarstvo i pravo*, No. 1, January 1975, pp. 33-34.
- [58] G.I. Litvinova, in *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 8, August 1975, p. 153.
- [59] G.I. Litvinova, "Vozdeystviye prava na trudovyye resursy," *Khozyaystvo i pravo*, No. 12, December 1977, p. 74. The article was published shortly before the massive conference on labor resources in April 1978, referred to in Sec. II.
- [60] Ibid., pp. 75-76.
- [61] G.I. Litvinova, "Demograficheskoye zakonodatel'stvo yevropeyskikh sotsialisticheskikh stran," *Sovetskoye gosudarstvo i pravo*, no. 7, July 1980, p. 70.
- [62] Ibid., p. 69.
- [63] G.I. Litvinova and B.Ts. Urlanis, "Demograficheskaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuza," *Sovetskoye gosudarstvo i pravo*, No. 3, March 1982, p. 38. Urlanis died in June 1981.
- [64] Ibid., p. 39.
- [65] Ibid., p. 41.
- [66] V.F. Burlin and V.V. Bondarenko (eds.), *Tezisy dokladov pervoy respublikanskoy nauchnoy konferentsii po demografii*, Statistika, Kiev, 1966, p.3.
- [67] Ibid., p. 5.
- [68] Ibid., pp. 23-24.
- [69] Ibid., p. 26.
- [70] P.I. Bagriy et al. (eds), *Voprosy demografii. Materialy konferentsii, posvyashchennoy sostoyaniya i zadacham demograficheskoy nauki na Ukraine, g. Kiev, 27-29 October 1966 g.*, Statistika, Kiev, 1968, p. 8. Bagriy was then Director of the Institute of Economics in Kiev.
- [71] The *tirazh*, or print run, of the two journals was very limited, 500 and 600, respectively. Nonetheless, they appeared long before Valentey's, which began in 1973.
- [72] Ibid., p. 62.
- [73] Ibid., pp. 70-71.

- [74] Ibid., p. 72.
- [75] V.P. Piskunov and V.S. Steshenko, "K teoreticheskomu obosnovaniyu demograficheskoy politiki razvitogo sotsialisticheskogo obshchestva," Institut ekonomiki Akademii nauk Ukrainskoy SSSR, *Demograficheskiye tetradi*, Vypusk 6-7, Kiev, 1972, p. 121.
- [76] Ibid., p. 102.
- [77] Ibid., pp. 116-117.
- [78] V.P. Piskunov, "Eskiz obshchey skhemy demologicheskogo predstavleniya o samovosproizvedenii narodonaseleniya (k utochneniyu osnov teorii demovosproizvodstva)," *Demograficheskiye tetradi*, Vypusk 9, Kiev, 1974, p. 101 ff.
- [79] See their articles in Akademiya nauk USSR, TsSU pri Sovete ministrov USSR, Institut ekonomiki AN USSR and Odesskiy institut narodnogo khozyaystva, *Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiye osobennosti vosproizvodstva naseleniya v usloviyakh razvitogo sotsializma, Tezisy dokladov i soobshcheniy Vtoroy respublikanskoy demograficheskoy konferentsiya [g. Odessa, 20-22 sentyabrya 1976 g.] Sektsiya I*, Kiev, 1978, pp. 7-8 and p. 25, respectively.
- [80] V. Steshenko and V. Piskunov, "Aktual'nyye voprosy dal'neyshego razvitiya teoreticheskikh osnov demograficheskoy politiki," in Institut ekonomiki AN USSR, *Teoreticheskiye problemy demografii v svete resheniy XXV S"yezda KPSS*, Kiev, 1978, p. 4.
- [81] V.S. Steshenko, *Izucheniye vosproizvodstva narodonaseleniya (teoreticheskiye problemy)*, Naukova dumka, Kiev, 1981, p. 72.
- [82] Ibid., p. 289.
- [83] Ibid., p. 293.

IV. THE PARTY AND GOVERNMENT

THE PARTY

Evidence of growing concern over population matters at the national level was sketched in Section I. Here the focus is on regional Party/government levels, where three tendencies have emerged in the 1980s: exploitation of regional population differences to argue for larger resource allocations; strong expressions of patriotism with respect to population growth or survival of language; formation of demographic bodies (commissions, scientific councils) to coordinate planning at the regional level.

Perhaps the demographers' debate since the 1970s on unified versus differentiated population policies (described in Section II) helped to alert regional leaders to the implications of the differentiated policies finally adopted in 1981. It would be natural for a leader worth his salt to reason that if there was going to be discrimination against high birth rate areas in the application of pro-natalist policies, then these areas should be compensated by additional investment to help them make fuller use of their abundant labor resources. (A cogent argument for extra investment in low birth rate areas with scarce labor resources could also be made.) If non-Slavic populations had to learn Russian to make them more capable of migrating to labor-deficit areas, then Russians residing in non-Slavic republics should have to learn the local language. And if regional population differences were so pronounced, then the only way to guarantee research and planning addressed specifically to local problems was to do it yourself.

Examples of the first tendency--citing population differences to justify more resources--were mentioned in Section II. A prime example of the second is A.E. Voss, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party. At a conference on nationality relations in Riga in 1982 he expressed concern for his republic's language and said bluntly that non-Latvian residents should learn Latvian.[1] A 1982 article in the Georgian-language Party newspaper advocated that Georgian families

should have a minimum of six children, and linked this to the goal of equal status and purity of the Georgian language.[2] In 1983 the same Party paper published an article by a Georgian historian who noted that patriotism involves one's nation as well as one's country: "Bringing up the future generation is the loftiest manifestation of patriotism . . . and to shirk it is tantamount to national betrayal." [3] The need for population growth in the republic was frequently mentioned by Shevardnadze while he was First Secretary of the Georgian Communist Party. [4]

It was also Shevardnadze who in 1982 suggested:

We should probably examine the question of the creation of a single republic demographic research center, entrusting to it the scientific development of demographic processes and their forecasting and rational regulation. The task is to fundamentally improve the demographic situation and formulate an effective comprehensive demographic policy. [5]

In 1983 the Lithuanian Party journal published an article by the deputy chairman of the republic's Labor Committee advocating formation of an interagency demographic council. [6] In Belorussia the Party journal published an article by a well-known local economist urging formation of a special scientific institution to study the republic's demographic problems. [7] In 1983 the Moscow City Party Committee together with the city Executive Committee approved a Plan of Measures to Improve the Demographic Situation and Stimulate Natural Growth of the Population. [8]

Thus Party and government leaders at all levels have become involved in demographic issues.

GOSPLAN

A 1975 article by N. Rogovskiy, head of its Labor Department, is perhaps the first indication that Gosplan proper (as distinguished from its Scientific Research Economics Institute) had begun to notice the connection between future trends in labor resources and declines in fertility and increases in mortality. [9]

In 1977 an internal order directed subordinate departments to consider relative labor supplies in drawing up the plans within their competence. For example, when planning capital investments the branch departments were to notice the difference between labor-rich and labor-poor regions, and to prefer labor-intensive or capital-intensive projects accordingly.[10] (Previously, one supposes, such choices were made on more whimsical grounds or disregarded as unimportant.)

Manpower ceilings were reintroduced as a planning indicator in 1980.[11]

In 1982 the government approved a new statute on Gosplan, which, among other changes, explicitly required it to incorporate demographic and health concerns into its plan preparations.[12] Presumably as a result of this requirement, a Social Planning and Population Department was created within the USSR Gosplan structure. It will be interesting to see whether there are any other results.

Since its formation in 1955, the Scientific Research Economics Institute has provided inputs to Gosplan on labor resource trends at national and regional levels. Its Sector for the Forecasting of Labor Resources (long headed by V.G. Kostakov, now a deputy director of the institute) has been deeply involved in manpower research and has published monographs on labor resources and employment projections. It has participated in conferences and held its own meetings to discuss research goals and problems.

GOSKOMTRUD (STATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS)

When originally organized in 1956, the State Committee on Labor and Wage Problems had little if anything to do with population matters. Rather it was a tentative organization of limited scope, dealing with labor issues for the first time since the Ministry of Labor was abolished in the early 1930s. Rarely did anything on labor resources appear under its imprimatur. In 1967 a change in title and in focus occurred; the organization became the State Committee on Labor Resource Utilization, retaining the wage and norm setting functions of its predecessor, but was given broad scope and regional agencies to deal with manpower issues. Finally in 1976 (after the Party Congress that

called for an effective demographic policy), it was again reorganized into the State Committee on Labor and Social Problems, adding issues dealing with older populations, their potential employment, and pensions.[13]

In June 1971 the RSFSR Goskomtrud and its Central Scientific Research Laboratory of Labor Resources sponsored the First All-Russian Conference on "Scientific Principles of Rational Labor Resource Utilization." [14] K.A. Novikov, chairman of RSFSR Goskomtrud, acknowledged that research on labor resources had begun to develop only recently.[15] By 1978, when USSR Goskomtrud along with other sponsors convened a gigantic meeting on labor resource utilization (described in Section II), the volume of research occupied seven plenary sessions and nine specialized working sessions. In contrast to the usual bland summary statement that resolutions were adopted at a given meeting, this conference produced a 26-page list of recommendations for action.[16] Many have subsequently been discussed in public and some adopted.

Soon after the 1978 meeting, Goskomtrud convened the first meeting of a new Scientific Council on Labor and Social Problems, headed by L.A. Kostin (first deputy chief of Goskomtrud).[17] It was to be concerned with long-term plans, appropriate legislation, and coordination of research on labor and social security problems.

In September 1978 Goskomtrud's role was further enhanced when a Temporary Statute on State Control for Labor Force Utilization was adopted.[18] This directive leaves open the possibility of future full control over the movement of the labor force, with constraints similar to those authorized during the period 1940-1956.

TSSU (CENTRAL STATISTICAL ADMINISTRATION)

TsSU's Census-taking Administration plays a major role in preparing the data that analysts use to evaluate trends in the population and its components. For many years, while headed by P.G. Pod'yachikh, it was a conservative, purely statistical unit that resisted outside suggestions for the collection of new data (e.g., on fertility)[19] and failed to release essential data that it did collect (e.g., age- and sex-specific death rates).[20]

The 1967 Party/government decrees on the social sciences opened the way for analysts outside TsSU to influence data collection. The scope of surveys planned by 1968 as a result of this decree went far beyond the limited concept of demography espoused by Pod'yachikh.[21] His viewpoint was finally repudiated by TsSU after the March 1969 conferences on demography and demographic statistics.[22]

Outside complaints about inaccurate data, which used to be ignored, seem to be taken more seriously in recent years. For example, steps to improve current migration statistics were taken in 1974 [23] and 1979,[24] and a more detailed statistical classification of the causes of perinatal mortality was introduced in 1981.[25]

In 1983 the name of the Census-taking Administration (now headed by A.A. Isupov) was changed to the Census and Population Survey Administration. Shortly thereafter a major innovation was announced: the introduction of a unique 5 percent sample survey of the population every five years, to begin in 1985.[26] The survey includes questions never previously asked about income, housing, fertility, occupations, quality of public services, and supply of food products.

The TsSU Research Institute has been one of the main participants in population research (and in the battle against Pod'yachikh). In 1971 its Demographic Laboratory began to issue a series of publications under the rubric of "Demographic Research."[27] By 1974, when it had been upgraded into a Department of Demography, it began a series of publications presenting the results and analysis of large-scale fertility surveys that began in 1967 and have continued to the present.[28] The Department has also touched upon mortality issues. Writing for a medical audience in 1976, the director of the Institute (Boyarskiy) invited the profession to address such trends as the rise in age-specific death rates of males, slower growth in average life expectancy, and the increase in infant mortality.[29]

A 1979 book in the "Demographic Research" series anticipated the emphasis on the family and acceptance of regionally differentiated demographic policies at the 1981 Party Congress. In the Foreword to the book *Demographic Development of the Family*, Volkov (head of the Department of Demography) stressed the persistence of ethnic

differentials in demographic processes and said, "If the ethnic factor is not taken into account, it is not possible to understand the patterns of formation and development of families."[30]

HEALTH INSTITUTIONS

Until the early 1970s, the Soviet medical community expressed little concern over the demographic situation, apart from the falling birth rate in Slavic regions and the possible effect that resumption of legal abortions in 1956 was having on this indicator. The conspicuous exception was A.M. Merkov, the leading social hygienist of the time, who was apparently the first person in the 1960s to make the link between health care and demography. In a 1962 speech he pointed out that birth rate and mortality indicators reflect not only changes in the medical condition of the population but also changes in its age-sex structure. "Without the use of precise information on the age and sex composition of the population, it is hard to avoid distorting the true picture of its medical situation."[31]

Merkov restated and expanded his ideas in a 1969 article containing remarkably accurate insights into the demographic problems of the 1970s.[32] He emphasized the effect of age-sex changes on morbidity. Aging of the Soviet population "requires special study of the physiology and pathology of the aged and elderly organism and the organization of medico-sanitary services for the aged (gerontology and geriatrics), as well as a strengthening of measures for the prophylaxis and treatment of cardiovascular diseases and malignant neoplasms."[33] With respect to population reproduction Merkov cited two undesirable phenomena from the social-hygienic point of view: high infant mortality with high fertility, and low infant mortality with excessively low fertility. The former signifies "irrational expenditure of labor and material resources going to the support and upbringing of that portion of the children who die," while the latter leads to excessively slow population growth or even depopulation.[34] The causes of this problem, according to Merkov, can be varied: indirect economic factors, difficulties in securing housing and food, excessive burdening of women simultaneously with productive activity and household responsibilities, growth in women's cultural level, and their broad participation in social life.[35]

Uncoordinated studies conducted by social hygienists and demographers in various locations around the country in the mid to late 1960s began to indicate that something was awry with the demographic situation beyond falling birth rates. The results of this research were sufficiently worrisome to impel the leadership to authorize a comprehensive morbidity survey of the population in conjunction with the 1970 census. Although Bednyy was later to criticize the methodology of this survey, the picture it gave of the population's health status, together with the census data, was evidently alarming. Study of the relationships among health, health care, and population reproduction expanded rapidly thereafter. As before 1970, much attention was directed toward two issues: the declining birthrate (with the notable exception of Central Asia) and the aging of the population.

The two major investigators of the birth rate were the Departments of Social Hygiene and Organization of Public Health at the I and II Moscow Medical Institutes. The department of the II Moscow Institute (Pirogov), directed by Yu. Lisitsyn, did work on the effect of such factors as financial security, housing, and alcohol abuse on the decision to have a child. As an example of this research, a 1971 study found that although these factors did have varying amounts of influence on the decision, the strongest influence was marital and familial harmony or disharmony.[36] In the department of the I Moscow Medical Institute (Sechenov) directed by A.F. Serenko, the main scholar on the subject of social hygiene and the birth rate is I.P. Katkova. In her studies of the influences on the number of desired and actual births, she found health, especially of the mother, to be a strong determinant of family size.[37]

At the other end of the lifespan, so to speak, D.F. Chebotarev, Director of the Institute of Gerontology wrote in 1977, "there are relatively few problems in contemporary medical science which have attracted such fixed and rapidly growing attention . . . as gerontology."[38] Much of this can be attributed to Chebotarev himself, who realized that as inputs to the labor force shrank in the future, the labor potential of the pension-aged population would increase in importance. By linking research in gerontology with the national

economic well-being through the use of pension-aged labor, Chebotarev was able to give stature to his field it might not otherwise have.[39] The research results necessary to formulate policies to extend working life were obtained from several works Chebotarev said had been published "in recent years" by his own Institute of Gerontology, the Semashko All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Social Hygiene and the Organization of Public Health, and other institutes.[40] Chebotarev expressed dismay in this article at the lack of interest in the issues of aging and pensioner labor from the organizers of medical-social assistance and factory directors.

Data from the 1970 census, and the research that followed it, confirmed the appearance of an alarming new trend--rising mortality, especially among infants and working-age males. Health officials must have been especially sensitive to this, and there is evidence that they acted to explore its causes. For instance, in 1972-73 the Department of Medical Statistics of the Semashko Institute and the Department of Medical Statistics of the USSR Ministry of Health jointly developed a new medical certificate on perinatal death. It replaced the old one on 1 January 1974 and followed World Health Organization recommendations, requiring not only a diagnosis of the disease or condition of the child, but also of any pathology of the mother that affected the fetus.[41]

Another action taken in the wake of the 1970 census was the creation in 1975 of a Scientific Council on Social Hygiene and the Organization of Public Health, attached to the Academy of Medical Sciences. The first director probably was A.F. Serenko. The council consisted of four problem commissions: (1) social hygiene and the organization of public health, (2) the history of medicine, (3) medical information, and (4) sanitary education.[42]

The Role of a Medical Demographer

As demographic indicators worsened, health care officials had intensified their research along two parallel but separate lines--social hygiene and demography. The two sciences were obviously closely related, but there was nothing to bridge the organizational and methodological gap between them. To ensure the necessary cooperation, M.S. Bednyy proposed the melding of certain aspects of social hygiene

with the study of population reproduction to create the new field of medical demography.

Bednyy may have been encouraged in this direction by Brezhnev's observation at the 1976 Party Congress that "new opportunities for fruitful research . . . are revealed on the borderline between, in particular, the natural and social sciences." [43] A more fundamental stimulus was that the public health system was being increasingly criticized for negative changes in the population's health, the causes of which (in Bednyy's view) lay outside the realm of health care in such demographic changes as the aging of the population, urbanization, and so on. [44] By directing research along the line between the two sciences, Bednyy hoped to equip health officials with better knowledge of demographic processes, which would permit more effective influence and deflect undeserved criticism of the health system.

Bednyy made his pitch for medical demography in a seminal article published in April 1977 in the medical journal *Zdravookhraneniye Rossiskoy Federatsii (ZRF)*. [45] It was the kick-off of a major campaign that he directed to institutionalize this field. In the article Bednyy cited several fruitful areas of study. He began with the birth rate. In his view, socioeconomic conditions and psychological motives as influences on the birth rate were being adequately studied. However, demographers and economists had ignored such other important influences as the health conditions of marital pairs, the prevalence and causes of infertility, and the presence of abortions in the woman's medical history. These were prime subjects of study for medical demography. [46] No less important was the problem of mortality. Bednyy observed that the adverse trends in mortality and life expectancy since the mid-1960s had not yet been explained. In his view, some new factors must be involved, because these trends were being observed when the material welfare and culture of the population had been growing and the network of public health services expanding. This was another subject that medical demography should investigate. [47]

To conclude his article, Bednyy stated that the proper status of this new branch of knowledge needed to be determined. Was it an independent scientific discipline, or merely a section of social hygiene and the organization of public health? Although Bednyy believed that it

would be more correct to keep medical demography within the framework of social hygiene, he did point out that Yu.P. Lisitsyn of the Academy of Medical Sciences, whom he described as a firm supporter of medical demography, believed that it should be an independent discipline and subject of study.[48]

The journal (*ZRF*) used Bednyy's article as the basis of a two-year discussion on the place, role and tasks of medical demography. In the course of the debate, 25 authors contributed 18 articles. Such notables as Yu. Lisitsyn, Ye.Ya. Belitskaya, A.G. Volkov, N.A. Frolova, and I.P. Frolova participated. The articles covered a broad range of topics but fell mainly into three areas: the relationship among medical demography, social hygiene, and general demography; the basic problems subject to study at the junction of these sciences; and various results of medico-demographic research conducted by the authors.

In September 1979, the editorial board of *ZRF* published its summary of the discussion.[49] Although there was some disagreement whether medical demography more properly belonged to social hygiene, as Bednyy and the majority believed, or to demographic sciences, as Volkov and several others believed, or lay between the two, all participants agreed on the significance of studying socio-hygienic and socioeconomic factors of demographic processes.[50] Such subjects of study were raised as the formation of labor resources and evaluation of labor losses, the importance of medico-demographic forecasting for the planning of public health, socio-hygienic factors of fertility and infant mortality, regional aspects of medico-demographic research, and the importance of going beyond mere description of how socio-hygienic factors affect demographic tendencies to the formulation of recommendations designed to eliminate unsatisfactory trends in this area.[51] Two important practical steps designed to promote the development of medico-demographic research were listed: the creation of a Republic Interdepartmental Council on the Problems of Population in Latvia and the organization of a Department of Medical Demography at the Semashko Institute.

Work on the rapidly growing field of medical demography was also going on outside the pages of *ZRF*. In 1976 the Ministry of Health of the USSR and the Soviet Academy of Medical Sciences jointly adopted a

"Long-term Program of Scientific Research on the Problem of Alcoholism for 1976-1990." [52] This program may have provided the underpinning for the wide-ranging, serious decree of May 17, 1985 designed to reduce the alcoholism problem. In 1978 the Academy of Medical Sciences and the State Committee on Science and Technology jointly prepared a program entitled "Scientific Foundations of the Protection of the Health of Mother and Child for 1978-1990" and a long-term program for the development of perinatology for 1978-1990. [53] On a slightly smaller scale, by 1979 the Semashko Institute was implementing a "complex" or comprehensive investigation of child health. [54] At roughly the same time, this institute was also conducting a broad study of medico-social services to the pension-aged population. Analysis of the results of a study in three cities helped to determine pensioners' need for various types of medical and social assistance, as well as the level of their ability to work. Recommendations were made on the regimen and nature of pensioners' labor. [55]

In late 1979 or early 1980, the Department of Social Hygiene and Organization of Public Health of the Semashko Institute organized a city-wide scientific conference on the problems of medical demography. This was apparently a major event, bringing together the leading representatives of several fields and institutions (medical, academy, and government) to give their views on the subject of medical demography. Uralnis supported the need to develop medical demography as a field of study and called for the introduction of a special course to be taught at medical institutes. His address emphasized the significance of priority and prescribed order in the distribution of resources for the smoothing of demographic differentials in the republics. [56]

Boyarskiy, then head of TsSU's Research Institute, remarked that demographic policy does not stop with the birth rate but also includes mortality and is closely connected with the problem of labor resources. Like Chebotarev, Boyarskiy noted that measures aimed at reducing mortality and improving the health of the population would also extend productive working life. He expressed his confidence that the country's "alarming" demographic problems could be overcome, provided that the tasks were correctly formulated and the appropriate measures enacted. [57]

I.P. Katkova used this opportunity to repeat her conviction that in the field of fertility a unified demographic policy was necessary regardless of ethnic differentiation. This meant the creation of optimal conditions for bringing up a healthy first child, which in turn would positively influence the desire to have additional children.[58]

Finally, A.G. Vishnevskiy expressed the wish that several demographic laboratories, or even an institute of demography, would be organized within the public health system. Vishnevskiy's specific mention of the public health system is interesting, because there was still some difference in opinion at the conference over the true position of medical demography in the field of sciences.

Undoubtedly, much of the material discussed at conferences in 1979 came from the initial findings of the 1979 Census. Just as certainly, these results did nothing to dispel the general conviction that the problems of medical demography merited broader and deeper investigation. Sometime in 1980 the RSFSR Ministry of Health organized a Republic Scientific-Research Laboratory of Medical Demography, charged with coordinating and conducting scientific research on medico-demographic problems.[59] As recognition for his efforts in proposing and promoting the study of medical demography, Bednyy was selected to direct this new research laboratory.

In 1982, *ZRF* published an article by N.A. Shneyderman (of Bednyy's medical demography laboratory) analyzing socio-hygienic factors of the birth rate. One was illegitimacy, an issue apparently neglected by researchers elsewhere. Because of imbalances in the age-sex structure of the population, extramarital births had become a serious demographic and social problem, because the mortality rate is higher among children born out of wedlock.[60] Increases in allotments to single mothers at the Party Congress in 1981 confirm the importance of the problem. Another factor that Shneyderman discussed is multiparity and short intervals between pregnancies. In his opinion, because these factors are characteristic in the majority of the RSFSR's autonomous republics (presumably referring to the high fertility ASSRs with large numbers of Muslims), they are problems that "must be considered in developing demographic policies appropriate to different regions of the

country."[61] Shneyderman cited the World Health Organization in discussing the need to regulate these phenomena, because they increase the risk of birth complications.

When Shneyderman turned to his next topic, abortions, he once again mentioned territorial differences. Abortions were harmful not only because they reduce the birth rate directly, but also because they can lead to secondary infertility, miscarriages, extra-uterine pregnancies, and complications during delivery. Nevertheless,

Prohibition of artificial abortion by itself cannot lead to an increase in the birth rate, because abortion represents only the method used by families to limit the number of children they have. . . . Subsequently, without effective means of contraception or poor propaganda for them, women are forced to seek out criminal abortions, the dangers of which are constantly being reiterated. . . . Therefore, the most important step for public health agencies, in relation to birth rate, must be the development, introduction and distribution of contraceptive methods, improvement in the health practices of the population including contraception and intensification of propaganda concerning the dangers of artificial abortion.[62]

Practical steps were taken after the 1979 Census to counteract negative trends in the birth rate and infant mortality. As one example, an article in the Georgian newspaper *Akhalgazrda Kommunisti* (October 28, 1980), described the work of the I. Zhordaniya Scientific Research Institute of Human Reproductive Function of the Georgian Ministry of Health in Tbilisi. The primary function of the institute is helping childless couples to start a family.[63] Although the USSR Minister of Health, S.P. Burenkov, later criticized the Zhordaniya Institute for unspecified shortcomings, its mission indicates that officials in areas other than Moscow are concerned with these issues.[64]

Recent Activities of the Academy of Medical Sciences

Burenkov's report before the 46th Session of the General Assembly of the Academy of Medical Sciences, held in March 1982, was devoted to contemporary problems of protecting the health of mother and child. A Laboratory of the Hygiene of the Labor of Women had been created in the Institute of Labor Hygiene and Occupational Diseases. Three all-union

centers had been created: a medical-genetics counseling center at the Institute of Medical Genetics (Academy of Medical Sciences), a center for the diagnosis of congenital pathology of children at the Moscow Institute of Pediatrics and Infant Surgery (RSFSR Ministry of Health), and a center for pre-natal diagnosis at the All-Union Scientific-Research Center for the Protection of Health of Mother and Child.[65] This latter center was organized in 1979. It was named the leading institution in the country on the problem of "Scientific Bases for Protecting the Health of Women, Mother and Newborn" and became the coordinator of the State Program of Scientific Research in the Field of Obstetrics and Gynecology.[66]

In addition, scientific councils on pediatrics and on obstetrics and gynecology were organized and attached to the Presidium of the Academy of Medical Sciences. Finally, in December 1980, the USSR State Committee on Science and Technology, USSR Gosplan, and the USSR Academy of Sciences approved a State Program of Scientific Research for 1981-1985 on the Prevention and Treatment of Diseases of Mother and Child.[67]

Perhaps to withstand further encroachments by medical demography into their field of research, social hygienists intensified their studies of the connections between health and population processes. In his report to the 45th Session of the General Assembly of the Academy of Medical Sciences, Serenko called for social hygienists to uncover the causes behind "stabilization of the indicators of infant mortality as well as the comparatively high indicators of working-age male mortality and the significantly lower indicators of male average life-expectancy in comparison with those of females," and to develop regionally differentiated measures for their improvement.[68] Subsequently, Ovcharov and Bystrova of the Semashko Institute called for a centralized, extraordinary study of the basic causes of death, with the aim of determining the influence on them of socioeconomic, cultural, and behavioral features of various population groups. The results should contain information on family size, income, migration, living and social conditions, occupation, and so on.[69]

At a session of the Problem Commission on Medical Demography in 1983, Bednyy said that demographic trends were presenting public health organizations with new tasks--not just preventing morbidity but also preserving the working potential. He concluded that deep study of health factors was inseparable from the development of an effective demographic policy.[70]

ENDNOTES TO SECTION IV

- [1] A.E. Voss, "Urgent Questions of Further Improving the Patriotic and International Upbringing of the Toilers," *Sovetskaya Latvija*, 29 June 1982, analyzed in Roman Solchanyk, "Latvian Party Leader Discusses Language Policy," *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 297/82, 23 July 1982, 6pp.
- [2] Guram Pandjigidze in *Kommunisti*, 27 July 1982, cited in Elizabeth Fuller, "Georgian Writers Discuss the Demographic Situation," *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 404/84, p. 2.
- [3] L. Tukhashvili in *Kommunisti*, cited *ibid.*, p. 3.
- [4] See, for example, *Molodezh' Gruzii*, 5 April 1980.
- [5] *Zarya Vostoka*, 5 June 1982, pp. 1-6, translated in FBIS, *USSR Daily Report*, 9 July 1982, pp. R30-31.
- [6] V. Lukoshyavichyus, "Problemy yestystvennogo prirosta naseleniya," *Kommunist*, No. 12, December 1973, p. 48.
- [7] *Kommunist Belorussia*, No. 8, August 1981, pp. 69-75.
- [8] From D.I. Valentey (ed.), *Demograficheskaya politika v SSSR*, "Sbornik narodonaseleniya," vypusk 42, Finansy i statistika, Moscow, 1983, p. 94.
- [9] N. Rogovskiy, "Nekotoryye problemy narodonaseleniya i trudovykh resursov," *Planovoye khozyaystvo*, No. 3, March 1975, p. 9.
- [10] "V Gosplane SSSR," *Planovoye khozyaystvo*, No. 8, August 1977, p. 156.
- [11] N. Rogovskiy, "Novoye v planirovaniye truda," *Sotsialisticheskiy trud*, No. 2, February 1980, p. 10.
- [12] See "Ob utverzhdenii Polozheniya o Gosudarstvennom planovom komitete SSSR (Gosplan SSSR)," Article 102, 17 June 1982, No. 544, *Sobraniye postanovleniy Pravitel'stva Soyuza sovetskikh sotsialisticheskikh respublik (otdel pervyy)*, No. 20, 1982, pp. 371-383.
- [13] "Ob utverzhdenii Polozheniya o Gosudarstvennom komitete Soveta Ministrov SSSR po trudu i sotsial'nom problemam," Article 890, 3 October 1977, in *Sobraniye postanovleniy Pravitel'stva Soyuza sovetskikh sotsialisticheskikh respublik*, No. 26, 1977, pp. 543-555.
- [14] Among others, see R. Sultanova, "Conference on Labor Resource Problems," *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 9, September 1971, pp. 147-151; and V. Grishin, "Vserossiyskaya konferentsiya po ispol'zovaniyu trudovykh resursov," *Sotsialisticheskiy trud*, No. 9, September 1971, pp. 153-154.
- [15] Grishin, "Vserossiyskaya," p. 153.
- [16] The basic report on the Conference is contained in L.A. Kostin (ed.), *Trudovyye resursy SSSR*, Ekonomika, Moscow, 1979. Kostin is the First Deputy Chief of Goskomtrud and one of the principal spokesmen on labor issues. The recommendations are on pp. 273-298. They were separately published in the Goskomtrud house organ, *Sotsialisticheskiy trud*, November 1978, pp. 75-86.
- [17] The report on the formation, scope of work, and activities is given in "At the Scientific Council on Labor and Social Problems,"

Sotsialisticheskiy trud, No. 8, August 1978, pp. 157-158.

[18] See "Ob utverzhdenii vremennogo polozheniya o gosudarstvennom kontrole za ispol'zovaniyem rabochey sily," *Byulleten' normativnykh aktov ministerstv i vedomstv SSSR*, No. 1, January 1979, pp. 3-7. This text is noted as being an extract (*izvlecheniye*). But the text, not designated as abbreviated and published a month later in Goskomtrud's own publication--*Byulleten' Gosudarstvennyy komitet SSSR po trudu i sotsial'nyy voprosam*, no. 2, February 1979, pp. 26-30--contains exactly the same paragraphing, subcategories, etc. Perhaps there is an unpublished section not referred to in the latter source and obliquely referred to in the former.

[19] See V. Perevedentsev, "Prodolzheniye spora," *Literaturnaya gazeta*, March 20, 1968, p. 11. The All-Union Conference of Statisticians was held in April of 1968.

[20] B. Urlanis, "Beregite muzhchiny," *ibid.*, 24 July 1968, p. 12. That the age-specific death rates by sex have not been published since 1973/74 in this form, and not at all since 1976 for both sexes combined, is caused by the continued exacerbation of the differential mortality patterns at the middle ages and of infants.

[21] See the listing in TsSU SSSR, *Vsesoyuznoye soveshchaniye statistikov*, 22-26 aprelya 1968 g. *Stenograficheskiy otchet*, Statistika, Moscow, 1969, pp. 457-479, especially pp. 475 ff.

[22] T. Ter-Izreal'yan and B. Dubnov, "A Discussion of Demography and Demographic Statistics," *Vestnik statistiki*, No. 8, August 1969, pp. 71-79.

[23] TsSU SSSR, *Sovershenstvovaniye gosudarstvennoy statistiki na sovremennom etape*, *Materialy Vsesoyuznogo soveshchaniya statistikov*, Statistika, Moscow, 1979, p. 150.

[24] "Noyabr'skiy (1982g.) Plenum TsK KPSS i sovershenstvovaniye statistiki," *Vestnik statistiki*, No. 2, February 1983, p. 9.

[25] In 1974, a special Certificate on Perinatal Death was approved. It had been developed by TsSU jointly with the Semashko Institute of the Ministry of Health. See R. Ignat'yeva, N. Kaderkayeva, and G. Gurova, "Novoye v izuchenii sostoyaniya zdorov'ya detey," *Vestnik statistiki*, No. 5, May 1981, pp. 17 and 22.

[26] BBC, *Summary of World Broadcasts, USSR*, 1430 gmt, 6 September 1983, SU/7434/B/2, 9 September 1983 and "Research by Demographers," *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, 13 October 1983, p. 2.

[27] See A.G. Volkov (ed.), *Faktory rozhdayemosti*, Statistika, Moscow, 1971. Most of the articles in this initial collection had previously been delivered at international meetings such as the International Symposium on Population Growth held in Varna, Bulgaria, in September of 1968, or at domestic conferences in Yerevan, Minsk, and Cheboksary described in the initial section of this study.

[28] A survey conducted in 1960 had slightly different age limits and is not usually considered to be part of this series of fertility surveys. See R.A. Sifman, *Dinamika rozhdayemosti v SSSR (po materialam vyborochnykh obsledovaniy)*, Statistika, Moscow, 1974, p. 57, footnote 3.

[29] A.Ya. Boyarskiy, "Sotsial'no-gigiyenicheskiye problemy narodonaseleniya," *Zdravookhraneniye Rossiyskoy Federatsii*, No. 12, December 1976, pp. 3-4. The journal is cited hereafter as *ZRF*.

- [30] A.G. Volkov (ed.), *Demograficheskoye razvitiye sem'i*, Statistika, Moscow, 1979.
- [31] A.M. Merkov, "Vosproizvodstvo naseleniya SSSR i nekotorykh zarubezhnykh stran," *ZRF*, No. 2, February 1963, pp. 32-36.
- [32] A.M. Merkov, article in *Sovetskoye zdravookhraneniye*, No. 10, 1969, republished in Bednyy (ed.) *Zdorov'ye naseleniya i metody yego izucheniya*, Statistika, Moscow, 1979, pp. 118-125.
- [33] Ibid., pp. 119-120.
- [34] Ibid., p. 120.
- [35] Ibid.
- [36] Yu.P. Lisitsyn, "Sociohygienic Study of Public Health and Life-Style," *Sov. zdrav.*, No. 7, July 1982, pp. 3-9, as translated in *USSR Report, Life Sciences: Biomedical and Behavioral Sciences*, No. 31, JPRS 83247, 13 April 1983, pp. 64-70, pp. 65-66.
- [37] I.P. Katkova, "Meditsinskiye aspekty demograficheskoy politiki," *ZRF*, No. 4, April 1978, pp. 17-20.
- [38] D.F. Chebotarev, "Mediko-sotsial'nye aspekty postareniya naseleniya," *Sov. zdrav.*, No. 6, June 1977, p. 8.
- [39] Ibid., p. 11.
- [40] Ibid., p. 13.
- [41] R.K. Ignat'yeva and N.I. Kaderkayeva, "Nekotoryye voprosy statistiki perinatal'nogo perioda," *Sov. zdrav.*, No. 3, March 1977, pp. 33-36.
- [42] A.F. Serenko, "Vklad sotsial'noy gigiyeny v stanovleniye i razvitiye sotsialisticheskogo zdravookhraneniya," *Sov. zdrav.*, No. 11, 1977, p. 55.
- [43] L.S. Brezhnev, *Materialy XXV s"yezda KPSS*, Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, p. 72.
- [44] M.S. Bednyy, "Zadachi organov zdravookhraneniya po osushchestvleniye effektivnoy demograficheskoy politiki," *ZRF*, No. 4, April 1982, p. 9.
- [45] M.S. Bednyy, "Meditsinskaya demografiya," *ZRF*, No. 4, April 1977, pp. 11-16.
- [46] Ibid., p. 14.
- [47] Ibid., pp. 14-15.
- [48] Ibid., p. 16.
- [49] "K itogam diskussii o meditsinskoy demografii," *ZRF*, No. 9, September 1979, pp. 3-10.
- [50] Ibid., p. 5.
- [51] Ibid.
- [52] N.Ya. Kopyt, "Izucheniye alkogolizma kak sotsial'no-gigiyenicheskoy problemy (metodicheskiye podkhody, opyt, perspektivy)," *ZRF*, No. 8, August 1980, p. 3.
- [53] Ye.Ch. Novikova, "Novye perspektivy razvitiya sistemy okhrany materinstva i detstva," *Voprosy okhrane materinstva i detstva*, No. 2, 1981, p. 7.
- [54] A.F. Serenko, "Socio-hygienic Problems of Public Health in the Light of Decisions of the Twenty-fifth CPSU Congress," *VAMN*, No. 5, May 1979, pp. 3-10; as reported in *USSR Report: Biomedical and Behavioral Sciences*, No. 113, JPRS No. 73912, 26 July 1979, p. 47.
- [55] T.A. Korol'kova and L.P. Tokareva, "Kompleksnoye izucheniye problem mediko-sotsial'nogo obsluzhivaniya naseleniya pensionnogo

- vozrasta (predvaritel'noye soobshcheniye)," *Sov. zdrav.*, No. 6, June 1979, p. 24.
- [56] "Nauchnyaya konferentsiya po problemam meditsinskoy demografii, posvyashchennaya pamyati Z.P. Solov'yeva," *ZRF*, No. 7, July 1980, p. 44.
- [57] *Ibid.*, p. 45.
- [58] *Ibid.*
- [59] "Byt' aktivnym propagandistom resheniy Partii," *ZRF*, No. 12, December 1980, p. 5.
- [60] N.A. Shneyderman, "Socio-hygienic Factors in Birth Rate and Formation of the Able-bodied Population of the RSFSR," *ZRF*, No. 1, January 1982, pp. 25-28; as translated in *USSR Report, Life Sciences: Biomedical and Behavioral Sciences*, No. 18, JPRS 81428, 3 August 1982, pp. 62-66, especially p. 63.
- [61] *Ibid.*
- [62] *Ibid.*, p. 64.
- [63] *Current Abstracts and Annotations; Supplements to the Radio Liberty Research Bulletin*, No. 22, November 21, 1980.
- [64] S.P. Burenkov, "Zadachi zdravookhraneniya i meditsinskoy nauki po uluchsheniyu i okhrany zdorov'ya zhenshchin i detey v svete resheniy XXVI S"yezda KPSS," *VAMN*, No. 11, November 1982, p. 10.
- [65] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- [66] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- [67] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- [68] A.F. Serenko, "Problemy zdravookhraneniya i obshchestvennogo zdorov'ya v razvitom sotsialisticheskom obshchestve," *Sov. zdrav.*, No. 8, August 1981, p. 4.
- [69] V.K. Ovcharov and V.A. Bystrova, "Osnovnye cherty mediko-demograficheskikh protsessov v SSSR i za rubezhom," *Sov. zdrav.*, No. 2, February 1981, pp. 14 and 16.
- [70] A.A. Popov "Problemnaya komissiya po meditsinskoy demografii Minzdrava RSFSR," *ZRF*, No. 3, March 1984, pp. 45.

V. CONCLUSIONS

AVOIDANCE OF MONOLITHIC AUTHORITY

Throughout the quarter century since demographic research began again in the USSR, conferences and individuals have proposed the formation of a USSR-level institute of demography, so far without success. Perhaps a one leader, one institute formula has been rejected as too sensitive politically, because of the implications of sharp regional differences in population growth. Alternatively, the authorities may regard a multi- channeled approach as the most sensible one for a multi-faceted field.

The multi-channelled approach is epitomized by the scientific councils that coordinate the work of multiple research centers. The most prominent of these, the Academy's Scientific Council on Socioeconomic Problems of the Population, in some ways resembles a surrogate for an institute of demography. Yet there are definite constraints on its authority. Because it has no research staff or budget of its own, it must rely upon its members (drawn from all jurisdictions) to obtain approval and funding for assigned research from their home institutions. Most of the Council's members hold full-time positions elsewhere, and some have responsibilities quite different from and of higher priority than their work for the Council. Thus the Council is best described as a clearinghouse that influences research directions, publicizes research results through conferences and publications, and transmits recommendations to policymakers.

In the 1960s Valentey clearly hoped to make his Center for the Study of Population Problems at Moscow State University into a *de facto* institute of demography. But he seems to have received only lukewarm support from the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education, which in any case lacked the prestige to assist Valentey beyond its confines.

In 1976 Ryabushkin, Valentey's main rival, became the third director of the Academy's Institute of Sociological Research, while retaining his position as head of the Scientific Council on

Socioeconomic Problems of the Population. He succeeded in establishing within the institute a Department of Demography that he may have expected to become the nucleus of a national research center under his direction. However, the institute turned out to be too unstable a structure to support his ambitions. Since its founding in 1968 it has come under periodic criticism from the Academy Presidium or the Party. Renewed criticism in 1982-1983 led to Ryabushkin's replacement by a fourth director. The Department of Demography has remained, and its professional staff of 50 (directed by Rybakovskiy) works on a wide spectrum of demographic problems.

The last major aspirant for becoming an institute of demography--at least on the republic level--is the Department of Demography in the Ukrainian Academy's Institute of Economics. One source of legitimacy for this group's ambitions is the lineage to Ptukha's prewar Institute of Demography in Kiev. The group's leaders, the wife and husband team of Steshenko and Piskunov, have at one time or another selectively opposed virtually every other participant in the demographic debates, as if to distance themselves from and offer a clear alternative to their rivals in Moscow. Even at the republic level, an institute would represent a departure from the apparent preference for diverse research sources that has prevailed so far.

The number of institutions with sections or departments for demography and related issues (labor resources, family problems) increased rapidly after the 1967 decree on the social sciences. As the seriousness of population problems became more evident, institutions increasingly closer to the center of policymaking (Gosplan, Goskomtrud, TsSU) made arrangements to study and meet the challenge.

THE STRONG ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Individual voices have powerfully influenced the direction and resolution of demographic debates. The prime example here is Valentey, the Moscow State University professor who first raised the issue of the scope of demography as a science. He took on and eventually defeated Pod'yachikh, the head of TsSU's Census-taking Administration.

Individuals disagree publicly with other members of the same organization. Boyarskiy, of TsSU's Research Institute, sided not with his colleague Pod'yachikh but with the outsider Valentey. Within the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy, Urlanis favored regionally differentiated population policies while Manevich strongly rejected them as discriminatory.

Individuals involve themselves in demographic debate even when their organization's specialty lies elsewhere. Litvinova, of the USSR Academy's Institute of State and Law, has been a vigorous contributor to demographic discussion.

An individual can successfully mount a public campaign to establish a new field of study and a new organization: Witness Bednyy, who made medical demography a recognized specialty and became head of the Research Laboratory on Medical Demography of the RSFSR Ministry of Health.

Institutional affiliation may provide a formal channel for sending expert recommendations up a ministerial hierarchy toward leadership levels. However, conferences in which experts represent themselves rather than their institutions provide a less formal and perhaps more effective way to bring individual views to the attention of the Party and governmental personnel who attend.

DIRECT INVOLVEMENT OF DEMOGRAPHIC SCIENCE IN POLICY ISSUES

It takes time for researchers to understand the causes and consequences of trends that spell problems for policymakers. It takes time for policymakers to reach a consensus on the problems they can no longer duck. Thus it is not surprising that it took about 15 years for demography to be acknowledged as a policy science in the mid-1970s.

Significant here is the fact that 1959-1970 was the first intercensal period without demographic catastrophes. In other words, the trends between 1959 and 1970 had to be considered normal. After these developments were analyzed--conspicuously including rising mortality among infants and working age males and persistent differentials in regional population growth--demographers were explicitly invited by the 1976 Party Congress to help develop effective

demographic policy. The urgency of population problems was underscored by trends between the censuses of 1970 and 1979, which confirmed the identity of "normal" with "troublesome." (Unlike the 1959 and 1970 censuses, the results of the 1979 census have never been published in a series of detailed volumes.)

Troublesome matters require more frequent and deeper assessment than decennial censuses can provide. The unique mini-census (or 5 percent survey) of the population first conducted in 1985 includes questions never previously asked about income, housing, fertility, occupation, food supply, and the quality of health services. Not only demographers but also Soviet leaders now recognize the multiple dimensions of population processes.

