

172050

JPRS 83428

9 May 1983

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1406

SELECTIONS FROM SOVIET
FOREIGN POLICY JOURNALS

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED *

19980605 202

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

6
155
AØ8

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1406

SELECTIONS FROM SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY JOURNALS

CONTENTS

International Conference on Current Asian Problems Held (ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	1
Political, Economic Developments in Third World Surveyed (Yevgheni Primakov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	3
Soviet Economic Aid to Asian States Described (cross-reference)	7
Principles of Soviet Trade With Asian States Praised (Alexander Mikhailov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	8
International Seminar on State Economic Sector in African States Held (Sergei Balashov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	11
Israeli Demographic Policy on Growing Arab Population Attacked (Boris Yamilinets; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	13
U. S. Military Activities in Indian Ocean Criticized (Alexander Chicherov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	18
Philippine Economic Progress Laid To State Action (Vsevolod Arkhipov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	22
Sao Tome and Principe Progress Since Independence Lauded (Andrei Tokarev; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	25
Traditionalist 'Third Way' of Economic Development Denied (Nikolai Lidlain; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	28

Business Pressure To Relax Apartheid in S. Africa Reported (Vyacheslav Molev; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	33
Soviet Economic Aid to Nigeria Described (ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	39
Official Pakistani Backing for Afghan Rebels Alleged (Vladlen Baikof; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	40
Anatoliy Gromyko Book on Socialist Orientation in Africa Reviewed (V. Lee; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	45
Soviet-Indian Cultural Links Detailed (Y. Smirnov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	47
Book on Mongolian, Yemeni, Ethiopian Revolutions Reviewed (L. Entin; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	48
Soviet Book on Japanese Social Thought Published in Japan (L. Zenina; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	50
Zagladin, Frolov Book on Global Problems Reviewed (O. Dreier; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Nov-Dec 82)	51
Rashidov Addresses AAPSO Presidium Meeting in Tashkent (Sharaf Rashidov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	53
Importance of Third-World Working Class in Future Developments Stressed (Alexei Rumyantsev; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	57
AAPSO Chairman Praises Soviet Nationalities, Foreign Policies (Mirza Ibraghimov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	62
Recent Economic Developments in Africa Surveyed (Vladimir Lopatov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	67
Structure, Activities of Modern TNC's Examined (Gleri Shirokov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	73
Uzbek Academician Hits Western Writings on Muslims in USSR (Erkin Yusupov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	80
Ethiopian Socioeconomic Progress, Eritrean Situation Described (Yuri Pichughin, Boris Bogdanov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	84
Discussions, Reports at International Conference on Asian Problems (A. Notin, et al.; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	89
International Backing for Sihanouk, Cambodian Resistance Scored (Vladimor Viktorov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	98
Book on History of Soviet-Afghan Relations Reviewed (S. Gavrilov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	102

Book by Husayn's Brother on Palestinian Problem Reviewed (Y. Mikheyev, V. Naumkin; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83) ...	104
Book on African 'Revolutionary Democrats' Reviewed (I. Yusupov; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	106
Book on Iranian Revolutionary Process 1905-1979 Reviewed (V. Plastun; ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY, Jan-Feb 83)	108
Table of Contents of 'LATINSKAYA AMERIKA' Journal (LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, Feb 83)	110
Mexico's New Status as Oil Power Examined (M. L. Chumakova; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, Feb 83)	112
National Capital Forms Monopolies Despite Underdevelopment (A. A. Oleynikov; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, Feb 83)	126
U.S. Food Export Policies Criticized (E. Gryaznov; KHOZYAYSTVO I PRAVO, Jan 83)	143

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CURRENT ASIAN PROBLEMS HELD

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 p 19

[Text]

On June 30th-July 2nd, 1982 the first international scientific and political conference "Current Problems of Contemporary Asia" took place in Moscow, USSR. The conference was attended by scholars, statesmen, and public and political figures from Algeria, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Iran, Jordan, the Yemeni Arab Republic, the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Morocco, the Mongolian People's Republic, Nepal, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Syria, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Turkey, the Philippines, Sri Lanka and representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organisation. The Asia and Africa Peoples' Solidarity Organisation was also represented at the conference.

The Conference had three sections: "Asia in Contemporary International Relations", "Internal Processes in the Countries of Asia" and "The Relations of the USSR with the Countries of Asia". Over 50 papers were read and contributions made at the plenary sessions and in sections. A discussion was held on a wide range of crucial problems concerning the international situation in Asia and on the problems of the economic and socio-political development of Asian countries and their relations with the Soviet Union.

The conference showed that such exchanges of opinions are conducive to better mutual understanding between countries and peoples. Proceeding from this fact, its participants consider continuity in holding such conferences expedient. In this connection, the conference set up a group of sponsors consisting of:

Hari Bahadur Basnet (Nepal) K. P. Misra (India) Albert Butros (Jordan) E. M. Primakov (USSR) Nguyen Khanh Toan (SRV) and instructed them to discuss a whole complex of related matters.

The main papers were read by Academician Y. M. Primakov, Director, Institute of Oriental Studies under the USSR Academy of Sciences and I. A. Kulyov, Deputy Chairman, USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations. The texts of the papers are published here in an abridged form.

Detailed information on other papers and contributions will be published in the next issue.

APPEAL

We, representatives of 20 countries of Asia, attending the conference "Current Problems of Contemporary Asia" held in Moscow on 30th June-2nd July, 1982, express our profound concern about the aggravation of the international situation which is characterised by new tensions and conflicts hindering the prospects of disarmament, development and peaceful coexistence.

There is no peace on Asian soil, the most densely populated continent where the bulk of mankind lives. The peoples of Palestine and Lebanon are suffering a bloody tragedy. Syria has also become an object of aggression. The Israeli aggressors, enjoying the overt support of the US administration, have captured nearly half of Lebanon's territory and have wrought death and destruction upon thousands of people, including women and children who have fallen victim to this policy of genocide. We call upon men of science the world over and all people of goodwill to raise a mighty voice of protest against the criminal aggression of Israel and the expansionism and genocide in Lebanon and to demand the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli troops from the sovereign state of Lebanon, as well as from the other occupied Arab territories, and to secure the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

The situation in Southeast Asia is still fraught with serious danger. There is no other way to lessen tension and avoid conflicts in this region but a peaceful dialogue which would open up the way to regional cooperation and goodneighbourliness.

The situation in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf regions arouses serious concern. A threat to the territorial integrity, sovereignty over natural resources and interests of security of the coastal states is clearly presented by the expansion of such naval bases as Diego Garcia and the formation of the US rapid deployment forces which prevent the turning of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, as was envisaged by the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace adopted at the 26th Session of the UN General Assembly.

The Mediterranean should be transformed from a region of military and political confrontation into a zone of stable peace and cooperation among all the countries

of that area. We support the initiatives of the countries of Asia to promote peace and security, to create nuclear-free zones, and to spread confidence-building measures to relations between the states of that continent.

The analysis of the urgent problems of contemporary Asia made at our conference confirmed our conviction that the nonaligned movement is an important positive factor in strengthening international peace and security and is conducive to a just international economic order.

Peace is a priceless possession of all the peoples on Earth. In the conditions obtaining, effective measures aimed at preventing the arms race and nuclear catastrophe are indispensable for mankind. Welcoming the decision of the Soviet government, which has unilaterally committed itself not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, we appeal to other nuclear powers to support the new Soviet initiative and to make similar statements to lessen and eventually rule out the terrible menace of nuclear war threatening mankind.

The developing countries of Asia as well as the young states of the other continents struggling for economic independence, want to rebuild international economic relations on the basis of justice and equality. A new, world civilisation of equal, peaceful people can become a reality if we put an end to the arms race and if mankind protects itself from nuclear catastrophe. We appeal to the world public, to the scientists of the world to struggle for peace and security and to create conditions for peaceful and creative development and changes in Asia and throughout the world... ■

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

POLITICAL, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS IN THIRD WORLD SURVEYED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 pp 20-22

[Article by Academician Yevgheni Primakov, director, Institute of Oriental Studies: "Policy and Socio-Economic Development of Oriental Countries"]

[Text]

An event of tremendous historic importance occurred in the middle of the 20th century: imperialism's colonial system ceased to exist. Dozens of young sovereign states sprang up on the ruins of recently mighty colonial empires. Lenin's prediction about the inevitable transformation of the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the East from passive objects into active subjects of the historical process has come true.

The activation of the countries of the East within the historical process is still closely connected with the general process of transition from capitalism to socialism throughout the world and the shift in the alignment of forces between the two systems.

The opposition between these socio-economically and politically different systems came into being with the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the formation of the first socialist state. Since then, the balance of forces between socialism and capitalism has passed through several phases in its development, each of them creating specific conditions for the liberation process in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Immediately after the establishment of Soviet power in Russia, socialism had only the major political advantages over capitalism that are inherent in the new mode of production that comes with the system. In all the rest—the key economic indicators, quantity and quality of armaments—the capitalist world had an overwhelming advantage over the socialist state. Nevertheless, imperialism proved incapable of liquidating Soviet power in Russia, although it did harbour such an idea and made attempts to carry it out.

Even the first phase of the alignment of forces between socialism and capitalism characterised in fact by socialism's political advantages only, exerted a positive influence on many Asian states. This demonstration of the political advantages of socialism, which could not be stifled by the "all-powerful" imperialist states had a definite effect. The weakening of capitalism, which had entered a general

crisis, began to make itself felt, though yet not fully.

A new phase in the change of the alignment of forces between socialism and capitalism began after the Second World War with the emergence of the world socialist system. The Soviet Union had solved its problem of finding class allies among states. A high degree of unity and cohesion was demonstrated by the group of socialist states united by the Warsaw Treaty and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA). A new frame of reference was created and the economic and geographic basis upon which socialism's advantages could be more graphically demonstrated, especially as regards rates of growth of productive forces, was expanded considerably.

From that time on, the alignment of forces between the two systems was increasingly based already not so much on political factors as on military and economic ones. This opened up broad possibilities for invigorating the role of "peripheral" countries in the international arena. Under these conditions, imperialism's colonial system disintegrated rapidly and a whole number of young sovereign states appeared from out of its ruins.

Another phase in the alignment of forces of the two world systems began after military and strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States was achieved in the 1970s. Political sovereignty is being strengthened in the newly-free countries, especially in the economic field, an intensification of the struggle for the democratisation of world economic ties and the growth of the socio-class element in the revolutionary process within the national liberation movement are occurring.

The development of the revolutionary process in the East has played an important role in turning that colonial and semi-colonial part of the world into an active force in history. This process, as predicted by Lenin, while being subject to common laws, at the same time bears the imprint of uniqueness resultant from the specifics of the historical, socio-economic and political situation in the emergent countries.

Such a form of social progress as socialist orientation came into being as a result of the non-simultaneous maturing in the East of the three conditions of revolution—its material prerequisites, objective socio-political prerequisites (a revolutionary situation) and a subjective factor. The elaboration of such a model of advance to progress by the newly-free countries can be classified as an unquestionable achievement of Marxist theory. The general characteristics of countries of socialist orientation, given by the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, is of much importance for theory and praxis alike. The criteria of these countries are outlined in the Report to the Congress by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Brezhnev: "Development along the progressive road is not, of course, the same from country to country, and proceeds in difficult conditions. But the main lines are similar. These include gradual elimination of the positions of imperialist monopoly, of the local big bourgeoisie and the feudal elements, and restriction of foreign capital. They include the securing by the peoples' state of commanding heights in the economy and transition to planned development of the productive forces, and encouragement of the cooperative movement in the countryside. They include enhancing the role of the working masses in social life, and gradually reinforcing the state apparatus with national personnel faithful to the people. They include anti-imperialist foreign policy. Revolutionary parties expressing the interests of the broad masses of the working people are growing stronger there."

It is clear, therefore, that a country's socialist orientation criterion can only be complex and multifaceted, encompassing the economic, social, political, and ideological spheres of development in a given country.

In countries of socialist orientation, however, transformations in all these spheres do not always take place simultaneously and as a rule, this is the cause of zigzags and occasionally, even regression in the development of these countries. Still, this does not rule out the conclusion that such a model of society's progress as socialist orientation is a viable and real one.

Along with the uneven development of various conditions necessary for revolution, its specificity in the East is also due to the strong influence of historical traditions. Revolution does not grow out of "traditionalism", as some ideologists abroad contend, but from class struggle. But "traditionalism" often deforms class struggle, imparting to it previously unknown, and in some instances, even ugly forms.

After the collapse of the colonial system, the influence of traditionalism on the revolution in the emergent countries manifested itself most vividly and contrastingly within the framework of Islam. The question of the impact of traditions in general and Islam in particular on the revolutionary process in the East is raised dialectically in the Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th Party Congress: "The banner of Islam may lead into struggle for liberation. This is borne out by history, including very recent history. But it also shows that reaction, too, manipulates with Islamic slogans to incite counterrevolutionary mutinies. Consequently, the whole thing hinges on the actual content of any movement". This Marxist-Leninist approach helps neutralise both the dangerous nihilism connected with the possibility (at a certain historical stage) of the positive influence of the religious factor on political processes in the East and the no less dangerous approach that glosses over the reactionary aspects of this influence. For local revolutionary forces, nihilism is fraught with the dan-

ger of sectarianist deviation and isolation from the masses. Another extremity which expresses itself in apology of the impact of the religious element is fraught with the danger of renunciation of a class approach and, in effect, degeneration.

By and large, the disintegration of imperialism's colonial system and the development of revolutionary process in the newly-free countries has exerted a considerable impact on the alignment of forces between socialism and capitalism. Colonial and dependent countries which gained state sovereignty have ceased to be a reserve of imperialism on the whole. And this applies not only to those former colonies and semi-colonies which immediately embarked on the road of socialism or adopted the socialist orientation but also to these in which, after political independence, the development of capitalism was started or continued as the leading economic form. In many instances, the development of former colonial and semi-colonial countries along the capitalist road does not blunt the anti-imperialist direction of their policy (e. g., India and several other countries). In the vast majority of cases, this complicates the overall picture of world capitalism's contradictions.

3

The transformation of the developing countries of the East into active agents of history also expresses itself in the growth of their role in world economy. The following phenomena and their consequences should be mentioned first and foremost in this connection: the appearance and strengthening of the world socialist system created a powerful counterbalance to imperialism, undercutting its ability to manoeuvre; the winning and consolidation of political independence in the "peripheral" countries enabled them to acquire sovereign rights over their resources, to determine entirely or to a considerable extent the structure of foreign capital investments and the scale of extraction of raw materials, to take part in determining prices for the exported raw materials; the deterioration of capitalism's structural crises—energy, raw materials, ecological and monetary—has prompted the monopoly capital of developed capitalist countries to set up energy-intensive, material-intensive, and "dirty" industries near the sources of raw materials and energy, or simply abroad, and to increase their commodity exports to recycle the "raw materials revenue" of the developing countries into the economy of the developed capitalist world; the mounting struggle by the working class, especially at the "centre" of the world capitalist economy, leads to a growth in the value and price of labour and increases the desire to shift labour-intensive industries to developing countries where the value and price of labour are much lower; the expansion of the domestic market in the developing countries as they become industrialised is important for the export of the products of developed capitalist countries.

It should be noted that the share of the "periphery" in the total gross national product of the nonsocialist world began to grow after the collapse of the colonial system. In the period from 1950 to 1980 it increased from 14.5 to 18.5 per cent, including industry—from 8.5 to 15.5 per cent and agriculture—from 46.8 to 53 per cent. The rates of structural transformation of the economy of developing countries have also gone up. In the period from 1950 to 1980, the share of agriculture in the gross product of these countries declined from 38.2 per cent to 19.6 per cent, while in industry it increased from 15.9 to 26 per

cent. The Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences predicts that by the year 2000, the share of agriculture in the gross product of the developing countries will drop to 15-18 per cent, while the share of industry will grow to 30-33 per cent.

But the existing economic gap between the capitalist and developing countries remains wide—in the period from 1950 to 1980, the difference between the average per capita incomes in these two groups increased by 140 per cent. The exploitation of developing countries by foreign monopoly capital is also continuing.

It appears that against this background of characteristics the most important one in the newly-free world is its growing heterogeneity. Today several developing countries which are ahead of the rest in rates of growth of national income, capital investments, and in a number of instances, in labour productivity are now forming a separate group. This group is comprised of the oil-producing states and countries with a relatively developed export sector in their manufacturing industries. Apart from these, as defined by the United Nations, there exists a group of the 31 least developed countries which have sunk to the depths of poverty.

In the 1970s, the uneven development of the former colonial and dependent countries has generated such a phenomenon as the export of capital in sufficiently large amounts from individual developing countries to developed capitalist states. Thus, by the beginning of 1980, the overseas assets of OPEC countries amounted to \$236 billion. The export of capital from individual developing states yields contradictory results: on the one hand, it becomes a source of rapidly growing profits for only a few of them and injects certain imperialistic elements into their policy, while on the other hand it becomes a means used by the imperialist circles to tie an important segment of the developing world to the main economic "centres" of modern capitalism.

The definite differentiation of the former colonial world became especially intensive in the 1970s. In the process, the heterogeneity of the post-colonial East manifests itself in the difference not only of the chosen road or the attained level of development but also in the political line of the newly-free countries—either independent or pro-imperialist. The dialectics of the interaction of uneven economic and political development began to manifest itself in the 1960s and especially in the 1970s in the form of the appearance of local "centres of power" in the developing countries—sub-imperialist centres, so to say. A unique feature of the situation is that the states forming local "power centres" remain within the system of the developing world. They still share common features with other developing countries, including a relatively low level of development of productive forces, the existence of multistructural economy, the "asymmetrical" nature of the interdependence with the "centres" of the capitalist world, the objective need to democratise the existing international economic order, etc. But at the same time, imperialist features are already expressing themselves in the economy and politics of such developing countries; a tendency for these states to expand economically into less developed areas is appearing; the struggle for spheres of influence is mounting, and in a number of instances, not just among the local "power centres" themselves but also between them and developed capitalist countries.

The export of armaments from the United States and other NATO countries has become one of the most important means of drawing local "power centres" into the imperialist policy. An example of this was Iran under the

shah; the United States wanted very much to turn Iran into a strong, reliable ally. Arms deliveries also served as a means of drawing Sadat's Egypt into the orbit of imperialist policy: they were instrumental in preparing the Camp David deal, designed to create the basis for Israeli annexation of the Arab territories of the West bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip.

The importance of these "sub-imperialist centres" in US strategy had grown markedly by the end of the 1970s as a result of the evolution of American military strategic concepts. By this time, the United States had clearly demonstrated its intent to become much more involved in regional conflicts, forming the rapid deployment force for this purpose and building up its military presence in the Near and Middle East, in the zone of the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf.

But imperialism's special emphasis on the utilisation of the "sub-imperialist centres" for its own ends has by no means altered, nor does it cancel the US overall neocolonialist strategy the main task of which is the total and all-embracing immersion of the newly-free countries in the orbit of capitalism, binding the entire "periphery" ever more firmly to the capitalist "centre". Imperialism has every intention of continuing its exploitation by methods adjusted to the altered objective and subjective conditions. The chief method here is presented by the activities of the transnational corporations in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The transnationals have become the main channel for the export of capital to these countries. Their activities, usually taking the form of creating enterprises with incomplete production cycles in developing countries, distort the latter's economic development. Exploiting local labour and controlling the marketing of products manufactured in the newly-free countries, the transnational corporations pocket and drain huge profits from these countries, profits much greater than those gained from similar capital investments in developed capitalist countries. On the whole, the transnational corporations invest fewer resources in the "periphery" than they take out of them to the capitalist "centre". Obviously this is not in keeping with the developmental needs of the newly-free countries.

4

Support for national liberation movements and revolutions and overall cooperation with the newly-free countries on an equal basis are the invariable features of the USSR's foreign policy course. With the assistance of the Soviet Union alone, enterprises were built or were under construction in newly-free countries by the early 1980s with an annual capacity to produce 20 million tons of steel, to extract 65 million tons and refine 17.6 million tons of oil, to produce 3.3 million tons of cement, and to generate 13 million kilowatts of electricity. It also helped to build more than 4,000 kilometres of roads and railways and develop some 700,000 hectares of new land. Within the framework of cooperation with the USSR, from 70 to 80 thousand citizens from the newly-free countries received vocational or industrial training annually or attended establishments of specialised secondary or higher education. All this has undoubtedly strengthened the national economies of the developing countries, making them stronger and more independent, and less susceptible to diktat from the capitalist "centre".

It is just as clear that the diverse relations of the developing countries with the socialist world exert a no lesser influence indirectly, often compelling the developed capitalist states to put their ties with developing countries

on a different basis, to soften terms for aid, and in some cases, even to stop using assistance as a means of imposing their demands on these countries.

While fully aware of the existence of sometimes substantial differences in the interpretation of what the new world economic order should be like, the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community resolutely support the just demands of the developing countries to overhaul international economic relations on a democratic basis. At the same time, considering constant neocolonialist attempts to pointedly ignore the fundamental differences between the two world systems (the concept of the "rich" and "poor" nations) and to wrest the national liberation movement away from its natural ally—the socialist community (the "concept of equidistance"), it should be stressed that the socialist world does not bear any responsibility whatsoever for the backwardness of the former colonies and semi-colonies. Neither, of course, does it bear any responsibility for their continuing neocolonialist exploitation by the developed capitalist states.

The Soviet Union takes a positive view of the policy of nonalignment pursued by the newly-free countries, and from the very outset has treated this movement as a positive element facilitating the stabilisation of the situation in the world and the struggle to neutralise the efforts of militaristic circles.

The national interests of the developing countries are in consonance with those of the socialist community and are clearly incompatible with those of imperialism. This became especially clear within the context of the "muscle flexing" engaged in by the US administration late in the 1970s and early in the 1980s. On the other hand, the policy of curtailing and stopping the arms race and asserting the principles of peaceful coexistence of the states of the two systems persistently upheld by the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community is of fundamental importance for the newly-free countries. It gives them many more possibilities of expanding their participation in world affairs, solving problems concerning the whole of humanity and shaping the destiny of the world. This policy of the socialist countries also creates real obstacles in the way of those who, in conditions of the tense confrontation of blocs and the increased international tensions, are using this situation to export counterrevolution to the newly-free countries. Last but not least, the USSR's policy opens up major prospects for the enrichment of those tendencies and processes that facilitate the growth of the economic potential of developing countries and for the strengthening of their position in the world economy thereby enhancing the growth of their role in international relations.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

SOVIET ECONOMIC AID TO ASIAN STATES DESCRIBED

For the text of the article by Iliodor Kulev, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, entitled "Economic and Technical Cooperation of the USSR With Asian Countries," see USSR Report: International Economic Relations (Trade With LDC's)

PRINCIPLES OF SOVIET TRADE WITH ASIAN STATES PRAISED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 pp 26-27

[Article by Alexander Mikhailov: "Equality and Mutual Advantage: The Sources of New Relations"]

[Text]

Dramatic changes occurred in the political and economic relations between the former Russian Empire and its Asian neighbours following the triumph of the 1917 October Revolution. Equality, mutual advantage, respect for national sovereignty and development aid, which are the principles written in all the present-day declarations and documents on the new international economic order were begun by the Soviet Union 65 years ago, in deed, not in word.

Although at that time Soviet Russia had as many as 16 trade partners in Asia alone and some in Africa and Latin America, the present article will dwell only upon its commerce with Asian neighbours, since their geographical proximity allowed Soviet Russia to exercise a new type of economic relations with them in the 20s-30s, while other relations were still being controlled carefully, hampered, and discriminated by the imperialists.

The first foreign policy steps of the Soviets with respect to Turkey, Afghanistan, Iran, China and Mongolia were to repeal all unequal treaties and agreements contracted by the tsarist government and to cancel the debts of these countries. The importance of these acts can scarcely be exaggerated. Leonid Krasin, the then People's Commissar for Foreign Trade and one of Lenin's closest associates, wrote: "Those were neither trifles nor petty objects, since, for example, the treaties we returned to Persia amounted, in terms of money, to hundreds of millions of gold roubles." The political repercussions were likewise considerable: for the first time in the history of international relations, a state renounced of its free will the concessions and other economic privileges as well as a policy based on exploitation. However, these were only the first steps; they were followed by a number of no less important innovations, such as monopoly on foreign trade which merit a separate discussion.

Foreign trade was declared to be the exclusive right of the state by the Council of People's Commissars decree of April 22, 1918. This right had to be upheld despite severe economic pressure from the capitalist world, which, damaging as it was, could not force the Soviet Government to renounce its policy. "The monopoly on foreign trade must remain intact", said the resolution of the October (1925) Plenary Meeting of the CC RCP (Bolsheviks). This stand was reiterated by the 14th and 16th Party Congresses.

At the same time, in view of the specific economic structures prevalent in some neighbouring Asian countries, their traditional trade capital and commercial customs, the Party and Government found it possible to adopt, in the course of the 1920s and 1930s, a more flexible policy toward them. Commissariat for Foreign Trade orders No. 58/61 of 1923 and No. 150 of 1924 allowed license-free import of Iranian agricultural products and some items of handicrafts industry output and provided for Soviet exports on the same terms. Identical orders were later issued with respect to Turkey (No. 11/a and No. 193, 1924), Western China (No. 51, 1925), and Afghanistan (No. 127, 1925). In addition, considerable privileges were granted to Mongolia.

These measures were above all conducive to strengthening the stand of those countries' trading communities, which, having obtained an outlet to an independent foreign market where the competitiveness of their commodities was guaranteed, could more easily oppose foreign capital at home. Merchants from those countries could travel unimpeded to the USSR and contract transactions on their own at the annual fairs in Baku and Nizhny Novgorod. They also enjoyed lower tax rates, lower transport tariffs and reduced bank fees on credit. The special (Eastern) easy customs tariff introduced in 1922, was also a factor in pro-

moting these activities. Its rate was lowered in 1924 and 1930, while such imports as cotton, most brands of wool, cereals and some other food products were exempt from import duties altogether. The same objectives were behind the creation of mixed trading societies which attracted merchant capital from neighbouring Eastern countries. Granting similar privileges to developed capitalist countries was naturally ruled out.

The Soviet balance-of-trade policy was much the same. The resolution on the five-year plan adopted by the 15th Congress of the Communist Party, said: "The overall foreign trade policy ... dictates the need to plan foreign trade in such a way as to necessarily wind up with an active balance." Nevertheless, this provision did not apply to the countries in question. In 1926, following the Party Congress, the USSR concluded trade agreements with Iran and Turkey, which, in addition to granting them privileges, provided for a net balance. Such terms were to be carried over to later contracts signed shortly before WW II. Beginning in 1927, the net balance was introduced in trade with Afghanistan. The consistent application of this measure did much to improve financial situation of Iran, Turkey and Afghanistan which were faced with particularly unstable capitalist market and the 1920-1931 crisis on top of it all.

The Soviet Union also gave them financial and economic aid. It could not be extensive, since the Civil War, Western and Japanese intervention, the postwar economic dislocation and an ever-present threat of renewed imperialist incursions limited the country's material potential. Nevertheless, it did find the money, and, moreover, all its long-term credits to neighbouring Eastern countries were granted on easy terms, and were channelled into economic development, whereas some of these, as, for example, the eight-million rouble loan to Turkey repayable over 20 years bore no interest at all. It would be appropriate to recall that the USA, which gave Turkey a \$10 million credit at almost the same time as the USSR, i. e., in the early 1930s, fixed the interest rate at 6.5 per cent per annum.

Soviet aid went for industrial construction and agriculture, too. Thus, it fostered the emergence of Turkey's textile industry (factories at Kayseri and Nazilli and cotton mills at Ereğli), thus permitting the country to discontinue the imports of cotton fabrics. The Soviet aid to Iran included complete plant for five rice-shelling factories and twenty grain elevators. Soviet specialists helped Iran and Afghanistan bring more land under cultivation and select better strains of cotton. Increased cotton yields in those countries were stimulated by guaranteed sales on Soviet ships. The same statistics show that Soviet commodity exports and, in some years, almost the whole of Iranian cotton crop. It gave veterinary aid to Mongolia,

leading to a tangible increase in the latter's export of cattle and dairy products. Similar examples are numerous.

This foreign economic policy brought about a marked growth in the USSR's trade with Afghanistan, Iran, China, Mongolia and Turkey. In the latter half of the 1920s and the early 1930s, these countries accounted for over three-fourths of the Soviet trade turnover with Asia (or 15-16 per cent of the USSR's overall volume of foreign trade, as against 9.8 per cent in 1913).

The structure of Soviet exports reflected Soviet Eastern policies in general. As industrialisation progressed in the USSR, the country increasingly exported machines, equipment, building materials, industrial raw materials (metals, oil products, timber), and chemical products. In the mid-1930s, these already constituted over 40 per cent of the Soviet exports to those countries. The two other largest groups of commodities were consumer goods and food. The importance of the latter should be stressed particularly, since at the time the USSR was experiencing grave economic difficulties: it was just beginning to rebuild its war-ravaged industries, and several consecutive crop failures in the 1920s made the food supplies in the country run at a premium. Nevertheless, the Soviet government was aware that should it discontinue food exports to neighbouring countries which had been Russia's traditional customers for many decades, it would put them in a most difficult situation, and so the food deliveries went on as usual and never dropped to less than 20 per cent of the overall exports to those countries.

The USSR was prepared to engage in a new type of economic relations with any and all nations which were fighting against imperialist violence and exploitation. The Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People issued by the Soviet Republic in 1918, announced "...a complete break with the barbarous policy of bourgeois civilisation, which has built the prosperity of the exploiters belonging to a few chosen nations on the enslavement of hundreds of millions of working people in Asia, in the colonies in general, and in the small countries."¹ However, more often than not all Soviet efforts to maintain direct economic and trade ties with the colonies were frustrated by the colonialists themselves. For example, although there are statistics on Soviet trade with the Dutch, India, Malaya and the Straits Settlements, there were never direct contacts, and the Soviet foreign trade organisations had to sign contracts with Western firms which undertook to deliver goods from those countries to Rotterdam or other European ports where these were reloaded onto Soviet ships. The same statistics show that Soviet commodity exports had practically no access to the colonies and colonial dependencies, and if the Soviet Union ran up against this rigid restrictions with respect to its imports, this could

hardly compare with the protectionist war the West and Japan led against its exports. The situation was aggravated still further by worsened inter-imperialist contradictions in the period between the two world wars. The Asian textile market saw the confrontation between Britain and Japan. Given such conditions, it was next to impossible to attempt to apply to India or Ceylon, for example, the same principles on which the USSR based its relations with its Eastern neighbours. Its relations with these countries began to develop only after the collapse of the colonial system.

Given present-day standards, the volume of the USSR's economic cooperations with neighbouring Asian countries in the 1920s and 1930s may seem insignificant. In fact, it has grown drastically over the recent three decades, and the cooperation itself has acquired new forms. It has involved a greater number of countries; the character of payments has undergone changes, as have the types of aid, privileges and many other things. However, what is most important has remained the same—the principles of equality and mutual advantage.

† V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 424. ■

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON STATE ECONOMIC SECTOR IN AFRICAN STATES HELD

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 p 28

[Article by Serghei Balashov, Cand. Sc. (Econ.)]

[Text]

In September 1982, the Soviet Union was the venue of the international seminar "The Role of Public Sector in Social and Economic Development of African Countries" sponsored by the Africa Institute, the USSR Academy of Sciences, and the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) in cooperation with the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology. The seminar was attended by scholars and practical workers from Africa, the Soviet Union, Hungary.

In greeting the participants, Anatoli Gromyko, Director of the Africa Institute, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, said that the seminar was a concrete answer to the UN resolutions pointing to the necessity of conducting systematic research in the role of public sector in developing countries. The papers submitted to the Seminar focused on the regularities inherent in the evolution of public sector. It was proposed to specify the notion of the public sector as applied to the multi-structural economy of developing countries. The participants made a detailed analysis of the public sector's role in carrying out the socio-economic strategies of African countries, and in the developing world's struggle for the restructuring of international economic relations.

The scientific advisor of the Seminar, Professor G. V. Smirnov, Dr. Sc. (Econ.), read a paper dedicated to the general problems arising from the development of public sector in African countries. He dwelt on state enterprise which he qualified as the most solid material basis for eliminating backwardness and attaining economic independence. He pointed to the need for public sector to include the projects of social infrastructure, since the state's efforts to improve the masses' living standards were a major component part of progressive social development.

A vigorous discussion followed the papers of other Soviet participants, which dealt with the effectiveness of public sector in African countries [S. A. Bessonov, Dr. Sc. (Econ.)], the use of state budget as a means for implementing the strategies of economic development [Y. M. Osipov, Dr. Sc. (Econ.)], the role of public sector in African countries' struggle for the restructuring of international economic relations [N. V. Volkov, Dr. Sc. (Econ.)], and the USSR's assistance in developing public sectors of African countries [E. S. Dranitsyn, Cand. Sc. (Econ.)].

Interesting papers were presented by foreign participants, too. Professor Mohammed Lakhdar Benhassine of Algeria took his country as an example to illustrate the mobilising role of the state in developing productive forces. E. Andriamikhata of Madagascar dwelt at length, on the role of the state in solving the present-day socio-political problems of Madagascar.

The participants expressed a unanimous opinion that the emergence of public sector in the economies of African countries was objectively called forth by the needs of the development of their productive forces and was a historically inevitable process.

Many papers as well as speakers in discussions stressed that state enterprise was more in accord with the national interests of the developing world than private capitalist enterprise. It is the state with its potentialities in the sphere of accumulation and distribution of material resources that can effect in a consistent and purposeful way radical socio-economic reforms needed to overcome backwardness and dependence. The participants agreed that the state must tackle such problems as limiting the activities of foreign companies (above all, the transnationals), supplying the population with staple foodstuffs and other necessities, diversifying production, developing natural resources, increasing employment, and developing backward areas. The state-owned enterprises must also become the basis of most important industries and be instrumental in speeding up industrialisation, overhauling individual branches of the economy, saving hard currency through import substitution, in extending the material basis of social security, etc.

An active role of the state in the economy and external economic ties is a vital condition of the African countries (and all developing countries in general) being able to get closer to the implementation of their demands for a new system of international economic relations. The concrete steps in this direction, the participants said, must be measures to strengthen African countries' sovereignty over their natural resources, to overcome their inequality in relations with capitalist countries, and to reform the international monetary system. The participants stressed the need to strengthen and extend regional cooperation. Also analysed were the ways of using in national interests the capital and technology of transnational corporations,

and means of alleviating the negative effect their activities have on the economies of young states.

Great interest was evoked by the discussion of the Soviet Union's and other socialist countries' contribution to the drive for the restructuring of the international economic relations on an equitable and mutually advantageous basis, as well as the prospects for further economic, scientific and technical cooperation between socialist and African countries, something promoting considerably the young states' progress.

After Moscow, the participants went to Alma Ata, the capital of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, to see the performance of a number of industrial projects and farms. This visit to the Kazakh SSR, said Professor Benhassine, gave us the opportunity to see with our own eyes the immense changes in the life of the Kazakh people who, working in the united family of Soviet republics, managed to eliminate, within short span of time, its social and economic backwardness, and to catch up with the most developed nations industrially, scientifically and culturally.

The participants summed up the Seminar by admitting that the significance of such meetings went far beyond the framework of purely scientific contacts, as they promoted better understanding between nations, gave the developing countries a good idea of the achievements of existing socialism and showed them the way to progressive socio-economic transformations.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

ISRAELI DEMOGRAPHIC POLICY ON GROWING ARAB POPULATION ATTACKED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 pp 29-32

[Article by Boris Yamilinets, Cand. Sc. (Econ.): "Israel: The Zionists' Criminal Policy"]

[Text]

Early in June of this year the Israeli Zionists launched a large-scale aggression in Lebanon against the national-patriotic forces of the country and the Palestinian resistance movement. The world public got another opportunity to see for itself the reactionary essence of Tel Aviv's policy and new evidence of the unfading importance of the special decision of the UN adopted way back in 1975, that condemns Zionism, the official ideology and policy of Israel, as a form of racism and racial discrimination.

The Israeli policy of violence, vandalism and genocide in Lebanon expresses in concentrated form its imperialist aims and designs directed against the progressive forces that head the liberation struggle of the Arab peoples.

The obvious interaction between Israel and the United States is evidence not only of their common interests, attempts to change the political situation in the Arab East in favour of US imperialism and force the Arab countries to support the Camp David policy of separate deals. Washington's allround support of Tel Aviv's aggression shows that the United States has given its "blessing" to Israel's attempts to destroy the Palestine Liberation Organisation and drive the Palestinians out of Lebanon. The United States together with Israel are thus making an attempt to "bury" altogether or, should they fail in this, then at least to put off for long the solution of the Palestinian problem. Israel's brigandage in Lebanon revealed the true aims of the Israeli Zionists: to seize more Arab territories, destroy the

Palestinian resistance movement, which is the lawfully recognised representative of the Palestinian Arab people, and to remove from the agenda the creation of an independent Arab Palestinian state.

Israel's ruling circles have been pursuing an expansionist policy throughout the entire existence of that state. The history of Israel is a history of wars and aggressions in the Arab East, a history of the seizure of Arab lands and the expulsion of the Palestinian Arab people. More than fifteen years have passed since Tel Aviv occupied the West Bank of the Jordan (including Eastern Jerusalem), the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights—these indigenous Arab lands. The Zionists spared no effort to join these territories to the Israeli state.

Driving out the native Palestinian Arab people and setting up Jewish settlements in violation of all norms of international law, Israel changed the demographic structure of the occupied Arab lands and established a new juridical status for them (in July 1980 the Israeli Knesset adopted a law on the annexation of the Eastern part of Jerusalem, while in December 1981 it adopted a law on the annexation of the Golan Heights).

As a result of the accelerated colonisation of Arab lands 100 rural settlements with permanent housing and 40 makeshift settlements were set up in the occupied territories in the period from June 1967 to May 1980, it was announced by R. Weitz (representative of "Labour Zionist"), head of the Department of Settlements of the World Zionist Organisation—Jewish Agency.

The five-year plan of colonising the occupied West Bank in 1979-1983, drawn up by the co-chairman of the Department of Settlements M. Drobles and approved by the Israeli government, provided for the establishment of some 60 Israeli settlements. The latest plan of the WZO-JA aims to increase the number of Jewish settlers on the West Bank to 100,000 by 1985, a four-fold increase as compared to the beginning of 1982.

The policy of ousting the Arab people of Palestine from the occupied territories is effected not only by military force but also by way of creating unbearable living conditions. This includes traditional Zionist methods: psychological pressure, destruction of housing and farmland, systematic reduction of water and power supplies for the Arab population's household, industrial and agricultural needs. Suffice it to say that two thirds of Israel's requirements in drinking water are satisfied by sources located on Arab territory. Tel Aviv employs a tough tax policy, control over monetary circulation and other measures to force the Arabs to abandon their lands and resettle in other Arab countries.

As a result of Israel's occupation policy the Palestinian Arabs cannot find jobs on their land. In 1981, for instance, 85,000 day labourers (a third of the entire labour force in the West Bank) went every day to work in Israel. And this figure includes only the officially registered ones. The per capita income of the population in the West Bank is much less than in Israel.

On coming to power the present Prime Minister Begin officially stated the Zionists' claims to the Arab lands of Palestine. "What occupied territories? If reference is being made to Judea, Samaria [West Bank of the Jordan. — B. Y.] and the Gaza Strip, these are liberated territories, a part of Greater Israel", he contended. "The Arabs of Palestine have no right at all to Palestine", it was cynically stated by Israel's Defence Minister A. Sharon. As to the coalition agreement, signed on August 4, 1981 by the members of the present government, it proclaims the "eternal right of the Jewish people to Eretz Israel ("Greater Israel") that cannot be put in doubt". And the military-fascist Begin clique asserts this "right" in Lebanon by most barbarous methods.

Israel's colonialist policy in respect of the occupied lands, the Palestinian resistance movement and the Palestine

problem as a whole began not in 1977, when the ultra-rightist Likud bloc headed by the terrorist Begin came to power in Israel. The previous government of the Labour party (MAI) also did not recognise the Palestine Liberation Organisation and also did not want even to hear about the creation of a Palestinian state. It preferred the tactics of "creeping colonisation" designed to achieve the aim of creating the "Greater Israel" without resorting to open annexation. It was during the rule of the Labour government that the "Movement for Greater Israel" and "Gush emunim" Zionist organisations came into being and started calling for the speediest colonisation of Arab lands. But in fact this aim was proclaimed already at the dawn of Zionism.

The preterm elections to the Israeli parliament in June 1981 showed that the Likud bloc's victory in 1977 was not accidental. In conditions of the development of capitalism in Israel, the fanning up of nationalism and chauvinism that gloss over class contradictions in many ways, in conditions of the widespread vogue to copy the American way of life, the country's population, which in its majority voted in the past for "Labour Zionists", supported the programme of the accelerated development of private enterprise proclaimed by Likud and cast its ballots for the right-wingers. Another factor that contributed to this was the social and political demagoguery that the big bourgeoisie and the right-wingers headed by Begin put to use with the support of the military and the religious fanatics and which found response among certain sections of the Israeli society.

The creation of the most reactionary ever ruling coalition consisting of the ultra-right pro-fascist Herut party, the bourgeois Liberal party and the Mafdal religious party reflected the specificities of the socio-political evolution of the Israeli society.

One of these specificities is that the political structure of Israel includes Zionist parties and organisations which are linked with their branches in other capitalist states. This is true of the Labour party, that was in power for 29 years, of the MAPAM party, the presently ruling Herut and Liberal parties and of the religious political parties which were represented in all governments and no less zealously supported the seizure of Arab lands and the idea of creating a "Greater Israel". Along with close cooperation with American imperialism this speci-

ficity of Israel's development gives the Israeli authorities the possibility of pursuing an openly impudent foreign policy and of ignoring all decisions of the international community on the Palestinian problem and the occupied Arab territories.

Without dwelling on the ideological mainstays of these major political groupings of Zionism in the question of Israel's future development it should be noted that long before the proclamation of the Israeli state there originated in Zionism various trends as regards Jewish settlements in Palestine. Two of them make up the core of Tel Aviv's present policy.

The first trend supports the idea of creating a "Greater Israel" and is connected with the territorial imperative. The second champions the idea of "Judenstadt" (Jewish state) proceeding from the priority of the demographic factor. The exponents of "Greater Israel" belong to Herut that dominates Likud. The supporters of the second trend, who uphold the policy of the eventual creation of a state with a predominantly Jewish population, comprise the ranks of the MAI and MAPAM parties that are presently in opposition.

The political debate about the future development of Israel became especially heated after the aggression of 1967 that resulted in Israel's occupation of the entire territory of Palestine. An important problem that was being solved by the Zionists was the fact of the existence of 1.6 million Palestinians on the occupied lands, mostly on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip (in 1979, only 1.1 million people lived there). The exponents of the "Jewish State" argued that considering the rapid population growth of Palestinians in Israel itself and the big number of the Arab population in the occupied territories, in the event of the annexation of these lands there would be a catastrophic change in the demographic situation and Israel would lose its Jewish character, thus putting in question the very idea of Zionism. While coming out for indirect annexation, the exponents of the "Jewish State" at the same time did not reject the idea of including a certain part of the occupied lands in the Israeli state.

The plans of Dayan and Allon became a tangible embodiment of the idea of integrating the Arab population in Israel's economic and public life and of annexing the occupied Arab lands. The first of them did not pro-

vide for the creation of Jewish settlements on the occupied lands in the near future and was directed at the economic integration of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Allon's plan provided for the creation of an enclave on the Jordan river Left Bank linked by a corridor with Jordan. This enclave, planned for the Palestinians, would border on the eastern part of the West Bank with Jewish settlements which would define Israel's border with Jordan.

Begin's policy in respect of the "administrative autonomy" of the West Bank and the Gaza strip, proposed by him in accordance with the Camp David agreements, became a new stage in the creation of a "Greater Israel", in the seizure of the Arab lands and driving the Palestinians from them.

Quite an extensive "national accord" exists in Israel concerning questions of the occupied lands and their annexation. A public opinion poll conducted early in 1980 showed that 50 per cent of all Israelis supported the establishment of new settlements in the occupied territories for considerations of security, while 19 per cent were for this without any particular motivation. The striving of the Israelis to seize Arab lands expresses itself both in the existing state ideology, the chauvinistic system of education and propaganda, and in the practice of the Zionists. Along with the activities of political parties to colonise Arab lands (each settlement is under the control of some party), the activities of the aggressive para-military religious-fascist "Gush emunim" organisation that enjoys the support of a considerable part of the population and sets up settlements on the West Bank without the official sanction of the authorities, a whole system of colonising Arab lands exists in Israel. It includes the Jewish Agency which has a special Department of Settlement. The "Bank leumi le Israel", which finances the Jewish Agency, plays a tremendous role in the colonisation of Arab lands. Operating in Israel is the Jewish National Foundation (JNF) the prime purpose of which is the purchase of land. It shall be noted that at present the state and the JNF control 18.8 million *dunams* (of which 14 per cent are the property of the JNF), or 93 per cent of the entire territory of Israel (within the 1967 borders), and 1.5 million *dunams* of land are in private ownership.

Jointly with the Department of Settlements of the Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation and the Department of Settlements of the Jewish Agency, the JNF arranges and directs work to set up and develop settlements in Israel and in the occupied territories. The organisation that directly colonises Arab lands, besides the military administration of the occupied lands, is the Israeli Land Department, or the Joint Committee for Settlements, that functions under the Ministry of Agriculture and leases or sells land in towns and countryside to organisations and individuals of Jewish origin. Its activities encompass the territory of Israel within the 1967 borders and the occupied Arab lands. The leadership of the Department includes seven representatives of the JNF and nine representatives of the ministries of agriculture, internal affairs, defence, construction, transport and communications, and finance. The Department was headed by prominent Zionists, including the present Defence Minister Sharon. At the same time the JNF, as it is said in its statute, "is recognised by the government and the World Zionist Organisation as an important instrument of expanding the territory of Israel".

By using various means, first of all naked violence, the Israeli Zionists seize the lands of Palestinian Arabs. Data about the correlation of land-ownership in Palestine on the eve of the proclamation of the State of Israel shows how they have succeeded in this. In 1945, Zionists actually did not own any land in 8 of Palestine's 16 districts, in three of them they owned less than a fifth of the land, and in another five, not more than 40 per cent of the land. Today the picture is totally different: in Israel (within the boundaries of 1967) there is no land belonging to Arabs while on the West Bank of the Jordan, Israelis now own more than a third of all land; a considerable part of the land on the Gaza Strip also belongs to Israelis. Israel uses all means to expand its possessions at the expense of Arabs. The Palestinian people did not succumb to the aggressor and annually on March 30 mark "The Day of Land Defence", strongly protesting against their expulsion from their homeland.

All the organisations engaged in the colonisation of Arab lands recognise the political guidance of the World Zionist Organisation. The 29th congress of the WZO was held in Je-

rusalem in 1978 and approved Begin's policy of setting up a ramified network of Jewish settlements in the occupied territories. The congress concentrated on discussing the demographic situation in the country and working out the tactics of the settlement policy in line with the aim of creating a Jewish state on the territory of the whole of Palestine.

It is forecasted by Tel Aviv that by 2000 the population of Israel will reach 5.5 million, of them 4.3 million (76 per cent) Jews and 1.2 million (24 per cent) Arabs. According to official statistics as of September 28, 1981, the country had a population of 3,968,000 of which 653,000 or 16 per cent, were Arabs. So the forecast envisages a considerable growth of the Arab population.

Proceeding from racial considerations in their domestic policy the Israeli Zionists are prepared to take extreme measures to prevent a growth of the Arab population in the country. It is apt to recall here the plan presented to the government by the senior official representative of the Ministry of Internal Affairs in Galilee, Koenig. It noted that "their increase [of Arabs. — B. Y.] in Galilee threatens our rule in this area". (Late in the 1970s of the 200,000 people living in that area 145,000 were Arabs). Koenig suggested various methods of changing the demographic situation there. His views reflected the racist aims of the government and were at variance with the official declarations about the equality of citizens in the country. The abovementioned document evoked a "proper" response from the Department of Settlements of the Jewish Agency: in 1979 it started the building of 12 Jewish settlements in Galilee.

The Israeli Zionists are trying to change the demographic situation also by other measures similar to the mass expulsions of Arabs from Arab territories seized in 1948. As reported by the London magazine *Middle East International*, the Israeli establishment has contingency plans to deport 700-800 thousand Arabs from the territory of Israel. It was thus that the Zionists headed by Prime Minister David Ben Gurion "solved" an analogous problem of "the unsatisfactory balance between the Jewish and Arab population" and saw to it that more than 2,000,000 Palestinians settled in Arab countries, including about 500,000 in Lebanon.

The policy of genocide in respect of the Arab people of Palestine, the policy of annexing Arab lands was con-

demned by numerous United Nations decisions. This was the case at the emergency special session of the UN General Assembly convened in December 1981 to study the question of Israel's annexation of Syria's Golan Heights and in June, July and August 1982 when the Security Council studied the question of curbing the Israeli aggression in Lebanon.

The General Assembly stated again that the seizure of Arab lands and their annexation convincingly confirm the fact that Israel is not a peace-loving country and called on all United Nations member countries to stop supplying it with arms and military equipment, to suspend any economic, financial and technological cooperation, to sever diplomatic, trade and cultural relations with it, so as to ensure a total isolation of the aggressor. But as before the United States voted against the United Nations decision and defended Tel Aviv's expansionist policy.

It is clear that this support for Israel fully accords with the interests of American imperialism's policy of hegemonism directed against the national liberation movement of the Arab people of Palestine and the vital interests of Arab countries.

In pursuance of reactionary aims and in alliance with American imperialism the world Zionist organisations which express the interests of the Jewish bourgeoisie in various countries, turned Israel into the base of expansion in the Middle East and did everything to consolidate Tel Aviv's military and economic potential.

This became especially obvious after 1978 when the Camp David accords were signed and Israel, on concluding a separate treaty with Egypt, succeeded in splitting the front of Arab states opposing its aggression. A new situation, however, was created by the absence of the results sought by Washington and Tel Aviv under the Camp David scenario—not a single Arab country supported the policy of separate deals with Israel. The United States tried to use this situation to expand its military presence in the Middle East by sending its shock troops of the rapid deployment force to Sinai, as part of the so-called multinational force and an "arbiter" in the circumstances created by the Israeli aggression in Lebanon.

After Camp David, Israel consolidated its military cooperation with the United States still further. The American-Israeli memorandum on mutual understanding in the field of strategic cooperation was signed at the close of 1981. This document shows that it is only by drawing on the aid and

support of US imperialism that Tel Aviv can pursue its policy of colonisation of Palestine and fulfil its reactionary plans of creation of the "Greater Israel". In conditions of Israel's growing international isolation this memorandum demonstrates the full support given by the United States to Israel's policy of annexing Arab lands and of genocide in respect of the Palestinians. The American-Israeli agreement on strategic cooperation also shows that the United States and Israel are trying to revive the Camp David process and channel it into the military-political sphere, into the sphere of military actions against Arab countries (this being most patently demonstrated by Israel's aggression in Lebanon), to use the American military presence and Israeli militarism as instruments of putting pressure on Arab countries. With brutality of the Nazi butchers the Israeli Zionists killed tens of thousands of civilians and rendered hundreds of thousands homeless. The destruction of Sabra and Shatila (the Palestinian refugees' camps) and the tragedy of many towns, villages and Palestinian camps in the south of Lebanon, razed to the ground, are yet another stage in the Israeli-US expansion against the Arab countries, an attempt to get control over the Arabs.

But these attempts are vain. Israel's aggression against Lebanon has convincingly shown that neither the Camp David separate deals nor intimidation can check the process of consolidating the unity of the Arab nation which has every possibility to give a fitting rebuff to the unrestrained plunder and merciless genocide on the part of Israel. Having exposed their predatory make-up, the Israeli expansionists suffered a political and moral fiasco in Lebanon.

The tragic events in Lebanon have clearly demonstrated that the Zionists and their US patrons have no intention to establish peace in the Middle East which can only be achieved through a just political settlement in the region.

This is precisely the position taken by the Soviet Union. On 16 September, it set forth a constructive programme of normalising the situation in the Middle East. The clear-cut principles of the programme are as follows: non-admissibility of aggression against, and seizure of, other peoples' lands; ensuring to the Arab people of Palestine its inalienable right to self-determination and independent statehood; guaranteeing the right to security and independent statehood; guaranteeing the right to security and independent development to all the states of the region. The implementation of these principles would lead to peace in the interests of all the nations. ■

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

U.S. MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN INDIAN OCEAN CRITICIZED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 pp 33-35

[Article by Alexander Chicherov, doctor of science (History): "Indian Ocean: Cooperation, Not Confrontation"]

[Text]

The essential and rather rapid changes occurring in the Indian Ocean engendered by both socio-economic and political shifts and the global processes are linked with liberation from imperialist and neocolonial exploitation and dependence which contributes to the greater independence of developing countries in international relations, and to their significance in world politics.

At the turn of the 1980s, the Indian Ocean area has been characterised by intensified anti-imperialist trends which have made themselves felt to a particularly great extent in the politics of the states opposing the Camp David deal and the "strategic cooperation" between Israel and the USA. The more vigorous struggle being waged by the nonaligned countries against the imperialist-supported racist regime of South Africa has also exerted a positive influence on the structure of international relations in the region. Certain changes in the foreign policy of ASEAN have also been registered, though the stand taken by its members regarding a number of world issues is marked by serious differences.

However, the negative changes in the structure of international relations in the Indian Ocean area were exacerbated in the latter half of the 1970s, stemming above all from the militaristic, aggressive trends in the foreign policy of the USA. The fear of the imminent, objectively predetermined progressive changes, including in the countries of the Indian Ocean region, which shook the entire system of imperialist foreign policy ties set up there in the 1950s-1960s, have considerably shrunk the sphere of imperialist

domination. This fear has brought to life the notorious theory of the "arch of instability", or the "arch of crises" by Zbigniew Brzezinski, as well as attempts by the US administration, aided by the mailed fist of the rapid deployment forces, to check the further development of processes which are not to the liking of imperialism. The desire for confrontation with world socialism and attempts to gain strategic military superiority over the USSR, primarily in the field of nuclear missiles, looms large in the American strategy.

Such is the main content of the "Carter doctrine" and the ideas and practice of Ronald Reagan, bringing to mind the worst days of the cold war, which are also intended for the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. From the concepts of Harold Brown on the need to wage "a war and a half" (a "small war" in Asia) to the ideas of Caspar Weinberger about "two and a half wars" (a "small" and a "big" war in Asia), and to the latter's maniacal thesis on being prepared for "any number of wars in any place of the world", and, finally, to the thesis of Ronald Reagan on the "acceptability" of a nuclear war are examples of the buildup of militaristic hysteria within the US administration.

In implementing this adventurist foreign policy, imperialism is seeking to draw the developing countries into an aggressive militarist policy and an unbridled arms race fraught with the spread of nuclear weapons in the region. The imperialists have staked on the use and aggravation of religious, national, territorial and other contradictions and disputes among the developing countries, on the intensification and in-

citement of local conflicts (between Somalia and Ethiopia, Iran and Iraq, and so on), on "controlling" and "guiding" them in the interests of reactionary imperialist forces, and on the splitting and emasculation of the non-aligned movement.

The Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf above all, the whole of the Middle East and Southwest Asia, have been proclaimed a new, "third strategic zone" (alongside Western Europe and the Far East) of military confrontation between imperialism and the Soviet Union. An attempt is being made to convert the Indian Ocean, too, into an arena of direct military confrontation between imperialism and world socialism and the national liberation movement.

There is a growing desire on the part of aggressive imperialist quarters to resort to military interference under changes in international relations in the region. The making of hasty and risky decisions by the US above all, in those "crisis situations" created by the imperialists in "vital zones" thousands of kilometres away from the territories of imperialist states are becoming much more likely. They are thus blatantly trampling under foot the generally recognised standards of international law, primarily the sovereign rights of the developing states located there.

Among the new elements in US militarist strategy in the region are the following:

—introduction of US forward-based strategic nuclear forces and their stationing on a permanent basis as a factor in the global arms race;

—considerable increase and qualitative change in the constant direct US military presence along different lines;

—finally, the stationing of the rapid deployment force which presents a direct threat to the coastal states in case "crisis situations" emerge.

Long before the beginning of the developments around Afghanistan which are posed as the "main reason" for or "justification" of the US militarist course, i. e., back in the early 1970s (without dealing at length with the history of the military bases and the CENTO and SEATO blocs) serious measures were being taken by the USA to militarise the Indian Ocean. The anti-Indian action by the US Navy in the Bay of Bengal in 1971 during the military conflict between India and Pakistan is a case in point.

In the mid-1970s, signs of military activity in the Indian Ocean were cle-

arly seen: the formation of an infrastructure of bases to meet Washington's strategic aims; regular calls to local ports by the shock groups of US Navy warships, including aircraft carriers; and the conducting of military exercises.

After the USA unilaterally refused to hold negotiations with the USSR on the limitation of military activities in the Indian Ocean, the infrastructure of bases belonging to the US and its allies was developed at a higher pace, especially in the latter half of 1978 and the early half of 1979. The aircraft carriers of the US Navy which are the strategic nucleus of the Pentagon armed forces in the region were brought in on a more permanent basis.

The years 1980 and 1981 clearly demonstrated the trends toward stationing US Navy and landing forces units on a permanent basis, as well as Washington's urge to implement, a further escalation of its military presence in the Indian Ocean in the coming years.

For example, since the mid-1970s, in conformity with the official decisions of the US government, Diego Garcia has been turned into a major US military strategic base.

Data on the unprecedented concentration of US aircraft carriers in the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea between 1978 and 1980 intended to put pressure on Iran and accomplish a counter-revolutionary coup there are widely known. The same is true of these ships' constant plying the Indian Ocean, and of the plans to create a US 5th Fleet there.

The USA has been involving its allies from various blocs—Great Britain, Australia, the FRG, and others—in that policy. A considerable number of French warships are present in the Indian Ocean also on a permanent basis.

In a bid to make ANZUS and ANZUK more active, Washington is trying to build up the military efforts of Australia and New Zealand, to use and link up their military bases into a single network with its own bases in the Indian Ocean and the Pacific, to militarise ASEAN and intensify its level of confrontation with the countries of Indochina.

Gaining access to military bases in Oman, Kenya and Somalia, using bases in Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Israel, and rendering large-scale military aid to the abovementioned states eloquently characterise the US militarist line at the turn of the 1980s. The participation of the troops of the United States and oth-

er NATO countries in the "international" forces in Sinai within the framework of the Camp David deal is a logic development of such a line which is provocative with respect to the majority of the countries in the region.

In Bahrein the US has its Jelfur base which serves American warships and reconnaissance planes. In Oman, Washington uses Es-Elbe, Tamrante and Masira air bases, and naval bases in Matrah and Salala as well. In Kenya, US armed forces have at their disposal the Mombasa port and the Nanyuki and Embakasa air bases, and in Somalia, the Berbera and Mogadishu ports.

The Pentagon attaches special importance to Australia where it has communication centres of the US Navy in North-West-Cape and ground tracking stations in Alice Springs and Woomera. The US Navy Command plans to build a new base in Western Australia which will serve the US fleet in the Indian Ocean on a permanent basis. At present, US strategic aviation has its aircraft at the airports in Darwin and Lirmont, whereas missile-carrying submarines are based in the Cockburn Sound Port at the Indian Ocean coast.

US partnership with the racist regime of South Africa provides the USA with fresh opportunities to use the naval base in Simonstown.

The Pentagon displays much interest in Egypt. According to the Arab press, the USA is building two military bases there: in Ras-Banas and near Mersa-Matruh. One of them is to be used by the Pentagon to stockpile nuclear weapons, while the other is intended for chemical and bacteriological weapons. Washington also plans to build a big military air field in Ras-Banas and an electronic tracking centre in El 'Alamein, which will consist of powerful radar installations and a station for processing information obtained from its spy satellites.

The Pentagon is bending every effort to build naval and air bases in Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, the Sudan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Djibouti.

A real alternative to the alarming situation that has taken shape in the area is the proposal made by the non-aligned countries to create a zone of peace in the region, a proposal supported by the Soviet Union.

In accordance with a proposal made by a group of nonaligned countries, including India, Sri Lanka, Madagascar and others, in 1971, the 26th UN General Assembly adopted a well-known Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a

Zone of Peace. To prepare for practical measures to translate this declaration into reality, the 27th UN General Assembly in 1972 adopted a decision to set up a UN Special Committee on the Indian Ocean. The 1979 Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the region, was another step in implementing the idea of converting the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. It adopted the Principles of Agreement on the Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. In 1979, the 34th UN General Assembly passed a decision in accordance with the recommendations of the above said Meeting on holding an international conference on the Indian Ocean in Colombo (Sri Lanka) in 1981. The preparation of this conference was entrusted to a UN Special Committee on the Indian Ocean.

Since June 1980, the UN Special Committee on the Indian Ocean has been examining practical problems of preparing an international conference, above all the essence of the concept of creating a zone of peace in that area, including problems of foreign military presence, nuclear weapons, peaceful settlement of disputes, and so on.

The discussion demonstrated the closeness of the stance taken by the USSR and other socialist countries with that of the majority of the Indian Ocean states. At the same time, the USA, Great Britain, Australia and some other western states joined the discussion from obviously militaristic positions and spared no efforts to frustrate the UN decision on the convocation of an international UN Conference on the Indian Ocean. A similar stand was taken by Japan. Aware that this conference might well promote the disclosure of the militaristic positions of the United States and its allies, the Western countries thwarted its holding in 1981, with the developments around Afghanistan as a false pretext. The 36th UN General Assembly reaffirmed the need to convene the conference no later than the first half of 1983. However, the USA and its allies are going out of their way to prevent this forum from being held.

Of course, the USSR does not deny that it has its own state interests in the Indian Ocean region, which, however, in no way contradict the concept of the zone of peace, and have nothing in common with US claims to zones of "vital interests". The Soviet Union cannot be indifferent to whether the Indian Ocean becomes an arena of pea-

ceful cooperation of states or a scene of confrontation. The creation of a zone of peace in this region not so far away from the southern borders of the USSR would undoubtedly promote the strengthening of the Soviet Union's security. On the contrary, the whipping up of tension and the expansion of the military presence of the USA and other non-littoral countries there would increase the threat to the USSR's security from the south.

The Soviet Union approaches certain concrete aspects of the proposals made by the littoral states in conformity with this stand. It supports their demands that all foreign military bases in the Indian Ocean be eliminated and that nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction be not stationed there. These states also insist that the nuclear powers should undertake not to use nuclear weapons against the littoral and continental states and that they should refrain from stationing armed forces and armaments which would threaten the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of the states.

Thus, from the general political viewpoint, i. e., that of the struggle for spreading military defence to different areas of the world, and from the viewpoint of its national interests, the USSR consistently supports the conversion of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

The Soviet Union's stand with respect to ensuring peace, stability and security in the Indian Ocean was elucidated by Leonid Brezhnev in his speech to the Indian Parliament in December 1980 and reaffirmed by the 26th Congress of the CPSU. "The Soviet Union," Leonid Brezhnev emphasised, "firmly supports the idea of converting the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. We are prepared to work actively in this direction with the other states concerned. We maintain that the Indian Ocean was and continues to be the sphere of vital interests of states located on its shores, and not of any other states."

It was pointed out in the joint Soviet-Indian declaration signed by Leonid Brezhnev and Indira Gandhi in December 1980 that the two countries insist on eliminating all the foreign military and naval bases in that area, such as Diego Garcia, that they stress the inadmissibility of setting up any new bases and denounce any attempts to build up foreign military presence in the Indian Ocean, irrespective of the pretext under which it might be done. The parties also stated their readiness to collaborate for the sake of the early implementa-

tion of the UN declaration proclaiming the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

The Soviet Union highly appreciates the realistic approach of the Indian government to key international issues, I. Gandhi's contribution to the struggle for peace and security of nations and against imperialism, neocolonialism and racism.

In his speech at the 17th Congress of Soviet Trade Unions held in March 1982, Leonid Brezhnev set forth an extremely important new peace proposal which also bears on the Indian Ocean. "We hold in general," Leonid Brezhnev said, "that the world situation requires utmost restraint of the two opposing blocs of states in their military activity. We would be ready, for example, to reach an agreement on a mutual restriction of activities of the navies. In particular, we would deem it possible to agree that the missile-carrying submarines of the two sides would be withdrawn from the present-day vast areas of combat patrol and their navigation be limited by mutually agreed upon frontiers. We would be also ready to discuss the spread of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans, especially to areas with the most heavily travelled sea routes. In a nutshell, we favour a greater part of the World Ocean becoming a zone of peace in the near future."

Leonid Brezhnev's answer to the letter from Australian peace supporters in which he confirmed the Soviet Union's willingness at any time to continue negotiations with the USA on the limitation of the military activities in the Indian Ocean evoked a broad response.

These proposals were met with great interest by the peaceloving public throughout the world. Today, this public has come to play an ever greater role in the struggle for disarmament, in particular for converting the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and for eliminating pro-imperialist military bases there.

In the course of the Soviet-Indian talks during Prime Minister of India Indira Gandhi's visit to Moscow last September Leonid Brezhnev reiterated that the weakening of military tension in the Indian Ocean should be achieved along the lines of implementing the proposals set forth by the littoral countries on its conversion into a zone of peace, and expressed again the Soviet Union's readiness for holding any negotiations on the problems of the Indian Ocean—bilateral and multilateral—with all countries concerned on the basis of full equality and equal security.

PHILIPPINE ECONOMIC PROGRESS LAID TO STATE ACTION

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 pp 36-38

[Article by Vsevolod Arkhipov, Dr. Sc. (Econ.): "Economic Achievements and Difficulties"]

[Text]

The Philippines is one of the few developing nations to have made essential headway in expanding its productive forces in the seventies as the world capitalist economy grew increasingly plagued with crises. The gross internal product (GIP) in constant prices almost doubled over the decade, whereas the gross national product (GNP, very close in size to GIP) per capita comprised 1,862 pesos in 1979 as compared to 1,428 pesos in 1972 and 736 pesos in 1965. In 1980 the same indicator in current prices was equal to 5,660 pesos (or \$ 755).

The fast growth of the Philippine economy was explained, to a large measure, if not predominantly, by the much more energetic interference of the state into economic processes, more effective planning, greater aid to development, extensive encouragement and diversification of exports, and heavy investment (private and public) in the national economy: from 1972 to 1979 they increased in real indicators from 11.6 billion to 63.4 billion pesos. A significant contributory factor was the discovery of oil fields on the coastal shelf. Though they have only been worked since 1979 and they account for only 5-10 per cent of the country's needs in liquid fuel, they save the country a good deal of hard-to-get foreign currency. Another favourable factor was enough skilled technicians and engineers, due to a well-developed system of training and education.

As the main economic sectors developed more or less evenly, the GIP pattern did not undergo any radical changes. A certain reduction in the relative share of agriculture (from 29.4 to 26 per cent) and services, trade and transport grouped in Philippine statistics under one heading (from 42.9 to 38.7 per cent) was compensated for by a respective increase in heavy industry and construction (from 30.1 to 35.2 per cent).

Noticeable changes have taken place in agriculture, which in many respects continues to be the backbone of the country's national economy. A land reform and intensified production made for a rapid growth in many crops, specifically, paddy, the Philippines' staple food of all exports; in 1978 this index fell to 40, whereas the figure rose to 5.1 million tons in 1972, to 7.3 million tons in 1979, to 7.706 million tons in 1980. The average yield

over this period almost trebled, owing largely to expansion of irrigated acreage (1.3 million hectares in 1979 as opposed to 616,000 in 1970). For the first time in many decades, the Philippines is self-sufficient in rice and even exports it. In 1972, for example, the country imported a \$600 million worth of rice; by 1977 it had considerable surpluses; and in 1977-1979 it exported some 450,000 tons.

As to the industrial sector, the most remarkable positive changes occurred in the pattern of the manufacturing industry, where enterprises, according to the latest official data, numbered 9,500 (five or more workers) in 1977 as compared to 2,500 in 1974. Their added value share in the manufacturing industry as a whole was 39 per cent, fixed assets constituted 41 per cent, and annual investments equalled 44 per cent. Employment in these new industrial enterprises has reached 535,000 (as opposed to 104,000 in 1974), while in the manufacturing industry as a whole, it almost doubled. In 1975-1979 its average annual rates of production growth hit the 8.3 per cent mark as compared with 6.4 per cent in 1967-1972. Though still the prevailing medium, small-size and handicraft enterprises are being steadily and rapidly ousted by larger businesses. Electrical instruments and devices, chemicals and metal-working are the key lines of production in heavy industry.

Foreign trade has been characterised by a sharp rise both in exports (from \$1.1 billion in 1970 to \$5.8 billion in 1980) indicative of the country's increased productive capacities, and in imports demonstrative of the vigorous efforts to modernise the economy and of the enlarged foreign currency potential.

The most striking feature of exports, particularly over the past five years, was rapid diversification and a growth of non-traditional products (those whose sales did not exceed \$5 million in 1968). In 1970, the five major traditional export articles—coconut oil, copra, sugar, copra concentrate and timber—accounted for 75 per cent of all exports; in 1978 this index fell to 40, whereas the share of non-traditional export products (knitted goods and garments, electrotechnical goods, leather products and footwear, chemicals and furniture) skyrocketed from

6.7 per cent in 1972 to over 50 per cent in 1980. This impressive growth of cost volume could be achieved only through diversification.

The rapid growth of infrastructure also reflects the Philippines' intensive economic growth. Specifically, the country's network of highways was extended from 55,400 km in 1965 to 77,300 km in 1972, to 129,200 km in 1979 which has involved remote, formerly inaccessible areas in the commodity-money process. Sea and air transport, as well as communications have also made headway.

The Philippines' economic achievements seem particularly impressive against a background of unfavourable domestic and, specifically, international events. The country was hit hard by the fuel and energy crisis: it had to pay more than \$30 per barrel of imported oil (the major source of its energy resources) in the latter part of 1980 as compared to \$1.9 in 1972. In 1980, oil imports cost it \$2,100 million, or over \$800 million more than in 1979, though the physical volume of imported oil remained roughly the same. From 1973 to 1980 an 8 per cent decrease in the physical volume of the country's oil imports was concurrent with a 910 per cent increase in their cost. The \$2,090 million which the Philippines paid for imported oil in the first nine months of 1981 alone comprised 39 per cent of its total import costs.

The Philippines were not in a position to meet this skyrocketing rise in oil import costs with an adequate increase in foreign currency earnings. Despite a general upswing in the country's exports, their rate of growth in certain years was low due to unfavourable world prices for some staples, traditional for the country. This artificial level of prices was often maintained by Western industrial nations, the Philippines' major trade partners. For example, prices for sugar (a major Philippine export article for a number of years in the past decade) fell from 30 to 6 cents per lb. over 1974-1978 because of US refusal to join the International Sugar Agreement. Consequently, the Philippines' sugar export earnings plummeted over these years from \$737 million to \$197 million, or more than 3.7-fold, sending this product to the fourth or fifth place in the export pattern. Prices of sugar began to climb only in 1980, but the prices for coconut palm products and tropical timber which had been on the up for several preceding years recently went down.

In general, the terms of trade (export-import price ratio) have been almost continually unfavourable to the Philippines which has had to spend an ever greater part of its export earnings to purchase just the same amount of import goods. Towards the late 1970s, the index number of export-import prices had dropped to 70 as against 100 in 1972, and the tendency continued more intensively into 1980.

And, finally, the country's efforts to enlarge its foreign currency income run into the Western powers' discrimination against a series of Philippine goods, particularly industrial, the most promising and, therefore, the most important part of the country's exports. This discrimination not only limits the Philippines' sales on the major markets, but also checks the development of its young manufacturing industry. This discrimination affects textile products, first and foremost. The US, the Common Market countries, Canada and Australia, which buy

90 per cent of the Philippine-made garments have set quantitative restrictions on their imports combined with high customs tariffs. A system of import quotas for Philippine-made footwear is operative in Japan and Canada; it will probably be introduced in the other abovementioned countries. Australia has imposed restrictions on imports of Philippine handicrafts, ceramic bathroom equipment and plywood; Britain, France and West Germany have imposed similar restrictions on foodstuffs, specifically fruit juices; and New Zealand, on furniture and other wooden articles. Discrimination against certain Philippine goods and the continued instability of their chief buyers' markets have reduced the country's export earnings (in 1981 as compared to 1980) from such staples as sugar, timber and iron ores.

The high rates of interest on Western countries' large loans are also a heavy burden for the Philippines.

These external factors stand out among many others that have been adversely affecting the Philippine economy since the end of the past decade. In 1980, the rate of GIP growth fell to 4.7 per cent, i.e., below the 1972 level (in between it fluctuated from 5.3 to 8.7 per cent) with the country's adverse balance of payment reaching \$350 million. In 1981, the imbalance hit the record figure of \$560 million which sent the worried government into speeded-up search for foreign loans. By the late 1980 the country's foreign debt increased to almost \$12,000 million (with roughly \$2 million added in the course of the year) and continued to climb to \$15,800 million in 1981. Public foreign currency reserves dropped from \$3,155 million in 1980 to \$2,573 million in 1981. The unprecedented hikes in imported oil products' prices (in 1980 they doubled) hit hard the country's industry, transport and public finances and accelerated the rates of inflation to 19 per cent.

In the opinion of some Philippine economists inflation, which has become the country's "enemy number one", has an immediate devaluating effect on the peso (a 38 per cent decline in the exchange value by the late 1979 as against 1972) and lowers the living standards of the overwhelming majority of the population.

Devaluation of the local currency has increased the cost of industrial and infrastructure projects already under construction or those in the blueprints; the shortage of funds for financing made the government seriously reconsider the development plan for 1978-1982. In fact, it has been replaced by a new economic programme made public in October 1979 and later supplemented with additional provisions relating to energy.

The new programme envisages concentrated state efforts to achieve three objectives. First, to develop industries and enterprises for manufacturing finished and semi-finished products in the next five years. Second, to step up exports as energetically as possible to earn more foreign currency for financing industrialisation and meeting the country's other needs in imported goods as well as for paying off foreign debts. And, third (this aim was reformulated in June 1980), to develop on a vast scale the national energy resources to be rid of the intolerably expensive oil imports. This objective was recognised in 1980 as the most important. The huge sum of \$5,400 million was budgeted for the next five years in line with this programme.

There are plans to increase hydroelectric stations' capacities almost five-fold—from 800,000 to 3,800,000 kWt. Most of the new hydroelectric stations are expected to be built on Mindanao Island and in the remote areas of Luzon Island.

More emphasis has been placed on large-scale geological prospecting for oil. Some 150 wells will be drilled in the 1980s in the shelf area and more than 50 on land. At present, only two deposits in the shelf area are producing oil: the Nido whose productivity has sharply decreased, and the Kadlao which went into operation in August 1981. The government hopes, however, that the discovery of new fields in the neighbourhood of the shelf (Matinlock-Pandan, Libro, and, quite recently, Tara and Galok) and their prospective development will cut down the country's oil imports roughly by one-fourth by the middle of the current decade.

Intensive exploration led to the discovery of new large deposits of coal the prospective resources of which are estimated at 175 million tons. Further efforts can bring them up to 600 million tons. In the next five years, coal production is expected to rise from 420,000 tons (1980) to 3,700,000 tons (1985), i.e., almost nine-fold.

The Philippines boasts of large resources of cheap and effective geothermal energy; in 1979 it ranked third amongst the eight nations that use it. In the 1980s the country intends to build more electric plants working on geothermal energy. In the late 1984, it plans to launch its first atomic power project (620,000 kWt).

As mentioned above, the programme of economic development attaches great significance to the further industrialisation of the country. In the 1950s-1970s priority was given to consumer goods production; as the result, the Philippines became almost self-sufficient in this field.

Now a marked emphasis is being laid on heavy industry; \$4,000 million (mostly foreign credits and direct investments) has been earmarked for 11 projects in this field. These include both individual enterprises and whole groups of them such as the following: a steel plant with a complete production cycle; a petrochemical refinery to use both local and imported oil; a pulp-and-paper factory; enterprises to manufacture equipment for cement plants; two diesel engine plants; etc.

An important producer and exporter of copper among capitalist nations, the Philippines loses much profit because it exports copper concentrate instead of pure metal. Therefore, it intends to build a copper-smelting complex to process more than half of the concentrate produced in the Philippines. Its waste will be used to make

phosphate fertilizers at a special facility to be constructed concurrently. The great amount of energy needed by these plants will be supplied by an experimental geothermal electric station in Tongonan which will also provide electricity for an aluminum factory, one of the new industrial projects.

Cement production is a well-developed heavy industry in the Philippines. Its particularly fast growth in the 1970s was stimulated by the extensive construction of roads, bridges, ports and irrigation systems, houses and offices, as well as the heightened demand for cement in many Asian countries.

The total production of 18 cement plants in the country approximates today 4.5 million tons per annum; a million tons goes for export. As the supply is inadequate to the demand, several more cement plants will be built.

The Philippines is the world's largest producer and exporter of coconut palm products, accounting for over \$1,000 million worth of export earnings (27 per cent of the total receipts) in 1979, including \$740 million for coconut oil. The industry provides jobs for 12 million Filipinos, who cultivate and process this crop, which explains the government's decision to build several more coconut oil mills.

The industrialisation programme is beginning to bear fruit: the first enterprise to produce ethyl alcohol as a cheaper motor fuel (in mixture with gasoline) has gone into operation; phosphate fertilizer, diesel motor and copper-smelting plants are under construction; blueprints are being drafted for several other enterprises to be built by the experienced construction firms which are being selected.

The new economic programme has intensified investment activities. In 1980, the breathtaking sum of 5,300 million pesos was invested in the national economy, an unprecedented fact for the Philippines.

True, the Ministry of Industry says that the country's experience in the construction of large-scale enterprises is very inadequate. Old contract rules, specifically those relating to foreign contractors are being reconsidered as a top priority new typical provisions meeting the national interests are being introduced.

In conclusion, it must be pointed out that there are still numerous economic pitfalls besetting the Philippines. How they will be coped with or offset depends on the country's ability to materialise the new economic programme, i.e., to commission the projected industrial and energy capacities and to finance the economic growth on a larger scale, through increased exports.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE PROGRESS SINCE INDEPENDENCE LAUDED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 pp 39-41

[Article by Andrei Tokarev: "Dawn Over the Islands"]

[Text]

The most diverse people were fated to make great geographical discoveries. Merchant Fernão Gomes never thought of such a thing when he was preparing his ships for a journey to the western coast of Africa. He was just counting beforehand the profits he would get from the trade monopoly for the area of 1,500 km south of Sierra Leone granted to him by King Alfonso V of Portugal.

Today we are not so interested in whether his expectations came true. His ships, commanded by captains João de Santarém and Pedro Escobar happened upon an unknown island at the equator which they called São Tomé because they reached it on St. Thomas Day, December 21, 1470. Four weeks later, on St. Anthony's Day, the seafarers discovered another island, which they not unnaturally called Santo Antonio. Soon enough they were corrected—the island was to be called Príncipe in honour of Prince João, Alfonso V's son and heir. So as not to offend the Saint, his name was given to the settlement that appeared there. For five centuries the two islands were to be a Portuguese colony.¹

In 1904, Russian warships passed the archipelago. Russian writer A. S. Novikov-Priboi who served on one of them wrote: "The Island of São Tomé, which belongs to Portugal came into view on the right of the squadron. From afar, it looked like a small grey cloud which had fallen on the plain of the sea."

¹ Before 1961, the São Tomé and Príncipe Overseas Province also included the enclave of São João Baptista de Ajuda in Dahomey (now Benin). After the country won independence, the Portuguese resident was expelled.

I don't want to dispute that impression: perhaps, the would-be writer had some foreboding of the Tsushima debacle that lay in store for the squadron. Or maybe the island does look grey from a ship. But what you see flying in its expanses of verdure which suddenly is cut through by a landing strip stopping abruptly at the verge of water.

We left the cool plane, and the moment the engine stopped, unusually thick silence enveloped everything around—the silence of sultriness. It took several minutes for human voices and the din of car engines to become discernible.

"Ours is a small country," I heard my fellow traveller from São Tomé say, "and everything here from the airport to the towns is also diminutive. But its beauty is in no way inferior even to Côte d'Azur!"

A highway lined with coconut palms running almost along the entire perimeter of the mountainous island leads to the capital. In places it clings to the ocean coast, and the palms avail themselves of a chance to lean towards it coquettishly as if it were a mirror, and then it winds like a serpentine to a height of several hundred metres. From there you can see golden fringes of sand pressed to the waterline by emerald woods and cliffs descending to the ocean at points. The waves crash below and salute with white spray. Mountain springs and rain form rivulets that seek the shortest route to the coast and fall down the slopes to the lower tiers of the mountains, then struggle further through thick verdure and stones. I was enchanted by the view and feasted my eyes on the exotic sight. It occurred to me that this was how I pictured the legendary Treasure Island as a boy...

But there was no Jolly Roger flying above or treasures hidden, literally or figuratively, in the bowels of the islands; nor does the islands' history offer any romantic story. Reality was commonplace and merciless. Slave traders used São Tomé and Príncipe as a stopover in shipping slaves from Africa to Latin America. Some of them were bought on the spot by Portuguese immigrants who had acquired plantations, *rozás*. Coffee and cacao, which had been brought as ornamental plants, soon became the colony's staples. Coconut palms and banana trees, sugar cane, vegetables and fruit were also grown on the plantations. After slavery was abolished in the nineteenth century, labourers were simply hired and became known as *contrafados*, that is, "contracted". But their position changed little.

Each major plantation with its irrigation system, routes for transporting crops and places for initial processing and storage was a "state within a state" having its own laws and practices with which the governor himself preferred not to interfere. The more powerful planters even issued their own money for the *contrafados* who could use it in shops run by a given *roza* (they were forbidden to buy anything in other shops under pain of severe penalties). Besides, they could leave the estate only with a special pass which was checked at every turn and revoked by policemen or military patrols at the slightest pretext. I am not speaking here of something which happened a hundred or fifty years ago, but the mid-1970s.

Day in, day out, Africans toiled on the plantations under the harsh tropical sun with no days off, fell ill, died of the back-breaking labour and fell victim to abuse. Forty-year-old José Sebastião who works at a nationalised plantation told me with bitterness and pain of those days, now gone forever but not forgotten by him and his compatriots.

"Can you imagine," he said, "that a worker who picked up a nut from the ground could be accused of stealing and have the nut split open with a machete on his head then and there? Often such "jokes" had an unhappy ending. After all, nobody could blame the owner for the death of a slave. And that was what we were—nothing but slaves."

The slaves responded to ruthless exploitation and arbitrariness with uprisings. In 1517, slaves from several *rozás* united against their owners in the first

major uprising, which was, like all subsequent ones, ruthlessly put down by the colonialists. On February 3, 1953, they shot at a peaceful demonstration of Africans in São Tomé demanding better working conditions and an end to violations of their rights. The bodies of those killed were thrown from the jetty into the water. Hundreds were put into prisons where agents of the Portuguese secret police, PIDE, subjected them to torture. Photographs kept in the country's history museum show that the Salazar secret police learned well what the Gestapo butchers taught them.

The São Tomé people remember and revere their heroes—Rei Amador, Youn Gato and other leaders of the anti-colonial uprisings, and on February 3 the country commemorates all those who perished in the struggle for liberation.

On July 12, 1975, after the end of the fascist regime in Portugal, it granted independence to the islands. By that time, the anti-colonial struggle of the people of São Tomé had been going on for fifteen years led by the Movement for the Liberation of São Tomé and Príncipe which declared that it aimed eventually at building a society without exploitation of man by man. Since 1972, this political organisation, which has become the ruling party in the new state, has been headed by Manuel Pinto da Costa, one of its founders. He has also become President of the Democratic Republic of São Tomé and Príncipe (with an area of about 1,000 sq km and a population of 90,000), which has joined the United Nations, the OAU and the nonalignment movement.

When abandoning their former colony, the Portuguese, as in Angola and Mozambique, were at their most spiteful: they carried away almost all equipment of the few enterprises there were, leaving behind no buses or cars, not even those fit only to be consigned to the scrap-iron heap. They tore out the electric wiring in some offices and even went to the trouble of carting away the stone benches for experiments in the veterinary laboratory. What were the motives of the fleeing colonialists? Were they driven by impotent rage over the unwillingness of the people to tolerate their sway or by the secret hope that, unable to overcome the disruption, the young republic would turn to the mother country for aid? If the

latter was the case, they certainly miscalculated.

There is again lively traffic on the roads of São Tomé and Príncipe—lorries, small cars and buses race along them. New equipment has been installed at power plants that give electricity to the town and the countryside, workshops and hospitals. It took the government a little over six years to acquire all this. Soviet Belarus tractors have won recognition there and diligently plow the plantation fields which, along with industrial enterprises, became state property on September 30, 1975, ten weeks after independence was proclaimed.

Officially, the working day starts at seven, but even before daybreak, at about four in the morning, people take to the road. Women with babies on their backs and men carrying bundles in their hands (breakfast and lunch) hurry to their work places while it is still cool or to the shops and market-places to be there when they open.

A young driver stops his car and waits patiently for an old man to shuffle across the street, even if there is no crosswalk. This is not just ostentatious courtesy but a deeply rooted custom. The gallantry of the São Tomé residents toward each other may seem incredible—a grown-up man uses the respectful form of address to a five-year-old child. The grown-up is merely displaying farsightedness: he will be just as helpless as that child some day and will then reap the fruits of the wise upbringing.

The moment the sun rises, women of all ages go to rivers and lakes carrying baskets of linen. It looks as if the entire country is doing its washing early in the morning. Even little girls are busy rinsing their tiny clothes. Then all the space where the sun shines is covered with colourful fresh linen.

Meanwhile the sun is blazing hot; it's time for a break. You won't be able to have a cup of coffee because it is rarely sold: almost the entire crop of coffee and cacao is exported and accounts for most of the state's hard currency earnings. But on the other hand, beer and lemonade produced by the local Ceto and Flebê factories are readily available in any shop or market-place.

The economy was greatly damaged in 1979 by the epidemic of African pig plague which reduced the total number

of pigs. The government took urgent measures to alleviate the blow. New agreements were signed on purchases of meat and other foodstuffs, and a network of people's shops and cooperatives has been set up and is operating, giving the government reliable support in combatting black marketeering and sabotage in trade.

Despite such setbacks, the people's standard of living is indisputably going up. The government is trying to ensure the equality of its citizens not only constitutionally but also in practice. Unemployment and destitution, two social scourges inherited from colonialism, are practically nonexistent in the country. A law on social security and social insurance for the population was adopted on the eve of the fourth anniversary of independence. The state provides allowances to large families and those who have lost a breadwinner. Pensions have been introduced and holiday homes and sanatoria opened for working people and veteran workers. Medical care and secondary education have become free of charge. All this confirms that the country's leadership is genuinely concerned with the needs of the people.

New revolutionary traditions have developed in the young republic. The state flag is solemnly hoisted before the presidential palace and above the government buildings and offices every morning at eight o'clock and taken down at half past five in the afternoon. At these moments, traffic stops in the streets; drivers and passengers leave their cars, and even children stand at attention.

I saw a tall bamboo pole with the three-coloured flag of the republic at the entrance to one of the schools. São Tomé Young Pioneers, a girl and two boys of about ten, stood under a small awning on both sides of the standard clenching wooden submachine guns. They were not playing, however; there have been cases when enemies of the people's rule hauled down the state flags and hung black cloths in their places. That is why children born in colonial times are taught to regard the national flag as the symbol of the new life they are now building and must defend.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

TRADITIONALIST 'THIRD WAY' OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DENIED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 pp 44-46

[Article by Nikolai Lidlain, Cand. Sc. (Econ.): "The Concept of 'Alternative Development'"]

[Text]

The developments of the recent decade have shattered many a concept which dominated the theory and practice of the developing nations in the 1950s and 1960s. This applies, above all, to the "catching-up development" doctrine which claimed that Asian, African and Latin American countries should cover the main stages of socio-economic evolution of the developed capitalist countries at a much faster pace and come up to the Western standards of consumption in the lifetime of one, or at the most, two generations. However, in the early 1980s, the per capita income gap between the majority of young states and the industrialised countries of the West reached 1,110 per cent, and, given the chronic economic difficulties of the West and the everrising cost of energy, only a few newly-free countries (either possessing unique mineral resources or figuring in the international division of labour as exporters of manufactured goods) could hope for a considerable acceleration of their economic growth and the approximation of their basic economic indices to those of the capitalist centres.

As global economic problems grew worse, the world scientific community began to display increased attention in the prospects for the newly-free countries' development. A number of long-term world economic forecasts of recent years have, for the first time, expressed apprehensions that, owing to the limited reserves of some minerals on the planet and the threat of global eco-collapse, most Asian and African countries will not be able, either in this decade or the next, to reach an average per capita consumption level as compared with capitalist countries. They have called into question the Western development model based on wasteful exploitation of na-

tural resources and extended consumption, and refuted the belief that the economic mechanism which was evolved in the developed capitalist countries after WW II can avert prolonged and serious interruptions in the reproduction process. The rampant processes that state-monopoly capital has lost control of have also caused greater alienation of the individual in bourgeois society.

The crises that plague the world capitalist economy have made the negative aspects of capitalist orientation stand out in especially bold relief; this applies, in particular, to the unilateral dependence of some newly-free countries on the markets of the industrialised Western states. In most cases, the speed and scope of economic growth were clearly inadequate to ensure a sufficient increase in the number of job openings, to modernise traditional structures, to improve the living standards of the masses, and to exert a decisive influence on all forms of social and cultural life. Industrial development was often confined to limited areas and did little to stimulate other sectors of their multistructural economies. Advantages and difficulties resulting from economic growth were unevenly distributed among both regions and social groups. As a result, many millions of people remained on the sidelines of economic and social progress and failed to improve their living conditions. Moreover, in some countries their property status even deteriorated. According to IBRD estimates, in the late 1970s, 900 million people in the developing world (some 40 per cent of the total) lived below the level of absolute poverty (earning average incomes of less than \$100 a year). Their fate is appalling: misery, hunger and diseases abound; infant

mortality among them is thrice higher, life expectancy thrice lower and educational level 60 per cent lower than the average in the developing countries.

These were the main reasons that made many scholars from both industrialised and developing countries question the fundamental values of the capitalist system and challenge the contention that copying the Western path was the best way to solve the young states' pressing social and economic problems. They have discarded the "catching-up development" concept and attempted to evolve alternative models. As a result, in the 1970s, non-Marxist political economists have come up with a new trend which is conventionally referred to as an "alternative development" concept. Its proponents are sometimes called fundamentalists or radicals, advocating as they do a drastic reassessment of the goals and the philosophy of socio-economic transformations.

THE GOALS OF THE NEW TRENDS

This new trend was founded by scholars from the Swedish Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation (notably Marc Nerfin).¹ Presently, they have been joined by many serious researchers from other Western and developing countries and various regional and international organisations, including the UN Asian Development Institute, UN University, the Bariloche Foundation (Argentina), the Latin American Institute of Transnational Studies in Mexico, and the International Fund in Geneva. In other words, the evolution of "alternative models of development" is emerging as one of the most popular trends in non-Marxist studies concerned with the problems of the newly-free countries.

Many concepts of "alternative development" are strongly anti-capitalist. Capitalism, the radicals claim, leads to the social alienation of the individual, the degradation of moral values, the predatory exploitation of natural resources, the destruction of environment, and the funneling of natural and intellectual potential into the production of commodities and services unrelated to society's actual needs.

¹ See, for example, *Another Development: Approaches and Strategies*, ed. by Marc Nerfin, Uppsala, 1977. Dag Hammarskjöld Report. *What Now: Another Development, Development Dialogue*, 1975. 1/2.

On the whole, this trend is characterised by petty-bourgeois romanticism, disregard for class contradictions and objective laws of modern production, and an eclectic combination of the principles of socialism and capitalism. Its authors' general theoretic premises and practical recommendations are extremely vague and lack concreteness. They are unable to present an integral system of views on the prospects of social development, but rather confine themselves to outlining the general principles upon which the revised development philosophy is to rest.

These are, in the first place, the "basic needs" concept which is to serve as a universal basis for future developmental strategies devised for the industrialised capitalist and newly-free countries alike. In effect, the concepts evolved by this trend may be viewed as radical versions of the "basic needs" doctrine. Secondly, these imply greater activation of social and moral factors, or "human orientation". According to Sri Lankan scholar Ponna Vingaraja, man is the goal and the means of development and, therefore, a strategy must be evaluated in light of its being able to promote the personality's transformation from the object into the subject of social progress, fostering in it collectivist traits which will open up the broadest opportunities for self-expression, etc.

Non-Marxist scholars intend to work out alternative strategies which would envisage a more rational use of natural resources and more modest and simple production and consumption models geared to satisfy immediate needs. However, while putting forward the principles of their ideal society, ensuring freedom from exploitation and active participation of all social groups in state government, they do not normally specify how this society will be formed or ignore its socio-economic characteristics.

Their recommendations for the industrialised capitalist countries include introduction of restrictions on the consumption of meat and oil products, prohibition of private cars, development of public transportation, more economic and rational use of living and production space, longer utilisation of consumer goods, etc.

As for the developing countries, the radical theoreticians, while rejecting the "catching-up development" concept, differ in their opinions with respect to an alternative concept: some favour a "democratic and anti-bureaucratic socialism", others—the Chinese experiment with the "cultural revolution", still others—Ghandism. So-

me of them even hold that this concept should be based on principles inherent in traditional societies and communal life². In this connection, many of them publicise Mahatma Gandhi's motto, "Let us reduce our needs and provide ourselves with basic necessities", and call on the young sovereign states to turn to the spiritual values of traditional societies where they should seek the philosophical base of alternative development, or, to quote them, "renounce the 'Madison Avenue' culture" and espouse the "bicycle culture".

According to Varindra Tarrie Vittachi of India, "...This is the true dilemma of development: whether to tread the same mill [i. e., to follow the Western example. — N. L.], seeking outward answers to stop the growth of poverty by trying to meet the increasing demand for the things that industrial societies have found to be 'good', or whether to look inward (and, if necessary, backward in history) for the values of development that enabled people to avoid the fallacy that equates having more with being more."³ As disillusionment with the basic values of bourgeois society and Western civilisation grows, an increasing number of scholars in Western and developing countries join in praising life in traditional societies, which, they allege, are characterised by an even distribution of incomes, the absence of antagonisms between individual and society, the prevalence of sentiment over reason and arts over science, by harmony of man and nature, in short, by all those values that have long been missing in industrialised capitalist countries. Nostalgia for traditionalism is more or less present

² Western Social Democrats think that the long-term prospects of world development would best be served by the establishment of "democratic socialism" (or at least of some of its elements) which they describe as an ideal type of society and an institutional basis for alternative models. In their view, the ultimate goal is a bourgeois democracy of, for example, the Swedish type. The Social Democratic version of "socialism" has been vigorously advertised by the Socialist International as some sort of "third way" of social development in the former colonial periphery. This partially accounts for the interest the Swedish Social Democrats display in the elaboration of the "alternative development models" and the support they give to these efforts.

³ V. T. Vittachi, "A Fresh Look Back", *Newsweek*, January 26, 1976, p. 25.

in many concepts of alternative development.

Representatives of the radical trend are in favour of small-scale, predominantly agricultural, decentralised development. What they seek to counterpose to the West-centrist model is a way of development which is more in accord with national cultural traditions, historical heritage, local conditions and natural environment, which implies renunciation of bourgeois values such as individualism, the striving to accumulate riches, and the quest for new spiritual values based on collectivism and mutual help.

Many of them are inclined to see the causes for the developing world's backwardness in the nature of the world capitalist market, which is conducive to regular reproduction of relations of dependence and subordination, and to the concentration of riches on one extreme and poverty on the other, both within individual countries and the world capitalist economy as a whole. They maintain that the entire system of relations between the capitalist centre and its developing periphery, including economic aid, the international movement of the capital, technology sales, the communications, political and military agreements, etc., stimulates consumerism in the young states, promotes the import of capital-intensive technology which does not correspond to the domestic conditions and needs of these countries, enhances the sporadic nature of economic growth, and exacerbates social problems.

"Reviewing the literature, there is total agreement," wrote Latin American scholar Enrice Oteira, "in the inadequacy of the 'old model' (dependent capitalism) in terms of its inability to overcome underdevelopment, while in some of those works the old model is considered a fundamental cause of the perpetuation of underdevelopment."

"There is also wide agreement that the emphasis given to foreign capital and imported technology from 'developed' countries to the detriment of local labour, creativity, and accumulation, has been a key element in a structure of exploitation, international and internal marginalisation, and inequality."⁴

The radicals call for restricting the role of foreign resources and imported technology in economic development. As an alternative to foreign capital and economic ties with the capitalist

⁴ E. Oteira, "An Annotated Agenda for the Discussion of Collective Self-Reliance", *Liason Bulletin*, No. 1, 1977, p. 62.

centre they put forward a concept of "self-reliance" and economic cooperation between the newly-free countries. This concept is consistently applied to various economic levels: the household economy, village, area, district, county, region, and, along with the "basic needs" doctrine, constitutes the nucleus of the "alternative development" models. Since these envisage the priority production of food, agriculture is given pride of place in them.

They call for the reduction of ties between the world capitalist centre and its periphery, or for obtaining a more rational working of these ties in keeping with the principles underlying the demands for a new international economic order. They hold that this would, in principle, help reduce the developing world's dependence on the imperialist powers to a minimum. In this context, the theory of "collective self-reliance" is particularly emphasised.

IDEALISATION OF PAST AND PRESENT

The "alternative development" concept contains a number of positive elements capturing the specific nature of the immediate tasks facing the developing countries. Marxist scholars support the anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist thrust of these concepts, and their proponents' sincere desire to make man the focus of development, to satisfy basic needs, and to enhance the role of social and moral factors of development. The search for alternative models in the sphere of consumption, technology, information, agriculture, education, health protection, etc., has generated a number of new and interesting ideas⁵. At the same time, these concepts fail to produce an adequately coherent picture of social progress in the newly-free countries; quite often they substitute emotions for a rational analysis, contain inner contradictions and, what is more important, do not tally in many respects with the objective course of the historical process. The present writer is of the opinion that they tend to glorify the traditional forms of production, social relations, everyday life, moral values, etc.

Of course, there is no denying the importance of the traditional sector in

the economic and social life of some newly-free countries, particularly those plagued by overpopulation and dearth of natural resources where modern economic development is in its earliest stages. In such countries, the role of the traditional sector might even grow to a certain extent in the future. However, counting on traditionalism to cure the actual and imaginary ills of developing society, many theoreticians almost completely ignore the fact of the newly-free countries' participation in the world economy. Their recommendations cut across the main trends of world development, above all scientific and technological progress.

There is no doubt that the calls for returning to traditionalism are reactionary by their very nature, since, if implemented, they would lead to social and economic regression. Given the current "population explosion", a reorientation on primitive economic methods cannot fail to be conducive to an abrupt deceleration of economic growth, a drop in labour productivity and a deterioration of living standards. The balance between a society's needs, even if reduced to the minimum, and the opportunities for satisfying them would have to be maintained virtually through extinction, or even extermination (as was the case in Kampuchea) of millions of people, rather than through greater production of commodities and services. Is this not too great a price for the developing countries to pay in order to solve their problems?

Small-scale industries cannot provide for technical and social progress. Large-scale industrial production only is the *sine qua non* for long-term solution of the newly-free countries' social problems. Hence the conclusion that a rational combination of modern and traditional economic methods, modern and traditional sectors, rather than their opposition, is the best advised way of action.

While idealising traditional forms of social life, the proponents of the "alternative models" reject the modern forms, seeing the evolution of money-commodity relations, rather than the development of capitalism as the main cause of growing social conflicts and greater property inequality.

Although they are fully justified in maintaining that one of the main causes of the difficulties facing the newly-free countries is their dependent status within the world capitalist economy and the exploitative nature of relations forced on the underdeveloped periphery by the capitalist states, some representatives of the radical trend are disposed towards isolationism in

⁵ "Towards Another Development in Science and Technology", *Development Dialogue* (DD), 1979, No. 1; "Another Development in Education", *DD*, 1978, No. 2; "Another Development in Health", *DD*, 1978, No. 1.

external economic relations. However, it is obvious from the experience of many countries that withdrawal from the international division of labour will inevitably slow down the technical and economic restructuring of backward economies and undermine the material base of social progress, i. e., economic growth. Therefore, appeals for rationalising external economic ties voiced by some proponents of "alternative development" seem more convincing than the isolationists' views, although these, too, need to be specified.

Many proponents of "alternative development" are prone to idealise relations among the developing countries themselves. They believe that these, in contrast to the newly-free countries' relations with the capitalist world, can remove the essence of exploitation and dependence. Yet, since the process of division and cooperation of labour within the capitalist-oriented countries is steered by their ruling, essentially exploitative, social groups, and is controlled by the regional and the world markets, it obeys the general laws governing capitalist economy. Logically, it leads to greater differentiation among the newly-free countries and the appearance of new economic centres and new peripheries, the relations between which are highly reminiscent of those between the capitalist and the developing countries.

The radicals' plans for dealing with production and consumption problem are also rather simplistic. While calling for "complete egalitarianism", the utmost restriction of consumerism, the rationing of consumer goods, and emphasising the importance of ideological and moral factors in the newly-free countries' economic de-

velopment, many of them run to the extreme opposite from that of the proponents of West-centrist models, counterposing the moral and material factors in the production process and in social life in general.

The philosophy that poverty is good is, in the Marxists' opinion, a poor alternative to consumerism, hoarding, and striving for gain. No matter how complex the problems of the developing countries are, here, too, social progress depends on the satisfaction of reasonable material requirements corresponding to the criteria and possibilities of modern civilisation. It is incompatible with either static needs or primitive forms of production. The overall harmonious development of the personality, the satisfaction of spiritual "requirements of socially developed human beings"⁶ is inseparable from developing material production, since "the realm of freedom actually begins only where labour which is determined by necessity and mundane considerations ceases".⁷

It is evident that there is not, nor there can be, a "third way" of development in a world divided into two socio-economic systems. The developing countries have, in the final analysis, only two directions to follow—either toward capitalism or toward socialism. It is quite indicative that a number of provisions underlying the doctrines of "alternative development" are based on the experience of some socialist-oriented countries. And it is in fact socialist orientation that is the real alternative to the dependent capitalist road.

⁶ Karl Marx, *Capital*. Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1974, Vol. 3, p. 258.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 820.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

BUSINESS PRESSURE TO RELAX APARTHEID IN S. AFRICA REPORTED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 pp 47-50

[Article by Vyacheslav Molev: "South Africa: Heading for an Explosion"]

[Text]

A 43-mile drive from Johannesburg will take you to the deepest mine in the world—the Western Deep Levels. With its lowest level 3,963 m below the surface, this vast labyrinth of shafts and tunnels is manned by an army of some 12,000 black miners machine-gunning away the bedrock with air hammers. This results in 115 kilos of gold—an ounce per every two tons of rock—being added daily to the stock of bullion of the Anglo-American Corporation which owns the enterprise. All in all, 36 major gold mines in South Africa turn out some 700 tons of bullion per year—more than anywhere else in the capitalist world.

In the din and thunder of metal, people work doubled over or even prone with the hellish heat sapping their last strength. At a depth of 2,200 m, the earth's natural temperature is 45°C, which rises one degree with every additional hundred metres. The hot, damp, dusty atmosphere of the mine is suffocating...

No wonder this "golden hell" of a mine accumulates not only the precious metal but also an explosive charge of anger. And if modern gadgetry forestalls the danger of an imminent slide or cave-in, then, according to South African specialists on labour relations, it is anybody's guess when this charge of anger will go off in yet another social explosion among African miners.

Labour unrest in South Africa, which resulted in the Soweto tragedy, has been on the upsurge since the second half of the 1970s. Joining in the struggle for workers' rights have been black labourers of the Ford and Volkswagen works, Colgate-Palmolive chemical enterprises, builders of SASOL-2 coal-extracted liquid fuel plant, metallurgists,

and municipal employees of Johannesburg. In defiance of the racist laws, so-called "illegal" black trade unions made their appearance and, winning recognition from their employers step by step, they have stood firm by the just demands of their members. Strikes caused a loss of 175,000 man-days in 1980, more than for the whole period from 1975 to 1979. At least one strike a day was registered in the first half of 1981. Finally, a wave of strikes swept the mining sector (with its workforce of 770,000) which for a number of years seemed to have been immune to social upheaval.

On May 26, 1981, the 1,600 black workers of the Buffelsfontein gold mine refused to surface after their shift. The GENCOR Company's administration used force to oust the miners and fired them for "unlawful behaviour". In June the same plight befell 800 miners of Richards Bay Minerals who struck for the recognition of their trade union. An especially fierce fight was put up by workers of President Stein Mine in Welkom where 10,000 miners set fire to the manager's office, the ware-houses and the "bars" in which the bosses kindly allowed the workers to "unwind" after their shift. Police killed one worker and arrested several. Soon riots erupted at the East-Rand Proprietary Mines in Boksburg and at a mine in Westonaria.

What are the reasons for the black miners' protests? And why are they not fully "synchronised" with the main trend of South Africa's industrial action?

The socio-economic structure of the regime of apartheid is defined in the programme of the South African Communist Party as "colonialism of a special type". Within the boundaries of one country there exist two societies—"black", with all the characteristics of

a mercilessly exploited colony, and "white", which is tantamount to a colonial power that has reached the stage of monopoly capitalism. The laws of apartheid, or "separate development of the races", set these two societies strictly apart, and yet bind them firmly together, thus providing conditions for the exploitation of 23 million blacks (as well as "coloureds" and Indians) by 4.5 million whites.

If Johannesburg, called I'Goli ("City of Gold") by the blacks, has become a symbol of South Africa's opulence, then the country's mining industry is a classic example of monstrous discrimination against black workers, practiced, of course, in the rest of the economy as well. The miners' protest is caused by the very system of apartheid, even though the immediate reasons may be different in each case.

Thus, a mass "mutiny" of African miners in mid-1981 was set off by the employers' intention to introduce new regulations for life insurance. The proposal seemed attractive at first sight: instead of a lump sum of 400 rands (about \$400) by way of insurance indemnity the family of a miner who died an accidental death on the job was promised the equivalent of his wages for two years plus the cost of his board and accommodation at a compound for the same period. The total came to about 3,000 rands.

Yet African workers, almost to a man, said "no" to the mine-owners' "bounty", regarding it as the latter's attempt to recover at least a part of the pay raise won by the miners. A bit of arithmetic laid bare the employers' plan: even at the minimum rate of the monthly deduction of one rand, 450,000 gold miners would have raised 5.4 million rands a year for the insurance fund envisaged by the project. The mortality rate in this branch of industry being 1.25 per thousand employed workers, the indemnity payments to the workers would have totalled 1.7 million rands per year, while the remaining 3.7 million would have been pocketed by the companies—and that on top of their fabulous profits.

Undoubtedly, 1980 was a record year for profits, wrote South African **Daily News**. Out of 41 companies and groups that forecast a profit rate not exceeding 20 per cent, ten actually chalked up 20-40 per cent, nine—41-60 per cent, eleven—61-100 per cent, and three companies more than trebled their profits. The poles of affluence and poverty are constantly been drifting further apart.

According to **The Rand Daily Mail** of Johannesburg, the total earned by the 20 per cent of South Africa's most affluent population, i. e., practically speaking by all whites, is 37.5 (!) more than that for the 20 per cent of the lowest paid population comprised of blacks.

Meanwhile, the cost of living has been rising steadily. From 1970 to 1978, food prices went up 2.5 times, while in 1980 alone they increased on an average of 30 per cent. In 1981, the cost of housing in the suburbs of Johannesburg was raised by the authorities from 8 to 14 rands a month for bed in a compound and from 18 to 22 rands for a tiny cottage, dubbed a "match box" by the Africans. The spiralling cost of living and inflation, with its average annual rate of 17 per cent, have practically brought to nought the wage increases forced several times by the workers from the government and private employers.

Officially, since 1970 the wages of African miners have almost trebled and the disparity between the earnings of white and black miners has been brought down from 20:1 to 7:1. But while the monthly wage of a black miner has reached 175-200 rands, the cost of subsistence for an African family of five has skyrocketed from 80 to 200 rands, which includes the cost of food, housing, clothes, cooking fuel, fares for the breadwinner, and excludes tuition fees for the children, medical services, taxes, etc. In fact, according to **Sunday Times** of Johannesburg, the situation is even worse: to avoid starvation, an African male requires 114 rands a month, and as to the difference in the earnings of the white and black miners, far from decreasing, it went up in absolute figures from 600 rands in 1970 to 900 in 1981.

Hence a vicious circle: poverty—strikes—pay rise—higher prices and inflation—poverty. But destitution is not the only reason for the surge of labour unrest in industry, since Africans in the countryside are even worse off. The defiant mood of black workers is the result of crying injustice of the existing labour legislation, especially the Migrant Labour Act and the so-called Colour Barrier Act which restricts access of non-whites to skilled jobs.

This applies first of all to the mining industry, because most black miners are short contract migrants, 40 per cent of them coming from the neighbouring countries and the rest, as a rule, being "citizens" of the bantustans set up by

the authorities on barren land where jobs are scarce.

The employers and authorities found many advantages in a workforce of migrants: since the miners feared being fired and sent home, the situation in the mines was generally "quieter" than at plants and factories. Ethnically different migrants were hard put to unite for joint action against the hated way of life. Besides, the mine-owners and government, bent on safeguarding the industry from social disturbances, decisively countered all attempts by the black miners to launch trade unions of their own. This policy was made easier by the presence of almost two million unemployed always ready to replace "unruly" workers.

Such were the reasons—including relatively high wages—for the specific character of industrial action by African miners and its partial isolation from the struggle of factory workers. But in the end, these same reasons have helped politicise the movement.

Today the African proletariat—both miners and factory workers—come out more consistently united under political slogans demanding an end to the racist laws, equal rights with whites, sharing of power and participation in the government. "All conditions of our life are closely bound with politics", said Thozamile Gqweta, national organiser of the South African Allied Workers Union. "How can one be reconciled, for example, with the Group Areas Act or the Bantu Labour Act? Thus politics interferes in our life. Everything that stands in the way of the workers' progress must be removed."

The concessions forced from the authorities, such as enlarged appropriations for housing and social welfare, stressed Persi Qoboza, a Soweto newspaper editor, "do not touch the system of apartheid. It is a fact that we are denied access to political power, are driven into reservations, and are being economically and spiritually oppressed. We want equal chances. Either the whites will share with us or lose everything in the end."

Driven to desperation—some by poverty, others by violations of human dignity, and all by harsh repressions—the oppressed majority are engaging in active struggle against apartheid. The most fearless and advanced join the African National Congress (ANC), the South African Communist Party, the ANC's military organisation "Umkhonto

we Sizwe" ("Spear of the Nation") which is waging an armed struggle for the non-whites' right to freedom and equality. The guerrillas blew up the SASOL plant, the railway connecting the coal mines in Freehide with the wharfs in Richards Bay, an electric railway in Soweto and a transformer power unit in Durban which caused a standstill of hundreds of enterprises in the area. Armed attacks on police stations were made. In the first ten months of 1981 alone, the guerrilla fighters mounted about 40 operations, inflicting a serious blow to the economy of the racist regime.

"Apartheid is the long way to suicide", said South African tycoon Harry Oppenheimer back in the late 1960s. Was this man, whose huge profits came from the exploitation of blacks, just putting on liberal airs? Not at all. "Brilliant Harry", whose empire's annual turnover currently runs into seven thousand million rands, knew full well what he was saying. It was a rational and substantiated warning, but a decade and a half ago, very few representatives of the ruling minority realised that apartheid, which gave white South Africa her wealth, would become her grave-digger.

Today, doubts about the expediency of apartheid are voiced ever more often in the business world of South Africa—and not just because it provides "fuel" for social conflagrations. Apartheid poses a formidable obstacle to the country's economic development by hindering the maximal use of its natural resources. "South Africa's economic growth is restricted by ... an acute shortage of skilled manpower,"—admitted former chairman of the Chamber of Mines Dennis Etheredge. "The crux of this shortage is experienced by a country with immense labour resources."

Statistics dispassionately bears this out. The growth rate of the white labourforce shows a steep downward trend—from 41,000 in 1975 to 26,000 in 1979. This makes the country ever more dependent on black labour. According to Minister of Manpower Utilisation, Fannie Botha, of the 5.5 million unskilled labourers available in the country 96,000 people receive professional training every year, whereas economic growth demands that at least 500,000 be trained—naturally, from among the blacks. At present, the country is short

of 700,000 skilled workers, and by 1990 the shortage will have topped one million mark. Meanwhile, a rational policy in professional training would enable the country, in the estimate of specialists, to increase its annual GNP by 18 per cent. Such a prospect is rather attractive to businessmen, but so far unrealistic because of apartheid.

In April 1981, Anglo-American Corporation, in an unprecedented move, gave a black man the job of a mining explosives foreman. A reactionary "white" trade union lost no time in politicising the matter. It charged that Anglo-American Corporation had not only violated the law forbidding skilled jobs to blacks in mining and construction but had also infringed upon the rights of a white miner who lost the chance to get that job. What's more, the trade union used that pretext to stage a wide campaign against the mine-owners' attempts to remove the colour barrier quietly, i. e., to encroach upon the holy of holies of the white minority—their privileges.

And yet employers practiced a gradual and de facto easing of restrictions against skilled Africans in the processing and machine building industries. What's more, in 1979, under pressure of economic necessity on the one hand, and mass industrial actions of blacks on the other, the government officially abolished the policy of reserving jobs for skilled whites in all branches except mining and construction. But with all the seeming radicalism of this measure, the authorities still toe the line drawn by the most reactionary segment of the white workers: most of their previously reserved jobs are "protected" by 49 agreements between the employers and "white" trade unions numbering 346,000 members.

Somewhat unexpectedly, company owners have discovered one more important factor which will increasingly influence their attitude towards black workers and blacks in general. As noted by a UPI correspondent in Johannesburg, in the minds of South African businessmen the words "black market" conjure up not underhand dealings but a sleeping giant just beginning to wake up. Even now, the black buyer is a conspicuous figure on the domestic market: in 1980 he spent 9 billion rands, which comprised 40 per cent of the total population's purchasing power, whereas by 1985, as forecast by Barclays National Bank, black consumers will be spending 18 per cent more than whites. It stands to reason that

many businessmen want a firm foothold on this market. As put by a local advertising agent, "it doesn't matter what colour the hand that gives you money is".

But a growing dependence on demands by blacks makes companies more vulnerable to the boycotting of their goods. This was brought home for the first time by a strike of the workers of the Fattis & Monis food firm. The boycott of the company's goods by the non-white population supporting the strike made the company accept all the conditions of the strikers. The same tactic, and with the same effect, was applied against the Simba Potatoe Chips and Wilson Rowtree companies.

Finally, apartheid is to blame for a loss of markets for South African goods in many countries of Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe who refuse to maintain trade with the criminal regime of Pretoria. And for those monopolies that maintain links with South Africa, the risk factor resulting from strikes and disturbances is beginning to outweigh the lure of economic advantage resulting from cheap manpower. The regime of apartheid is increasingly experiencing "investment hunger". In 1979, for example, the Americans invested only 23 million dollars in South Africa's economy, and that coming from reinvested profits of the locally based companies, whereas the outflow of capital totalled 164 million.

That is why both certain business circles and official opposition looked forward with hope and misgivings to changes that were to be made by the Pieter Botha government that came to power in 1979. "Adapt or die!"—such was the slogan the Prime Minister hurled at the white South Africans, calling for a sober assessment of the growing social tensions.

Not that he had much choice. A group of military experts who at the Prime Minister's request, estimated chances of keeping the black majority in check by force of arms, came to the conclusion that the army (whose appropriations grow every year) would be unable to control "internal strife". An apt recommendation on this score was made by Johannesburg's *Star*: "A more realistic concept of an advanced line of defences has to be sought in the solution of social problems."

Botha's new "total strategy", officially approved by the top brass (who were among its sponsors in the first place), envisaged the combination of beefed-up military muscle and appara-

tus of repression with a certain betterment of living conditions for the blacks. Of course, the ruling clique rejected out of hand any thought of granting the black majority equal rights with the whites. The Prime Minister has repeatedly stressed that reforms will in no way affect the present structure of political power. But he declared that evolution can and must proceed in the economic sphere.

In practice, this evolution is manifest in measures adopted by industrialists and businessmen under the motto "A man—a job" in providing professional training, employment, pay increases, etc., for Africans. The motto was coined by millionaire Anthony Rupert, who is close to the Botha government, and marks the limit beyond which the ruling cohort of the National Party neither wants nor is able to go. Economic concessions and abolition of the most appalling restrictions of so-called "petty apartheid" are regarded by it as a kind of "insurance policy" against further radicalisation of the black majority.

But even these steps were viewed by many in the white community as too bold and inadmissible. They were vehemently opposed by the ultra-reactionary *Herstigte Nasionale Party*, the right wing of the National Party, and the racist "white" trade unions. The "reformist" grouping found its manoeuvring ability severely restricted because the political future of the Prime Minister and his party depend to a large extent on a thin stratum of white voters who are rabid racists and totally unwilling to yield even a modicum of their privileges. This part of the population holds disproportionate power in the political life of the country. For example, the White Miners Union numbers 35,000, but the mining sector provides not only a fourth of the GNP but also three fourths of South Africa's exports, so that a strike by white miners can lead to rather adverse consequences for the National Party.

A warning signal was already given during the April 1981 snap parliamentary election Pieter Botha intended to provide him with a mandate for "reforms". But part of the white voters swung to the *Herstigte Nasionale Party*; and the National Party lost 8 per cent of its votes, with its right wing

growing stronger (it should be noted, however, that the liberal opposition also won additional seats, i. e., the white community is undergoing polarisation).

As a result, the Botha government did not dare to move any further, in fact, than to confirm those evolutionary changes that had already taken root. "Present relations in the sphere of industry," wrote the French monthly *Le Monde Diplomatique*, "have gradually come into being solely as a consequence of the employers' initiative on the one hand, and the struggle of the African proletariat on the other." In particular, formal abolition of the colour barrier, recognition of black trade unions and the necessity of vocational training for black workers were nothing but commitment to paper of existing realities.

Now there is talk of reforms in the mining industry as well, which so far has been getting along almost free of them. A government statement of September 30, 1981 proposed that job reservation for white miners be annulled, but it was accompanied by numerous assurances of guarantees for the rights of the white miners. Moreover the government left it to the companies and "white" trade unions to decide whether to remove the restrictions in any particular case, having stressed that not a single white miner would be replaced by a black one. This looks pretty much like defeat for the "reformers".

Two years ago, when a certain practical easing of conditions for black workers had found a *de facto* recognition in legislation, Pieter Koornhof, Minister of Cooperation and Development, said the following on a visit to the US: "Apartheid, as you know it, is dying, has even died". But in November 1981, at a meeting in Capetown

with the managers of South Africa's major industrial and financial groups, Prime Minister Pieter Botha made it quite clear that he was "bound by a pledge to stick to the policy of apartheid". So thus we have it: apartheid is dead—long live apartheid!

Entangled in the net of their own racist laws and political intrigues, the Nationalists have lost all sense of time and reality. And even their current, "modernised", policy will hardly fore-

stall the approaching social explosion. "Every thinking person understands," said Hermann Gilliomee, Professor of History at the University of Stellenbosch, "that the power base of the blacks is bound to expand, and that time is working in favour of those blacks who would like to take power... and use it to narrow the gap between the incomes of the races rather than simply relying on a rapid rate of growth."

With tensions in the South of the continent soaring, social upheaval there not only threatens the racist regime but puts in question the very future of capitalism in the country. "Pretoria is clearly wary of the possibility of revolution," said the American magazine **Newsweek**. "In the opinion of blacks, Botha's symbolic reforms, such as his plans of creating a confederation of bantustans and ending discrimination in industry, are nothing but a travesty of equality."

The numerous strikes, that tend to give workers even more political experience and the mounting armed struggle against apartheid are evidence enough that the oppressed people of South Africa are determined to win power. The striving for freedom, equality and social progress cannot be stopped. The postwar history of the continent—South Africa in particular—makes this point well proved.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

SOVIET ECONOMIC AID TO NIGERIA DESCRIBED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 p 50

[Text]

"Our friendly relations with Nigeria, one of the largest countries in Africa, are of long standing," said Minister of the USSR, Konstantin Belyak, President of the USSR-Nigeria Friendship Society, at an Executive Committee meeting. Among honourable guests were S. O. Oyeleke, Ambassador of Nigeria to the USSR, and Ibrahim Dimis, National President of the Nigeria-Soviet Friendship and Cultural Relations Association.

The Soviet Union is rendering assistance to Nigeria in setting up national industries, including the most advanced ones: metallurgy and petrochemistry.

Nigeria and Tropical Africa's first iron-and-steel mill is being constructed with Soviet assistance. Its initial stage will be commissioned in 1984-1985 and is expected to produce 1.3 million tons of steel a year. The total output may be further raised to reach 2.6, and ultimately 5 million tons a year. That will fully meet Nigeria's demand, as well as allow it to export steel rolled stock and other goods to neighbouring countries. Another important Soviet-Nigerian project is the Warri-Benin City oil pipeline, which is part of an over 900-km-long oil pipeline network. Soviet experts are also rendering assistance in geological prospecting. More than 700 Nigerian students are enrolled in Soviet specialised secondary and higher schools.

Last year a Cultural Cooperation Protocol for 1981-1982 was signed in Lagos. It provides for showing feature films and documentaries, exhibitions of photographs, articles of folk art and so on. Nigerians will also have a chance to get themselves acquainted with the Soviet circus.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

OFFICIAL PAKISTANI BACKING FOR AFGHAN REBELS ALLEGED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 pp 53-55

[Article by Vladlen Baikof: "Pakistan: A Hornets' Nest of Counterrevolution"]

[Text]

We crossed Pakistan's main river, the Indus, from the left bank to the right near the ancient Mogul fortress of Attok over a narrow bridge suspended like a slender metal string over the river's frothy waters. For some time, the road clings to the river, obediently imitating its erratic twists and turns. Then it veers off to the north. The surrounding landscape becomes more austere with every kilometre.

A pole barrier blocks the road at the settlement of Jamrud. After unhurriedly checking our documents, the official let us pass and warned that we were entering the "tribal zone" and that it was not safe to leave the main road.

The "tribal zone" is a strip of mountain territory up to 130 kilometres wide stretching along the border with Afghanistan and is an independent administrative unit of the Northwest Frontier Province. It is inhabited mostly by Pushtu tribes who to this day live according to their strict Medieval laws. Blood feuds are still common. A slight to a mountaineer, the law says, can be washed away only with blood. Over the centuries, so many mutual grievances have accumulated that the tribes are in a state of almost permanent internecine strife.

The warning given us by the official in Jamrud was by no means unwarranted: by agreement with the central government, the tribes guarantee a traveller's security only along specified routes. You can travel such a route without fear for life or property. But if you carelessly stray even a few hundred metres from the asphalt, then ... there is no telling what may happen. On making this fateful step, foreign tourists have vanished without trace, and all attempts by diplomatic missions

to learn at least something about their fate were usually in vain.

The "tribal zone" appeared on the map at the end of the last century when the colonialists had undivided rule over their overseas possessions and carved and recarved them as they liked. The purpose of this "buffer zone" was to ensure the security of the British colonies in India from the north. But that is not all. After their abortive attempts to subjugate Afghanistan by force, the British used the "tribal zone" adjoining Afghan borders for political intrigues against the independent state and for interference in its internal affairs. It was from there that late in the 1920s British intelligence agents guided the actions of the Afghan feudal and clerical reactionaries who rose up against the government of Amanullah Khan who was pursuing an independent and progressive policy.

Following the victory of the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan, the forces of imperialism and international reaction turned the Pakistani border territories into the main area from which the undeclared war against the DRA is being waged.

ESCALATION OF INTERFERENCE

☞:

The golden rule of goodneighbourliness says: you can't choose your neighbours, but you can develop good relations with them. Alas, those who shape Pakistan's policy are not heeding this bit of folk wisdom. They are actively encouraging the enemies of their northern neighbour. Islamabad's complicity in the aggression against the DRA is widely known. It has long been established and is confirmed by documentary evidence.

Immediately after the April revolution, the present military regime in Pakistan took a hostile stand toward the people's democratic rule in Afghanistan. I happened to be on a tour of Afghanistan in May-June 1978. Those were unforgettable days. I talked with ministers of the people's government, party functionaries, soldiers, workers, office employees and peasants, all of whom spoke enthusiastically about the future and shared the dreams of the new life they were going to build in their country...

But suddenly, against the background of this country-wide jubilation, I had a jarring meeting with Colonel Ghulam Nabi, Commander of the Afghan army division stationed in Jalalabad, the administrative centre of Nangarhar Province. During those early post-revolutionary days, on the government's order he concurrently discharged the functions of governor of this border province.

As I entered the governor's office, a man with eyes bloodshot from lack of sleep wearing dusty military shirt damp with perspiration, rose from his desk to greet me.

"I am just back from the province's mountain regions. I've hardly had any sleep during the past five days", he said as though begging forgiveness for his appearance.

I learned from his account that a mutiny had flared up eight days before in a number of remote mountain villages of the province strung along the Pakistani border. It was instigated by members of the "Ehvan" nationalist organisation who had fled Afghanistan. The authorities sent a peaceful mission to the rebels to find out why they were disgruntled, but the latter opened fire.

"We wish everyone well, but we will answer fire with fire", Ghulam Nabi said tersely and invited me to a room adjoining his office. "Take a look at what we have captured."

Heaped in a corner of the room were swords, rifles and grenades. There was a stack of booklets, with blue and green covers on a nearby table.

"It is not by chance that the mutiny began in an area adjoining the Pakistani border", Ghulam Nabi explained. "The men we captured testified that they were given a crash guerrilla training course on Pakistani territory and were supplied with arms and propaganda literature there."

Thus, only five weeks after the April revolution, I first heard the word **dushmans**, as the Afghan people subsequently began to call the counterrevolutionary bands sent to the DRA from Pakistan.

These were only the first harbingers, hastily trained and haphazardly armed. But the scale of subversive actions expanded rapidly. The imperialist powers, the reactionary regimes of the Persian Gulf countries and hegemonistic China joined in the struggle against the Afghan revolution. Extravagantly funded centres for the training of subversives began to spring up on Pakistani territory one after another. They appeared in Miram Shah, Bannu, Sadda, Chitral, Parachinar, Kohat and Yasin in the Northwest Frontier Province; near the towns of Quetta, Pishin and Nushki, in Baluchistan, and in some other places. Pakistani instructors were not the only ones engaged in training the counterrevolutionaries. Chinese and American specialists also appeared there. The bands began to receive arms from American, Chinese, West European and Egyptian arsenals.

FACTS EXPOSE

Complicity in the plot of imperialism and reaction against the DRA has been officially denied in Islamabad, and these denials continue to this day. But such statements are not persuasive, to say the least, compared with the numerous direct and indirect evidence proving exactly the opposite. Most of this evidence is supplied to the world press by Western journalists in their quest for sensational stories, and these journalists can hardly be suspected of bias with respect to the Pakistani regime or of having any particular fondness for the Afghan revolution.

Thus, a correspondent of the British **Guardian** described his visit to a camp in Warsak where terrorists are being trained. The US **Newsweek** magazine published a map showing the places where bands of Afghan rebels are concentrated on Pakistani territory and noted the routes they take when infiltrating Afghanistan. The Hong Kong **Far Eastern Economic Review** reported that the Pakistani police in Dera Ghazi Khan district had detained a truck convoy of arms being smuggled from Karachi to the Peshawar area. The policemen stopped the truck by chance to check for narcotics, but when they threw back the flaps they discovered rifles, submachine guns and mortars. When they reported this to their superiors, they received a peremptory order to let the trucks pass. But this order came too late, because the trucks had already been spotted by a correspondent from a local newspaper.

This list could be continued. Several eloquent instances of collaboration of the Pakistani authorities with the enemies of the Afghan people were re-

corded in my notebook even before my tour of the Northwest Frontier Province. I recall well my meeting with Karachi longshoremen in February 1980... I met Aslam, an activist from the longshoremen's union, in a roadside cafe right across the port gates—a traditional meeting place of longshoremen. They gather there after the shift to rest and have a cup of strong tea with milk.

Following with his eyes the ribbed bodies of the trucks emerging from the gates, Aslam said:

"Trucks exactly like these—powerful West German Mercedes—hauling arms from the port late in January. But they had different license plates—military ones. The arms were brought by two Pakistani ships that berthed at piers 7 and 8. Unloading was done at night only and in total darkness—without any flashlights or searchlights. We longshoremen weren't allowed anywhere near the piers: only soldiers worked there."

"Then we had another 'rest' in the first days of February when another ship with arms for the Afghan rebels arrived", the man sitting next to Aslam said.

"But how did you find out that there were arms in the holds and who they were intended for?"—I asked.

"Worker's solidarity", Aslam said and explained that they had learned about the contents of the holds from the sailors and about the delivery route for the arms from the truck drivers. As soon as they were loaded, the trucks took the Hyderabad Highway to Sukkur and then turned north to the Afghan border. It seems that one such convoy was accidentally detained by policemen in Dera Ghazi Khan.

BEHIND TALL WALLS

Our car weaved with difficulty through the noisy, colourful streets of Peshawar. Ignoring all traffic rules, pedestrians and cyclists dart between cars and tongi—horse-drawn carriages that are the poor man's taxi. The traffic includes donkeys barely visible under the pyramids of boxes with which they are laden, camels and coolies who pull loaded carts in the absence of draft animals. Traders have laid out their wares on the sideboards of the streets and swirls of customers form around them... In short, the external rhythm of Peshawar is like that of many large oriental cities. But various organisations of the Afghan reactionaries have established their hornets' nests deep in the city blocks, behind the tall mud walls

surrounding the houses. Peshawar is the location of the headquarters and several sections of one of the most active detachments of Afghan counterrevolutionaries—the Islamic Party of Afghanistan (Hezb-i-Islami) headed by Gulbuddin Hekmatyar. The headquarters of smaller groupings like Nijate Mili and Jamiat-i-Islami are located in the Takal, Gulbahar and Jahangirabad districts. It is here that the ringleaders of the counterrevolution draw up their plans for acts of terrorism against the people's power and plot the routes of their bloody raids into Afghanistan. It is not mere coincidence that this city has become the centre of anti-Afghan activities, for Peshawar is only 40 kilometres from the border, while terrorist training camps and arms caches can be easily concealed in the surrounding mountains.

I spent two days in Peshawar, but even this brief period of time was sufficient to give me an idea of the enormous scale of subversive activities against the DRA conducted from there.

When driving through the Fakirabad-2 area, I saw a green flag flying from a thin pole over the Haji Daoud Building right across from Shahi-bag Park. Armed guards stood at the entrance to the building. This was nothing else but the headquarters of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan.

An employee of Hotel Dins, where I was staying, gave me the address and telephone number of yet another section of Hezb-i-Islami. It is on Bajawohr Street, Post Box No. 294. When I dialed the telephone number, 74-865, I heard from the other end of the line: "Mongal Hussain, Secretary of Hezb-i-Islami listening." When I told him I was a Soviet journalist, he quickly slammed the receiver down.

A chance meeting at the hotel: my interlocutor, Swiss journalist Raymond Soller who was touring the province for over a month gathering material for *Tribune de Genève*, told me how the counterrevolutionary groupings were being financed. The Peshawar branch of the Bank of Oman serves as an intermediary. Money from the United States, Saudi Arabia and other countries is transferred to an account opened in this bank in the name of the leader of the local reactionary organisation Jamaat-i-Islami, Tufail Muhammed. This money, usually sent anonymously, is spent on the purchase of arms, motor vehicles and equipment that are then resold to the Afghan counterrevolutionaries.

I also learned in Peshawar that the notorious Badaber Base in the outskirts

of the city has been reactivated. It was from there that American spy Gary Powers took off on his flight over Soviet territory 20 years ago. US specialists have now appeared here and at the base in Matanui. They are installing special espionage equipment to "peer" into the territory of the DRA.

THE "AFGHAN REFUGEES" PROBLEM

The Western and Pakistani propaganda speaks a lot about the so-called problem of refugees from Afghanistan, constantly harping on the "tragedy" of the Afghan people and "mass flight" from Afghanistan.

My trip to the Northwest Frontier Province allowed me not only to get first-hand information about this "problem" but also to realise the enormity of the deliberate lies injected into the hullabaloo raised over this issue.

All sorts of "have beens" fled the DRA: members of the feudal aristocracy, big landowners, rich usurers and merchants, reactionary officials, a part of the clergy—in short, all those who were deprived by people's power of their privileges based on ruthless exploitation of the Afghan people. By resorting to deceit and lavish promises, but more often to open blackmail and intimidation, they succeeded in inducing some inhabitants of villages in the border provinces to follow them—ordinary peasants who objectively do not and cannot have any contradictions with people's power. My meetings with "refugees" only confirmed this.

After yet another bend in the road near Landi Kotal, a view opened on the picturesque mosaic of a tent settlement: there were several dozen multi-coloured tents scattered at random against the brownish background of a rocky plateau, children playing and cattle grazing.

"Afghan refugees", Ashrad Khan, a Peshawar journalist who was accompanying me on this trip, said crisply. I stopped the car. We were approached by several Afghans wrapped in cloaks of home-spun fabric. Their faces were emaciated, their eyes dim.

Ismail Ali, Niyaz Khan and other residents of the village of Helj, Nuristan Province, told us the tragic story of their privations and trials in the course of months of wandering. When the rich man of the village, Rakhim Khan, loaded his property on camels and fled the country, his servants forced nearly half of the village to follow suit. Rakhim Khan now lives comfortably in Peshawar where he bought a house while

the peasants who left with him are in desperate straights.

The worse their existence becomes, the more often they are visited by recruiters who offer them money to take up arms and direct them against their fellow countrymen. But their sole thoughts are about how to return to their abandoned homes, to a peaceful life.

They are homesick and listened enthusiastically to news of the DRA government's call to all countrymen to return to their native places, to peaceful work. Reports have increased in the Afghan press in recent months of the return to the country of thousands of Afghans who, for various reasons, found themselves abroad. But it is not all that simple to leave Pakistan.

The Pakistani authorities are interested in the existence of the "refugee" problem and of sustaining it, even if by artificial means. On the one hand, they are trying to use the "refugees" as a reserve for replenishing the terrorist bands. On the other hand, speculating on their need for aid, they hope to line their pockets. A number of charity organisations have been set up in the West that are sending food, clothing and manufactured goods to the "refugees". Aid is also sent through the United Nations. The exact number of those in need of assistance is not known, since the Pakistani side is drawing up lists of "refugees" and this clearly creates extensive opportunities for all sorts of machinations.

The Pakistani authorities spend part of the cash donations as they see fit, in particular for financing the aggression against Afghanistan, and a considerable portion of the aid is pocketed by corrupt officials. The commodities and food earmarked for nonexistent "refugees" are sold by enterprising businessmen.

The fact of the shameless plunder of this "aid" has been admitted officially by the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.

VOICE OF REASON

The course of assisting the plot of imperialism and reaction against the DRA pursued by the Pakistani authorities is condemned by large sections of the Pakistani public. Meetings with ordinary people representing various social strata convincingly show that the Pakistani people are aware of the fallacious nature and danger of this line. "It is not in the interests of the Pakista-

ni people to play up to the imperialist intrigues. This is fraught with the danger that Pakistan might become an obedient tool in the hands of international reaction; our national independence might well be lost", writes the *Sachai* magazine. "The only way to ensure Pakistan's security is to pursue a genuine policy of good-neighbourliness", states an open letter sent to President Zia ul-Haq by a group of the country's prominent public figures.

Naturally, the border areas' population, like the entire Pakistani public, is interested in the events taking place in the neighbouring country. The meetings and conversations in Peshawar and other towns with representatives of political and business circles and with intellectuals convinced me that in these sections, too, many condemn imperialism's attempts to interfere with the normal existence of the Afghan people and the active connivance at these attempts by the country's military administration.

"The policy with respect to Afgha-

nistan should not be conducted under pressure from Washington, but first of all we should proceed from our national interests", I was told by the President of the Federation of the Chambers of Commerce and Industry of the Northwest Frontier Province. The correctness of such views is being increasingly confirmed as the dust raised by the Western propaganda machine over the events in Afghanistan and the Soviet Union's internationalist assistance to the Afghan people settles and people—in any case sober-minded people—can size up things calmly.

It is already obvious that under cover of the outcry about the "military threat" to Pakistan from the north and the need to repulse this "threat", American imperialism and Chinese hegemonism are trying to use Pakistan as a means of fulfilment of their aggressive plans against the DRA. But the Pakistani people want no quarrels with their northern neighbour. They want only to live in peace with it.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

ANATOLIY GROMYKO BOOK ON SOCIALIST ORIENTATION IN AFRICA REVIEWED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 p 62

[Review by V. Lee, Dr. Sc. (Hist.), of book "Africa: Progress, Difficulties and Prospects" by Anatoliy Gromyko, Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye Otmoshenia Publishers, 1981, 272 pages]

[Text]

The book under review first of all analyses the forces nurturing national liberation revolutions in the period when the communist formation is taking shape. This is the background against which the author studies in detail the major accomplishments of the anti-colonial and liberation movement on the African continent up to the early eighties, problems of overcoming social and economic backwardness, the policy of imperialism and neo-colonialism. The author of the monograph elaborates on the African proletariat's growing role in the class struggle to build a new society and the historic mission of world socialism for peoples developing along socialist lines.

The author successfully summarises the process of socialist orientation which is analysed as a "specific period of transition from old social relations to 'new' ones and as a 'stage of creating economic, social, cultural and other conditions for the building of socialism' (pp. 74-77). According to the data cited in the monograph, Asian and African countries already have a considerable, and steadily growing area of socialist orientation inhabited by nearly 150 million and occupying an area of over 12 million sq km (p. 72).

It seems possible at present to single out some of the main characteristics of the countries that have embarked upon this road of development. The author has every reason to list among those the foundation of vanguard parties of scientific socialism, the country's liberation from the sway of monopolies and course toward economic independence, the establishment of public ownership of the basic means

of production and the eradication of exploitation of man by man, the leading role of a socialist-type state sector in the economic mechanism, radical agrarian reform and collectivisation of the peasants, the democratisation of the state apparatus and the drawing of the people into running state affairs in practice, the cultural revolution, the complete elimination of tribalism, the moulding of a new man, and the strengthening of ties with the world socialist community. "Socialist orientation manifests its revolutionary progressive nature above all in the superstructure but it already begins undermining the old, archaic base. Herein lies its historic importance" (p. 84).

In analysing the emergence of a new political superstructure in the countries developing along non-capitalist lines, the author singles out three consecutive stages in the formation of the advanced political leadership of the party: a revolutionary democratic party (or organisation), a vanguard party of the working people (transitional) and finally, a Marxist-Leninist party (p. 92). The working people in town and country, above all the working class, should form the social basis for the emergent revolutionary parties.

The monograph deals with the influence exercised by the two world systems on the social development of the African countries. Many difficulties and unresolved problems of Africa, the author justly remarks, directly result from the fact that the continent's enormous material resources are being pumped into the zone of highly developed capitalism.

Diverse and ever expanding cooperation between African countries and

the USSR and other countries of real socialism is of a fundamentally different social nature and exemplifies a new type of modern international economic relations. On the whole the diverse "economic help of the Soviet Union", Anatoli Gromyko writes, "not only promotes the development of the material and technological base and the consolidation of the economic positions of African countries but also stimulates important social changes" (p. 162).

The progress of the revolutionary process on the African continent of late has added to the significance of cooperation in the field of ideology, enabling young revolutionary democratic parties to study the theory and practice of existing socialism more effectively and to combat racism, chauvinism and other negative trends.

Expanding relations between the national democratic forces and movements and world socialism in the political, economic and ideological fields are complemented by important cooperation in the military field, which, in the author's opinion, "strengthens the defences of the independent countries, enables them to repel the racist and neocolonialist aggression and defends

them from military pressure and direct occupation or expansionistic acts on the part of imperialism" (p. 144). The effectiveness of this cooperation has been forcefully confirmed by the courageous struggle of the peoples of Algeria, Ethiopia, Angola and other countries in defence of their revolutionary gains.

The book offers sound arguments in connection with attempts made by some researchers to "place" the mixed social structures "somewhere between capitalism and socialism" (p. 73). The author also justly points out a certain underestimation by researchers of the processes of political disassociation among the national intelligentsia. He writes that researchers sometimes ignore the fact that "representatives of the intelligentsia join the ranks of both the revolutionary democrats and those of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie" (p. 21).

The book by A. Gromyko contributes to studying the urgent problems of the developing countries' economies and politics. Presenting a wealth of facts, the book under review allows the reader, besides getting an insight into today's problems of the peoples inhabiting the "Black continent", to visualise their morrow, too.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

SOVIET-INDIAN CULTURAL LINKS DETAILED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 p 62

[Article by Y. Smirnov, doctor of science (Philol.): "In the Interests of the Two Peoples"]

[Text]

The USSR and India continue to strengthen their friendly ties in various fields. The study of languages is important for both peoples to know better each other's culture. In India, the teaching of Russian is provided at special schools and university departments both in Delhi and elsewhere, as, for instance, at the Punjab University in the city of Chandigarh. Indian linguists have undertaken theoretical studies of Russian, which yielded, for example, such works as N. K. Dhingra's new approach to the systems of Russian declination and conjugation. In the USSR, the Indian languages are also a subject of scientific investigation, and even some secondary schools have switched over to teaching Indian languages.

Various aspects of these, such as phonetics, grammar, lexicology and general theoretical problems, were

dealt with in hundreds of Soviet publications. Thus, over the past two decades 20 essays on modern and ancient languages of India were published (in Russian alone) in the Asian and African Peoples' Languages Series, and two more are in the making.

Works by Soviet linguists are often published in India, as, for example, *General Hindi* by S. E. Dymshits, *Tamil Grammar* by M. S. Andronov, *Problems of the Complex Sentence (Punjabi)* by Y. A. Smirnov, and others. A number of dictionaries (Benghali-Russian, Hindi-Russian, Urdu-Russian, Punjabi-Russian, Malayalam-Russian, Telugu-Russian, Kannada-Russian, Russian-Hindi, Russian-Urdu, Russian-Tamil, etc.) mostly compiled by teams of Soviet authors have appeared in the USSR over a period of years.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

BOOK ON MONGOLIAN, YEMENI, ETHIOPIAN REVOLUTIONS REVIEWED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 p 63

[Review by L. Entin, doctor of science (Law), of book "National-Democratic Revolutions: Some Questions of Theory and Practice" by A. S. Shin, Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1981, 254 pages]

[Text]

The book under review is an in-depth analysis of the essence and typical features of national-democratic revolutions in our day based on vast experience and a wealth of factual and documentary material pertaining to non-capitalist development. It deals with some general theoretical problems of national-democratic revolution, the experience of formation and functioning of revolutionary organisations in the Mongolian People's Republic, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and Ethiopia and with the main trends and practical experience of revolutionary transformations in the political, socio-economic and cultural fields in countries of socialist orientation.

The author describes national-democratic revolution as a new type of democratic revolution and as a way of gradual transition to socialism in countries where the working class takes part in social coalitions responsible for state administration but is not as yet ready to act as a leader. Anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, and anti-tribal in essence, national-democratic revolutions give rise to the material and spiritual prerequisites "for a gradual transition to socialism bypassing the capitalist stage or cutting short its development in the initial stages" (p. 232).

The book devotes much space to the analysis of the motive forces of a revolution and to the nature of revolutionary democracy. Those are shown in their development, that is, the author explains how, in the process of the revolution's development, the participating political forces are divided ever more distinctly, gradually becoming differentiated.

The question of correlation between national and people's democratic revolutions is discussed on a general theoretical plane, though in brief outline. The growing role of the working class within the bloc of progressive forces is the main distinctive feature of the people's democratic stage of a revolution, with the Marxist-Leninist party guiding the revolutionary process. The actual political development of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (PDRY) and Ethiopia proves that a number of countries which have opted for the road of social progress develop precisely in this direction.

The establishment of revolutionary-democratic organisations to guide the people in building a new society, as well as their gradual change into parties of scientific socialism, is of immense import. Hence, a chapter on the Marxist-Leninist party in Mongolia.

The experience of People's Mongolia is vivid testimony to the possibility of setting up a party guided by Marxist-Leninist theory in a country with a predominantly peasant population. This feat can be accomplished by cooperation with the world communist movement.

The author shows how vanguard working people's parties are formed in the new historical conditions, citing the examples of the Yemen Socialist Party of the PDRY and the Commission to Organise the Party of Working People of Ethiopia. He devotes special attention, in particular, to summing up the positive experience of the revolutionary forces in the PDRY, which were strong enough to overcome their organisational dismemberment and, following the

defeat of right and opportunist factions within the movement, to form a militant political vanguard which is now at the head of the forces fighting for socialist development.

The book contains a comparatively detailed analysis of the principal trends in the development of the national-democratic revolution (again on the basis of the PDRY's and Ethiopia's experience). The establishment and consolidation of new revolutionary power and the construction of state machinery, the solution of the national question, and the introduction of revolutionary-democratic reforms in the socio-economic field are examined at length (in particular, considerable space is devoted to land reform and methods of introducing it, although some assessments of the reform are rather debatable).

The interconnection between the country's internal development and the international situation in the process of

building a socialist society is well-argued. The material cited in the monograph goes on to show that given close cooperation with the world socialist community and the international communist and workers' movement, the vanguard workers' parties will be able to fulfil their historical mission of ensuring the victorious development of national-democratic revolution. But some of the author's propositions are rather debatable. His contention that it is easier "for modern-day revolutionary democracy with leanings to scientific socialism" to move toward socialism than it was for the Mongolian People's Republic in its day (p. 199), hardly holds water.

Nevertheless, Shin's book is marked by in-depth Marxist analysis of a complicated and controversial process of social development in a group of countries now marching in the vanguard of national liberation.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

SOVIET BOOK ON JAPANESE SOCIAL THOUGHT PUBLISHED IN JAPAN

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 pp 63-64

[Article by L. Zenina, candidate of science (History): "Works of a Soviet Scholar in Japan"]

[Text]

The academic community in Japan looked forward with interest to the publication of the above-mentioned study by the famous Soviet scholar Y. Radul-Zatulovskiy. In Japanese this monograph was published by the Morioka branch of the Japan-USSR Society in the prefecture of Iwate. The translation of the book entitled *Progressive Minds of Japan of the Edo Period. The Flowering of Materialist Thought* has gone through two editions, September 1979 and January 1980. The translation and editing was done by professors of the Iwate University Ono Teramitsu, Kasahara Junjiro, Senior Lecturers Sawa Megumi, Inoue Masao, Hikawa Hiromu and others.

It is thanks to this study that the Japanese reader can better familiarise himself with the heritage of such outstanding thinkers as Ito Jinsai, Kaibara Ekiken, Muro Kyuso, Yamagata Banto, Kamada Ryuo. The concept of old historicism supported by Radul-Zatulovskiy in his analysis of the works of Japanese thinkers was never advanced before. The prominent scholar Suenaka Tetsuo, the author of a special study of the above-mentioned Yamagata Banto, wrote: "Prof. Radul holds not only Japan in his field of vision. He takes note of the links between East Asia ... and European culture. At any rate, it

is thanks to him that the image of Yamagata Banto has come to life in the history of world philosophy."

The translators are correct in noting that "the author ... is studying the essence and the significance of the most important philosophers of the Tokugawa period who promoted philosophical materialism" and shows that "... the struggle between materialism and idealism has not subsided, no matter what specific forms it assumed in various historical periods". They point out correctly that Radul-Zatulovskiy "was extremely scrupulous in fulfilling his task, analysing originals one by one and providing the necessary explanations of the socio-economic (historical) conditions in which these works were created".

Y. Radul-Zatulovskiy is an author of a number of important monographs well-known in Japanese studies the world over. His works have become an important contribution to the promotion of cultural ties between the two countries. *Ando Shoeki. 18th Century Materialist* is perhaps most significant among his earlier studies. This book, published by the USSR Academy of Sciences 20 years ago, has long become a rarity and is being prepared for publication in Japanese by the Morioka branch of the Japan-USSR Society.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

ZAGLADIN, FROLOV BOOK ON GLOBAL PROBLEMS REVIEWED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 6, Nov-Dec 82 p 64

[Review by O. Dreier, candidate of science (History), and V. Los, candidate of science (Philol.), of book "Global Problems of Our Time: Scientific and Social Aspects" by V. Zagladin and I. Frolov, Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya Publishers, Moscow, 1981, 238 pages]

[Text]

There is no doubt that when speaking of problems which are increasingly attracting the attention of the broadest range of specialists, one should primarily list the global ones. The authors of the book name four types of such problems. First, problems affecting the interests of the whole of mankind. Second, problems that are acquiring a global nature, that are an objective factor in the development of society in all regions of the world. Third, unsolved problems, which, by the very fact of their existence, create a threat to the future of mankind. And fourth, problems of a scientific, technological, social, and socio-political nature the solution of which requires the joint efforts of mankind. This book stresses the thesis that the problem of strengthening peace is the determining factor in the entire complex of global problems—present and future.

The Soviet Union, like the other countries of the socialist community, is conducting a struggle for peace along with those states that have freed themselves from colonial oppression. The entire postwar development convincingly shows that colonialism, the oppression of peoples and the suppression of their freedom are invariably connected with militarism and aggressive wars. There can be no objection to the statement that "colonialism and aggression, the policy of colonial oppression and the policy of strength are not only kindred phenomena but two sides of the same coin" (p. 51). Ending the arms race would be a major step in the solution of many questions

facing the developing countries. By drawing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America into its orbit, the arms race complicates the elimination of the aftermath of colonialism. But it is precisely in these areas that the problems of overcoming backwardness must be solved effectively. What choices are being offered to developing countries to overcome their economic underdevelopment and their social and cultural backwardness? The view is widespread in the West that they should repeat (perhaps with some deviations) the "classic road" of capitalist development. Also popular are the diametrically opposite concepts concerning the "specific roads of development" supposedly characteristic of the countries of the East. On analysing these ideas, concepts and schemes, the authors point out that it is impossible to overcome backwardness on a global scale without the countries in question advancing along the road of social progress.

Touching on proposals concerning international cooperation, V. Zagladin and I. Frolov stress that the national by no means becomes dissolved in the international. The internationalisation of economic life can serve mankind only under conditions of the development of equal cooperation among all countries and nations.

When studying problems of man's interaction with nature, the authors note that the growing impact on nature and the use of new technologies (with increasingly dangerous effects on the environment) may entail substantial

consequences of a negative character. This negative anthropogenic impact threatens to disrupt the principal cycles of substances in nature and undermine the rehabilitatory potentialities of the biosphere. Wars and preparations for war exert an immense destructive influence on the natural environment. In South Vietnam, for instance, herbicides fully destroyed 1,500 square kilometres of vegetation and damaged vegetation on an area of 15,000 square kilometres. Millions of people had to leave their homes due to the fact that chemicals made the land non-productive. In a number of areas, it will take decades to restore the natural ecological balance (p. 156).

The objective dialectics of the interaction of society and nature manifests itself in that in the course of material production man, on the one hand, increasingly frees himself from dependence on the spontaneous forces of nature while, on the other hand, he develops a closer unity with nature, putting to use a steadily expanding range of substances and types of energy, and drawing them ever more intensively into the sphere of life activity. The purposeful transformation of nature on the basis of further scientific, technical and

social progress will lead to greater harmony of man's interaction with nature today and in the future. The authors back up this conclusion with an analysis of the experience of socialist countries.

The last chapter dealing with modern global forecasts, models and scenarios of world development is of much interest. A study is made of the scientific principles of methods of global forecasting and modeling. The authors explicate the evolution of the models of the Club of Rome, investigate the Latin American "world model", the report of "Interfutures". etc. In fact, the authors have not left out a single major study of this type. The authors analyse them critically and contrast them with the Marxist-Leninist concept of the future, with due account for the need to solve global problems in the context of human progress. The book is keynoted by the thought that joint solutions concerning the future of mankind and its development given the peaceful coexistence of different social systems must be sought out. Concrete forecasts and models of the future can be made only with due consideration for this reality.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1982

CSO: 1812/138

RASHIDOV ADDRESSES AAPSO PRESIDUM MEETING IN TASHKENT

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 2-3

[Speech by Sharaf Rashidov, alternate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Uzbek Communist Party, at the 11th AAPSO session in Tashkent, end of 1982: "For Peace and Solidarity Between Nations"]

[Text]

The Presidium of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation (AAPSO) met at its 11th session in Tashkent, capital of Uzbekistan, at the end of 1982. Tashkent heartily welcomed representatives of 60 countries and 15 international and regional organisations fighting for social progress, justice, peace and friendship among the peoples and against imperialism and neocolonialism.

The participants in the session heard the speech by SHARAF RASHIDOV, Alternate Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Uzbek Communist Party.

"It is highly significant," the speaker pointed out, "that our meeting is held in Tashkent, the city of brotherhood and friendship of nations. It has become a centre of international cooperation where representatives of government, public and political circles, men-of-letters and arts from all the continents regularly meet.

"This new meeting with you delegates of the glorious anti-imperialist movement of solidarity with the peoples of Asia and Africa is especially noteworthy. It is held on the eve of the sixtieth anniversary of formation of the USSR, a landmark event in the history of our multinational Soviet state.

"History has known quite a few multinational state formations. But none of them was equal to the Soviet state, in which more than one hundred nations and national groups voluntarily united on the basis of true equality and friendship. These were cemented by the great and noble aim of building a communist society.

"The nationalities problem is one of the most complicated socio-economic, political and cultural problems. It has not been nor can be solved under capitalism. The latter has for ages been building and fostering the colonial system of slavery and oppression. Together with you we witnessed its downfall under the pressure of the national liberation forces. However, as before, imperialism is attempting to exploit entire countries and continents, this time by different, neocolonialist methods. At home, too, imperialism develops national relations on the principles of oppressing and exploiting one nation by another and of unequal and humiliating division of people on the grounds of colour, faith and nationality.

"This is something that has long and forever been done away with in the Soviet state. Drawing on the theory of

Marxism-Leninism, the Communist Party ensured the just solution of the nationalities problem. The multinational state has translated into life Lenin's ideas of combining the struggle for national liberation and the elimination of national oppression with the general struggle waged by the working class for the victory of new social relations, for eradicating all forms of exploitation and for socialism.

"The Soviet Union has forever put an end to class and national antagonisms. All-Union statehood and national statehood of Soviet republics develop in all their aspects and in inseparable unity, in keeping with the principles of democratic centralism, socialist federalism and socialist democracy. These historic gains and achievements have been formalised in the new Soviet Constitution.

"Today this country, which occupies nearly a sixth of the globe, is a close-knit socialist family of 270 million free people who have voluntarily united in 15 equal republics. There is a striking difference between these republics and those which were born on the ruins of the tsarist empire.

"Uzbekistan offers a graphic example. Formerly our land was a backward outlying area in tsarist Russia. At present it is a thriving socialist republic which, in a historically short period, has advanced to socialism bypassing capitalism. Since the USSR was established, the total industrial output in the republic grew 415 times over. Millions of tons of "white gold"—cotton—are produced by Uzbek farmers. Uzbek karakul and silk, fruits and vegetables are quite popular in the country.

"We are by rights proud of the powerful upsurge of Uzbek culture which is a gem in its own right among the treasures of multinational Soviet culture. The Uzbek republic makes a tangible contribution to the development of Soviet science.

"Now that the USSR marks sixty years of its existence and entire progressive mankind shows interest in the experience of the world's first society of friendship and brotherhood of peoples, we find it pertinent to stress those aspects of Soviet experience in solving the nationalities problem that are of international importance. Before the revolution, the peoples which now inhabit the Soviet Union, had different levels of social development ranging from the capitalist mode of production to primitive society. The involvement of all these peoples into the building of socialism and phenomenal progress along the lines of fraternal help and mutual assistance among nations forcefully demonstrate the boundless constructive potential of socialism."

Speaking about Soviet foreign policy, Sharaf Rashidov stressed that nowadays profound mutual understanding, close cooperation and brotherly friendship and solidarity with the Asian, African and Latin American peoples fighting against imperialism are an essential feature of the moral and political make-up of the great Soviet people, the internationalist people.

"The Tashkent meeting of prestigious representatives of the anti-imperialist movement of solidarity with the Afro-Asian peoples," he went on to say, "makes it possible to exchange opinion on the most burning issues of relevance to the vital interests of every nation and all mankind.

"The present-day situation in the world is tense, complicated and fraught with grave danger. Imperialist powers, above all the US, have chosen to achieve military superiority over the USSR and the socialist countries and are escalating the arms race. They are nurturing dangerous plans for turning Western Europe, the Middle East and the Indian Ocean into a nuclear testing ground threatening the USSR and its allies and friends. At the same time, the militaristic ruling elite in the US ignores numerous constructive proposals and

concrete practical steps made by our country in the field of detente.

"Developing and making more specific the principles of the Peace Programme for the Eighties, which was proclaimed by the 26th CPSU Congress, Leonid Brezhnev set forth in his Tashkent and Baku speeches some new ideas and proposals. They aim at putting an end to distrust, at achieving a political settlement of disputed issues among the Asian countries and at turning Asia and the Indian Ocean into an extensive zone of peace and mutually advantageous international cooperation.

"On the whole the course of world affairs and world developments forcefully show that, for all the sophisticated misanthropic schemes of the forces of imperialism, Zionism and racism, their plans are doomed to failure. The machinations of those who want to provoke a world nuclear catastrophe, the aggressive policy of those who look for their "vital interests" in far-away seas and at strange coasts and the reckless adventurist policy of the forces of militarism and imperialist reaction are now countered by the might and cohesion of the socialist community, its growing solidarity with the forces of national liberation and democracy, the unbending will and firm determination of all the peoples and peaceloving forces to defend their inalienable right, dignity and freedom and to preserve peace and life on earth.

"We have met here on the eve of the 25th anniversary of the Afro-Asian peoples' solidarity movement, a militant and recognised contingent within the international democratic anti-imperialist movement," Sharaf Rashidov pointed out in conclusion. "The solidarity movement and its organisation were born of the very logic and practice of the anti-colonial liberation struggle of the Asian and African peoples.

"From the early days of the Afro-Asian peoples' solidarity movement the Soviet public actively joined its ranks not only because the bigger part of our country lies on the Asian continent. In their feelings and ideas the Soviet people are guided by the sacred and lofty principles of proletarian internationalism and solidarity with all the oppressed nations, the principles spread among our people through the immortal doctrine of great Lenin.

"Today the AAPSO and its numerous national branches face new important tasks. These have to do with mobilising the broad mass of the people to defend national sovereignty and to repel the ever more vicious aggressive encroachments by imperialism, Zionism and racism. They envision an ever more active involvement of the Asian and African public in the worldwide struggle to curb the arms race, towards disarmament, genuine economic independence of its countries and their protection from diktat and exploitation by the transnational corporations."

The AAPSO Secretary-General NOURI ABDEL RAZZAK delivered a report of the AAPSO standing secretariat, surveying the 25-years-long activities of the Organisation, which had won broad recognition and authority by its purposeful and consistent struggle for the true interests of the Asian and African peoples and for peace throughout the world.

The session was also addressed by ABDULLAH HOURANI, head of the PLO delegation and member of the Palestinian national council; TAREK CHEHAB, vice-chairman of the Progressive Socialist Party of Lebanon; KURT SEIBT, head of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic and chairman of the solidarity committee of the GDR; V. DHARMALINGAM, AAPSO representative and member of parliament, Sri Lanka; ERNESTO FLORES (Salvador), representative of the Farabundo Marti national liberation front and ALBERT FARHAT, secretary of the Lebanese national committee of Afro-Asian solidarity.

When discussing Soviet peace initiatives, the forum spoke highly about Leonid Brezhnev's proposal that the leading

bodies of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation should make statements about not spreading the sphere of the two alliances' activities to Asia, Africa and Latin America.

"The Soviet commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is motivated by a profound sentiment for peace," said the AAPSO *Deputy Secretary-General* CHITTA BISWAS (India). "Only a country truly concerned over the well-being of entire humankind and working towards peace could make this important step so necessary to the people."

"By developing the atmosphere of mutual understanding and goodneighbourliness on the planet, we would eliminate the possibility of not only major wars but also of 'smaller' conflicts," TRAN LAM, *member of the National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam*, emphasised.

"We are constantly aware of what 'defending the interests' of the imperialist countries means," CHUM BUN RONG, *Secretary-General of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Committee of Kampuchea*, said. "It looks like the atrocities perpetrated by the Pol Pot bands are in keeping with the interests of the US Administration and other countries' governments that install these outcasts in international organisations. We clearly see who is our friend and who is our enemy. Our people are deeply grateful to the Soviet Union, other socialist countries and all the progressive forces which helped Kampuchea and expressed sympathy with the just struggle of our people."

"Imperialism is interested in provoking conflicts and maintaining tensions on all the continents", ABDUL MAJID SARBILAND, *Deputy Chairman of the Afghan Organisation of Peace, Friendship and Solidarity*, pointed out. "We consider attempts by some Western countries to make the UN discuss the so-called Afghan problem a gross interference in our domestic affairs. This is obviously designed to distract the attention of the international public from imperialism's bloody crimes in Lebanon, Southern Africa, El-Salvador and other Latin American countries."

"We support the demand made by the littoral states that the Indian Ocean be declared a zone of peace and security," MADANMANI DIKSHIT, *member of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee of Nepal*, said.

The session of the AAPSO Presidium adopted some documents, which convey the unbending will to strengthen friendship and solidarity in the struggle for peace, freedom and the flourishing of the peoples and in defending human rights.

The general declaration of the 11th AAPSO session stressed that the US Administration was threatening mankind with nuclear terror and escalating the arms race in the interests of the transnational corporations. At the same time it was the US Administration together with its NATO partners that were to blame for thwarting disarmament negotiations at the second special session of the UN General Assembly. The AAPSO Presidium called on all the peace- and freedom-loving people in the world to make the United States and other nuclear powers follow the example of the Soviet Union which had renounced to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The people of the world urge to foil the reckless attempts of the US Administration to lead the world to the third world war.

The session passed declarations on Palestine and Lebanon, resolutions on the Middle East, Asia, Africa, the Indian Ocean and Latin America, an appeal to the nonaligned movement, a resolution on disarmament problems and the anti-war movement and a declaration on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the AAPSO. A declaration was also made to the Soviet people on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the foundation of the USSR.

The AAPSO Presidium worked out a programme of action of the organisation for the coming period.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

IMPORTANCE OF THIRD-WORLD WORKING CLASS IN FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS STRESSED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 4-6

[Article by Academician Alexei Rumyantsev: "The Transition From Capitalism to Communism--The Hallmark of Our Times"]

[Text]

One of Lenin's well-known ideas was that every country and every nation would choose its own road to socialism. "...Different nations are advancing in the same historical direction", Lenin wrote, "but by very different zigzags and bypaths."¹ Historical practice shows that in none of the existing socialist countries have the forms, methods and paths of socialist revolution copied other people's experience, all of which gives the lie to assertions that there is some sort of "unification" of methods of struggle for socialism and that the Soviet Union allegedly attempts to impose its own experience of building a new life on other countries. No one denies the right of communist parties and revolutionary movements to have national peculiarities and to choose their own ways and forms of struggle for socialism. The Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee on the 60th Anniversary of the Formation of the USSR states that "the Soviet Union imposes on no one any pattern or 'model' of state structure that would ignore the peculiarities of one country or another. It exercises growing influence on the course of history by the very fact of its existence and the actual practice of social and international relations of a new type."

It is an altogether different matter that, for all the peculiarities of individual countries in their advance towards socialism, the fundamental laws of struggle for socialism, which have been tested time and again and confirmed by historical practice, should be taken into account. The problem is summarising concrete experience and major tendencies in this struggle and dialectically outlining the specifics of realising these tendencies in different countries.

Nowadays, the revolutionary, socialist, and national liberation movements are gaining strength in many African, Asian and Latin American countries. National democratic revolutions, which often occur as a result of the on-going national liberation processes, became especially widespread in the second half of the 1970s. This confirmed the conclusion of the CPSU on the qualitatively new stage in the national liberation movement when "the struggle for national liberation in many countries has in practical terms begun to grow into a struggle against exploitative relations, both feudal and capitalist".²

The countries which have freed themselves from colonial dependence inevitably face the problem of choosing between the capitalist road of development and socialist orientation. Socialism presently enjoys such great prestige that

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 195.

² *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1971, p. 15.

many countries have opted for socialist orientation. Nevertheless, they are confronted with considerable economic, social and cultural difficulties along this path.

Many of these states are at a development level when historically imminent general democratic changes (the elimination of precapitalist forms of exploitation, the solution of the agrarian problem, and egalitarian political reforms) should ensure their gradual advance towards modern bourgeois society. The concept of dependent social development which is a major accomplishment of Marxist social science, provides ample proof, however, that the backwardness and dependence of the developing countries (their two fundamental characteristics) are a natural product of objective laws operating precisely within the capitalist formation.

The national economy of each of these countries was (and in many cases remains) but a part of the world capitalist system. The nature of this "involvement" in the world economy is such that the newly-free countries generally receive impulses for development from external sources and as a direct result of the corresponding changes in the productive forces and the mode of production in the leading capitalist countries. It is only natural and most significant that capitalism manifests itself as a destructive rather than constructive force, which accounts for the growing social tensions and uneven development. This has to do primarily with the fact that the eradication of precapitalist relations and the emergence of "national" capitalism "within" the country is often not only non-concomitant with the process of introducing capitalism from "without" but proves to be incompatible with it. Besides, the tremendous gap in the level of social and economic development between the industrialised capitalist and newly-free countries, the latter generally lack the necessary prerequisites for the "natural" appearance of "national" capitalism.

This social situation results in the emergence of, for example, populist theories that combine bourgeois-democratic (anti-feudal and anti-archaic) features with anti-capitalist tendencies enhanced manifold at present by the influence of the world socialist system.

Populism can be briefly defined as an ideology of non-capitalist development through adapting and modernising traditional collectivist methods and values (commune, artel, family and principles of moral solidarity and religious commandments, and so on). Socially and politically, it finds expression in widely ranging forms, from moderately reformist programmes to revolutionary democratic regimes. (Regimes of an intermediary nature with an ill-defined political orientation are also possible).

At the same time, the majority of the developing countries are far from having formed their main modern classes, while the transformation and development of their social and class structure are taking place in especially complicated circumstances. The rate, scale, and nature of this process are affected by a group of factors which are determined by the backwardness of social development which resulted from the prolonged sway of colonialism, the emergent states' dependent position within the world capitalist economy, the neocolonialist policy of imperialism, and also the existence of extensive, and so far, quite viable social layers connected with various precapitalist modes of production and early forms of capitalism. All this, taken together, explains the numerous layers of the social and class structure and the specific forms of class struggle in the newly-free countries.

Western social science has even produced a special trend—"third world" sociology or development sociology—which tries to prove that the laws of socialist development formulated by the Marxist philosophers are allegedly inap-

applicable to the newly-free countries with their backward social and economic structures. For instance, some representatives of this trend claim that the social structure of many developing countries, in Africa in particular, is not a class structure. Hence they deny the existence of the working class in a number of newly-free states.

The ideological opponents level especially fierce attacks at the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the vanguard role of the proletariat in the revolutionary process. Not only bourgeois sociologists but also some progressive and revolutionary-minded politicians assert that the peasants, rather than the proletariat, now constitute the main revolutionary force in many poorly developed countries. Some peculiarities, characteristic of the working class in these countries, which distinguish it from the working class in the developed capitalist countries, are used as a major argument in this respect.

Marxism-Leninism proceeds from the premise that the formation of the proletariat is inseparably connected with capitalist production. The proletariat grows along with the development of capitalism. At the same time, in composition and structure, today's working class is quite different from the working class of the days of the industrial revolution. Capitalist relations developed in the newly-liberated countries under the specific conditions of a colonial regime and in a social medium where productive forces were as yet unprepared by preceding development to play their normal role in society. For this reason, capitalism was somewhat alien to the social organism of these countries; this had a definite effect on the formation of the proletariat and determined the peculiarities of its formation. Nevertheless, the 1960s and 1970s saw qualitative changes in the composition and structure of the proletariat in many developing countries, changes that brought it closer to today's working class, even though some distinguishing features still remain.

Statistical analysis carried out by Soviet scholars shows that the share of the economically active population engaged in agricultural and other traditional sectors will decrease noticeably in the newly-free countries in the coming twenty years. At the same time, the share of industrial workers, small-scale proprietors, and urban working people will grow considerably. In principle, these social shifts can greatly strengthen the positions of workers and peasants in the Asian and African revolutionary movements.

In analysing social structure, Marxism-Leninism proceeds from defining the place people occupy in the system of social production. Incidentally, this is the fundamental difference between the Marxist theory of classes and class struggle and the stratification theory advocated by Western sociologists. The strong point of the Marxist method consists in its dialectical, developmental, and historical approach. It not only uses the past to explain the present but also views the latter as an instant of historical development in its universal integrity, within which the past exists as a "vestige" and a constituent of the present and the future.

The formation of the proletariat as a separate class has two distinct aspects—socio-economic and socio-political. The former is determined by the capitalist mode of production and was studied in detail by the founders of scientific communism. As for the socio-political aspect, Karl Marx connected it with the proletariat's turning from a "class in itself" into a "class for itself", with a growing class consciousness and awareness among the proletariat of its historic mission, that of a revolutionary transformer of society.

It should be pointed out that the proletariat gains class consciousness not only from the level of socio-economic development but also under the influence of many other factors. A country can be rather highly developed in social and eco-

conomic respects, but its proletariat may not be a "class for itself" if it is unaware of its class interests and is influenced by bourgeois ideology, which is alien to it in essence.

At the same time, the working class in less developed countries, fighting under the leadership of Marxist-Leninist parties to eliminate the capitalist system, is capable of not only becoming a "class for itself" but even a ruling class.

The specific historical conditions of its struggle against the exploiter system are of decisive importance in the proletariat's turning from a "class in itself" into a "class for itself". (This does not exclude the fact that the appearance of class consciousness is connected first and foremost with the level of development of the capitalist mode of production). Furthermore, during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, this transformation of the proletariat from a "class in itself" into a "class for itself" will take place much more quickly than it did in the past. Incidentally, the programme documents of the ruling parties in quite a few developing countries, including the Congo, Mozambique, Angola, Benin and Ethiopia, recognise the leading role of the proletariat in carrying out social transformations.

As far as prospects of historical development are concerned, the results of class formation in the newly-free countries depend largely on whether they choose the socialist or the capitalist road of development. This is explained by the fact that when the integral social class structure has not yet formed, the role and activity of different intermediary strata, movements, and social groups is growing, while super-structure institutes become relatively more independent and have an increasing affect on socio-economic processes.

In this context, when analysing the main tendencies of and prospects for social progress in the countries which have embarked on the road of independent development, it is highly important not to judge phenomena at their face value and to be able to see the main course of the historical process in outwardly diverse social and political trends.

Marx and Engels pointed out that the essence of every discrete historical process could not be understood if treated in isolation. All discrete processes taking place in one country or another are organically connected with the world historical process, for all their peculiarities. Today's democratic liberation movements and the newly-free countries' struggle against neocolonialism can triumph only in alliance with the international workers' movement and the forces of world socialism.

We do not identify national liberation movement with social revolution, because they have different tasks and aims and are characterised by a different alignment of class forces. For this reason, a revolutionary situation in the course of a national liberation movement is not identical to a revolutionary situation which can lead to the complete victory of, for example, the proletarian revolution. But we should not overlook the possibility and tendency of a revolutionary situation of one type to evolve, under certain circumstances, into a revolutionary situation of a different, higher (in a historical respect) type.

The victory of the national liberation or general democratic movement can lead to the end of the revolutionary crisis or the revolutionary situation for a comparatively long period and to the beginning of an evolutionary stage of struggle. This stage will gradually produce conditions for a new revolutionary crisis, which would call for a socialist revolution.

However, developments can take a different turn, and the victory of the national liberation or democratic movement may not exhaust all the possibilities of the revolutionary situation but further develop it toward the gaining of power by the proletariat itself. For example, the Cuban revolution was not a socialist revolution at the outset. But when the bourgeois government set up as a result of that revolution began obstructing social transformations and the armed pe-

ople demanded that another government be established, the Cuban revolution acquired socialist tendencies.

The theory of the world revolutionary process occupies an exceptionally important place in the great heritage of the founders of Marxism. Needless to say, Lenin was the most avowed advocate of the world revolution, but, unlike his opponents, he saw it not as some "categorical imperative" or dogmatic "precept" but as a vital process, which must evolve and ripen but which cannot be "scheduled".

When analysing the paths of the revolution, Lenin insisted on a specific and objective approach to the various features and phenomena in all their complexity, interrelatedness, and interdependence. He resolutely opposed superficial ideas of capitalism as a system which could be eliminated almost automatically.

Today, as never before, it is important to bear in mind Lenin's maxims on the paths of the revolution, on the importance of the proletariat's taking into account and making use of all existing differences and social conflicts and of the need for all anti-monopolist and anti-imperialist forces to strengthen their alliance.

●
"Miraculous prophecy is a fairy-tale. But scientific prophecy is a fact."¹ History has corroborated this idea of Lenin: the Marxist theory reflected and brought together in a dialectical unity the social processes and contradictions of human society and scientifically defined all the main motive forces of the present-day historical period, its content, development trend and intrinsic characteristics. Marx and Engels proved that the development of society is not a chain of chance occurrences nor a result of voluntarist arbitrariness nor God's will but the natural dialectic materialist process of the development of the productive forces, public weal and the people's consciousness in all their interdependence, interaction and contradictions.

If changes in production relations are viewed in retrospect it can be seen that, after the primitive stage, mankind went through three consecutive economic stages (types of relations). It is observed that every time new relations took shape within the preceding type. The very process of their emergence and development in society was spontaneous and independent from the people's will and consciousness. It was only the class already dominant in social production that consciously seized power. Consciousness in this process did not cancel the decisive spontaneous development of production relations nor the need for old relations to be supplanted by new ones.

Certain features connected with objective economic interests of different social groups fighting to ensure the preponderance and development of their own interests kept accumulating within a formation. The struggle was between the classes, on the one hand, ruling under given economic relations and, on the other, those refuting these relations and engendering new ones and new social structures. It was a matter of changing the very foundation of the formation.

When society passed from capitalism to communism (socialism) history introduced an essential objective factor in this traditional natural and historical process, namely, communist (socialist) relations, as is shown by history, do not nor can emerge spontaneously under capitalism. For this reason transition from capitalism to communism (socialism) is only possible as a conscious transition ensuring the goal-oriented development of relations non-existent under capitalism.

¹ V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 27, p. 494. ■

AAPSO CHAIRMAN PRAISES SOVIET NATIONALITIES, FOREIGN POLICIES

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 6-8

[Article by Mirza Ibraghimov, chairman of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee: "In the Vanguard of the Struggle for Peace and Progress"]

[Text]

The Soviet people have celebrated the 60th anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the first workers' and peasants' state in the world. It will not be a mistake to say that the peoples of other countries of the socialist community, as well as all the fighters for social progress regarded the anniversary as a common, international holiday. The 1917 October Revolution broke the fetters of social and national oppression and enabled all the peoples of Russia to engage in independent historical creative endeavour. The establishment of the power of the working class and the toiling peasants, and also of public ownership of the means of production laid down a solid foundation for the free development of all nations and nationalities, and of their closeknit unity and friendship.

The achievements scored by the Soviet Union are ample evidence that socialism has provided for unheard of progress in all spheres of life. The national income has increased many times over that period. The USSR's share in the world industrial output has grown from one per cent in 1922 to 20 per cent today. Suffice it to say that the Soviet Union produces more pig iron, steel, oil, iron ore, coal, cement and many other items than any other state.

Such social evils inherent in capitalism as famine, poverty unemployment and illiteracy have been eradicated for ever in the Soviet Union. Soviet science has scored outstanding successes in the key spheres of mathematics, mechanics, and the exploration of outer space, as well as in many other fields. The building of a society of developed socialism has been the main outcome of the selfless labour of the Soviet people.

The history of the Soviet state demonstrates the tremendous vitality of the ideas of Lenin and of his principles of the national policy. The multinational family of Soviet peoples, armed with the historic decisions of the 26th Congress of the CPSU (1981), has been making confident strides forward, showing the rest of the world an example of unshakable friendship, close fraternal cooperation among the workers of different nationalities in building communism.

In one of his speeches Leonid Brezhnev said: "The unity of the multinational family of Soviet peoples is solid as diamond. The diamond has a multitude of varicoloured facets, and so does the unity of our people reflecting the diversity of the nations comprising it, each of them living a rich, free, and happy life." The formation and development of the USSR is of intransient, international significance, inasmuch as it

marks an important historical watershed in the age-old struggle of progressive mankind for equality, friendship among nations, and the revolutionary renovation of the world.

Life has corroborated Lenin's prevision that the new social system gives birth to totally different international relations devoid of the discrimination, domination and subordination inherent in the capitalist world. It is precisely on such noble principles that the USSR is basing its relations with the newly-free states of Asia, Africa and Latin America which are fighting against imperialism, and for the consolidation of national independence and social progress. The Soviet Union has been coming out resolutely for the elimination of the vestiges of colonialism, and against neocolonialism and racism, economic and political diktat and inequality in international relations. It supports consistently the anti-imperialist traditions of the nonaligned movement, rendering practical support to the struggle waged by the developing countries to restructure the international economic relations along democratic lines.

The Soviet public, including the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, makes an important contribution to the resolution of these tasks. Millions of people—representatives of all strata of the multinational family of Soviet peoples—take part in the Committee's activities. Expressing the interests of the Soviet public at large, the Committee regards it as its principal task to strengthen solidarity with the peoples of Asian and African countries and develop ties and contacts between the Soviet public and that of Asia and Africa. It gives allround moral, political and practical assistance and support to the peoples fighting for freedom and independence, against neocolonialism, racism, hegemonism and imperialism.

The Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee is developing broad fraternal ties with solidarity organisations, revolutionary democratic parties, and national liberation movements of more than 80 countries. It also maintains contacts with many progressive international organisations, including UN Special Committees on Namibia and on the Indian Ocean, UNESCO, the Organisation of African Unity, the Arab League, and the progressive public in Western Europe and America. The Soviet participants in the Afro-Asian solidarity movement regard the strengthening of cooperation and unity of action with the public of the fraternal socialist countries as a principal task in the allround development of international ties. The Soviet Solidarity Committee has been developing successfully its joint activities with the solidarity committees of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia. The movement for anti-imperialist solidarity in Asian countries, which are confidently following the path of socialist development, has become truly internationalist in content. The formation in recent years of solidarity committees in Vietnam, Mongolia, the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, Laos and Kampuchea is a case in point.

The massive political campaigns of solidarity with the just struggle of the Vietnamese people, joint action days, solidarity weeks, Soviet-Vietnamese friendship months, sponsored by the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, the Soviet Committee of Support to the Peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea and other public organisations, are graphic manifestations of the fraternal feelings of the Soviet people for the Vietnamese people.

Voicing the opinion of the Soviet public, the Soviet Solidarity Committee has been actively working to promote unity of the anti-imperialist and anti-racist forces. On the initiative of the Committee, the Soviet people annually observe the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (21 March), Africa Liberation Day (25 May), and

the Week of Solidarity with the Struggle of the Peoples of Southern Africa (25-30 May), during which meetings, get-togethers, exhibitions and seminars are being held.

The Soviet public also marks widely the International Day of Solidarity with the Fighting People of Southern Africa, the Day of Solidarity with Political Prisoners in South Africa and the Day of the Heroes of South Africa. The programme of events to mark the 70th Anniversary of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) was an important action of solidarity with the just struggle of the peoples of Southern Africa.

The Soviet Solidarity Committee renders assistance and support to the fighting peoples of Southern Africa in the person of their vanguards—the ANC and SWAPO.

The further rapprochement between world socialism and the national liberation movement, the two revolutionary forces of our day and age, the heightened impact of the concept of scientific socialism on African and Asian countries, the extension of all-out political, moral and material aid to the national liberation movements, progressive organisations and parties, and the further development of the anti-imperialist orientation are regarded by the Soviet public as the main guidelines in the Afro-Asian solidarity movement.

The peoples of Asia and Africa value highly the assistance given to them by the Soviet Union, and in particular by the Soviet Solidarity Committee. This is invariably evident from the meetings and conversations with statesmen and political leaders, prominent figures in the national liberation movement. They have repeatedly voiced their gratitude to the Soviet Union and its people for the support rendered to the just struggle of the peoples of Asia and Africa and for the vigorous upholding by the Soviet Union of the ideas of peace, progress and humanism, at international fora.

The peoples of the world consider the Soviet Union to be an example of the social and political remaking of society on the basis of the just principles meeting their aspirations and ideals. The evils inherent in the capitalist world, such as economic crises, unemployment, impoverishment of the working people, social and national inequality, as well as the realisation by the broad strata of the population of the fact that it is inconceivable to solve the vital tasks of social development along capitalist lines, make the ideas of scientific socialism more attractive, impelling the peoples of Asia and Africa to better acquaint themselves with the experience of national and state development in the USSR. The Soviet Union does not impose on anybody any patterns and "models" of development. It has been exerting a growing influence on the course of history by the very fact of its existence, the practice of social and international relations of new type, by its example of tackling most complicated problems which capitalism is unable to cope with. The USSR—a powerful socialist state—bases its relations with other countries on the lofty, as Lenin put it, principle of human equality.

The growing number of states which have embarked on the road of socialist orientation in recent years fully corroborates the veracity of Lenin's proposition as to the possibility of the development of backward countries towards socialism in the contemporary period, bypassing the capitalist stage. Today, hundreds of millions of people in different countries of Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America, together with the peoples of the USSR, are following the road paved by the October Revolution. This is fresh evidence confirming the time-tested proposition that there is no, neither can there be, a road towards socialism, which would ignore general regularities discovered by Marxism-Leninism, reaffirmed by the

experience of the USSR and other countries of the existing socialism, and by the international practice of revolutionary struggle and socialist construction. There can be no successful movement along this road without due account of the national specifics of each country.

The newly-free countries have come to play an ever bigger role in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, racism and reaction. In confrontation with imperialism they have been upholding with ever growing force their rights, endeavouring to consolidate their political and economic independence and raise the level of social and cultural progress of their peoples.

Imperialism, however, has not reconciled itself to the loss of its colonial sway. It hopes, through neocolonialism, to continue exploiting those countries, and controlling their economic and political life. Imperialist quarters resort to subversion aimed at dividing the national liberation movement and breaking its weakest links. The imperialist and reactionary forces make use of the difficulties encountered by the young national states and their economic backwardness. In a bid to regain their positions in the developing countries, the imperialists torpedo their economic and social development, stage counterrevolutionary putsches, support anti-popular military dictatorships and fan up nationalism and separatism.

The US doctrines of the admissibility of "limited nuclear war", delivering a first nuclear strike, carrying out large-scale plans of producing new types of nuclear weapons, neutron weapons included, setting up military bases and rapid deployment forces in various parts of the world pose a great danger to the cause of peace, freedom and independence of nations.

The imperialist forces, primarily the United States, act as inspirers and engineers of military conflicts, aggressive wars, and subversive activities against independent states and the national liberation movements. This was graphically demonstrated, for example, by the Israeli aggression against Lebanon launched with the aim of dividing this independent country, eliminating the Palestine resistance movement, weakening the liberation movement of the Arab peoples and establishing imperialist domination in the Middle East.

The Soviet people have always sided with the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples waging a valiant struggle against the Israeli aggressors. Meetings and rallies condemning Israeli aggressors have been taking place in the USSR. The Presidium of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee devoted a special sitting to the struggle for the rights of the Lebanese and Palestinians. Representatives of the Soviet public laid bare the aggressive, terroristic Zionist policy pursued by the Begin government against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples and aimed at whipping up tension in the region; a policy accompanied by grave crimes committed by the Israeli military on Lebanese soil. The message of solidarity sent by the Committee's Presidium to the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organisation and the Lebanese national patriotic forces expressed the will of millions upon millions of the Soviet people and their support to the just struggle of the Arab peoples.

Amidst the aggravated international situation caused by the policy of imperialism, the vigorous implementation of the Leninist strategy of peace pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet state is of paramount importance to the future of humankind. The Peace Programme for the 1980s set forth by the Soviet Communists in the 1970s and supplemented by fresh peaceful initiatives points to realistic and constructive ways for diminishing the threat of war, deepening detente, and developing large-scale cooperation between states with different social systems. It opens up possibilities for solving knotty international issues through honest and equitable negotiations, rather than through confrontation.

The commitment of the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, as well as other proposals tabled at the Second Special Session on Disarmament of the UN General Assembly are a political act of historical significance and another graphic manifestation of the peaceful nature of Soviet foreign policy. The USSR's stand at that international forum on disarmament reiterated that the policy pursued by the socialist community headed by the USSR is an effective counterbalance to the ambitions of the aggressive imperialist quarters to impose on the nations another round of the arms race and constantly to exacerbate the international situation.

The Soviet policy by nature is highly humanistic and democratic. It meets the interests of the peoples of the USSR, the fraternal socialist countries, and the whole of peace-loving humanity. This guarantees it support from broad sections of the world public, all people of goodwill. It is imperative today that the other nuclear powers take steps in response to the Soviet commitment.

The anti-war, peace-loving activities of public organisations, including organisations of solidarity with the peoples of Asia and Africa, are of special importance under the current complicated international situation. The record has shown that the foes of peace are forced to reckon with the peace-loving public, and it cannot be ignored by the governments of Western states. The activity of public organisations is aimed at exposing the dangerous schemes of the advocates of the arms race, and it helps the peoples fully realise the danger of their designs and intentions, thereby promoting the mobilisation of the broad masses in all countries for the struggle against war, and for a lasting peace. All this was convincingly demonstrated by such international forums with the participation of the Soviet Solidarity Committee as the meeting of the Presidential Council of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation (AAPSO) in Moscow, the International Conference "The Indian Ocean Is a Zone of Peace" in Delhi, the Second International Conference "On the Role of Transnational Corporations and the Strategy of Economic Development" in Addis Ababa, the sitting of the AAPSO Presidium in Tashkent, and so on. All these events took place in 1982.

The Soviet people marked the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR by new labour achievements. It takes pride in the historical mission being successfully carried out by the Soviet Union, which is in the forefront of the fighters for peace, independence, freedom and happiness of the peoples.

Cohesion within a single union state augments the creative efforts by the nations and nationalities of the USSR, and accelerates the economic, social and cultural advance of each republic. In mines and on oil rigs, at factories and plants, in institutes and laboratories, in fields and on farms, in town and country, the Soviet people are working selflessly to implement the far-reaching tasks of building the communist society of independent and equal fraternal peoples, the first in the history of mankind.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

RECENT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS IN AFRICA SURVEYED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 9-12, 19

[Article by Vladimir Lopatov, candidate of science (Economics): "Africa: Today and Tomorrow"]

[Text]

An analysis of the current developments in Africa shows that for the majority of the continent's countries, they are marked by further transformation of the struggle for national emancipation, into the struggle for social liberation and for overcoming economic backwardness and eliminating neocolonial exploitation.

The bastion of colonial and racial oppression, the base of permanent aggressive encroachments upon independent Africa remains in Southern Africa mainly due to the efforts of the USA and some of its NATO allies. However, in that region, too, as was pointed out in the decisions of the 26th Congress of the CPSU, the growing liberation struggle in Namibia, as well as in South Africa, vividly demonstrates that the domination of "classical colonialists and racists in drawing to an end".

LINES OF DIFFERENTIATION

While evaluating the processes of social development on the African continent, we should clearly realise that Africa today is highly heterogeneous. The watershed between the progressive and the conservative forces, which was previously often unobtrusive, is now assuming a more pronounced socio-class character. The phenomena and tendencies of social development in various countries which are similar on the surface, are essentially different, depending above all on the socio-political orientation of a given state and on a number of other factors.

Over a dozen of African states which have opted for socialist orientation—Algeria, Angola, Benin, the Congo, Mozambique, Ethiopia and others—

are in the vanguard of the struggle against imperialism, old and new forms of colonialism, and for a fundamental remaking of society along progressive lines. Of course, between these countries there also exist considerable differences not only in the length of time they have been moving toward the chosen goal, but also in the ideology of the ruling revolutionary parties, in socio-economic structure and level of economic development, in specific methods of running the transformations and in the degree of success attending their efforts. At the same time, they are united by a community of objectives including gradual elimination of the positions of imperialist monopolies, of local big bourgeoisie and feudal lords, curtailment of foreign capital's activities, helping the people's state assume control over the economy, providing for a transition to planned development of productive forces, encouragement of cooperative agriculture in the countryside, enhancement of the role played by the working people in social life, gradual consolidation of the state machinery by way of employing national personnel devoted to the people's cause, and the anti-imperialist character of these countries' foreign policies. Thus, the revolutionary parties are growing stronger and expressing ever more firmly the interests of the masses.

At the same time, the majority of African states still attempt to solve their problems through the evolution of private enterprise and capitalist relations. This numerous group includes countries with such regimes which, while upholding national and common African interests, more often than not enter into confrontation with imperialism. At the same time, there are also

countries which actually serve as imperialism's political and ideological mainstay in Africa, and act as an instrument of destabilisation in respect of the countries which have embarked on socialist development. At the turn of the 1980s, the USA and France have boosted their military presence respectively in East and West Africa.

The attempts at gross interference in the internal affairs of African states on the part of Western powers and the conflicts between independent African states provoked or fanned by imperialism have complicated the political situation in many areas of the continent. Suffice it to mention the aggressive intrigues against Angola, Libya and Ethiopia, the fratricidal war in Chad which finally ended in the overthrow of the legitimate government by insurgents encouraged from the outside. There are many other examples.

During independence, the economic gap between African states has grown considerably along with the socio-political differentiation. Using favourable natural factors and the situation in the world market, some countries found themselves in a more advantageous position. These are, above all, the oil producers—Algeria, Gabon, Libya, Nigeria—which have spent part of their earnings to develop the national economy (all differences in the political principles and social opinions dominating in those countries notwithstanding). Conversely, 23 countries which lack valuable raw materials in great demand on the world market, are among the least developed countries, according to UN statistics, and roughly the same number of African states occupy an intermediate position. Unevenness of their economic development is illustrated by the rates of the GNP growth in each of these groups: over the past two decades they amounted, on an average, to 7 per cent a year in the oil-exporting countries, 2.9 per cent in the least developed countries, and 4 per cent in the rest of the African states. In other words, the "train" is getting longer, and those nearest the caboose continue to fall progressively behind.

As has already been mentioned, the processes of differentiation in Africa are occurring under conditions of an acute internal struggle between diverse forces which are as yet far from seeing themselves as representatives and vehicles of the interests of any class in the true sense of the word. The interference of the army in politics has gained a certain regularity. It may be of a reactionary or of a progressive character, or bring about no essential social shifts, except for a change in the government.

In some cases, military regimes have actively involved the army in tackling economic problems. Experience shows, however, that relying exclusively on military force creates no sufficient conditions for economic development. This apparently explains the tendency, which has emerged since the late 1970s, toward a transformation of military regimes into civilian ones. Elections were held in Nigeria, Mali, the Congo and Benin, and the bloody dictatorship of Idi Amin in Uganda was overthrown. Some other countries have proclaimed that preparations are afoot for the restoration of civilian rule. Still, the developments in Liberia, the Upper Volta, and Ghana attest to the fact that the causes for the army's initial interference in domestic politics still persist.

The complex and contradictory character of social development in the African states, and the inability of many of them to assume even the minimal rates of economic growth make it impossible to give a concrete assessment of their actual achievements. Of course, the road toward a new life is not all roses. However, casting a retrospective glance at that road, one can say safely that the struggle for independence was not in vain.

ECONOMIC SHIFTS

As compared with the colonial period, the rates of economic growth tangibly accelerated and in the 1960s reached an average of 4.7 per cent, and in the 1970s—5.1 per cent (with considerable variations from one country to another). Still these rates of growth are so far too slow to ensure any drastic improvements in living standards of the masses, especially in view of the "population explosion". There are many reasons for that, including the fact that dozens of countries have small populations and narrow domestic markets, and are excessively dependent on the world capitalist economy; besides, they have to live under the sway of foreign monopolies, and lack skilled national personnel and means of accumulation. As a result of large-scale use of foreign sources of financing, the aggregate debt of African countries has topped \$50 billion.

An analysis of the dynamics of the major structure-forming elements of the GNP yields the conclusion that in the 1970s the services and manufacturing industry grew relatively fast (by an average of 6.5 per cent and 5.6 per cent respectively), whereas annual agricultural production increased by only 1.8 per cent. Of course, the average figures

veil the real state of things in individual countries (for example, in the oil producing states the increment of industrial output was 13.1 per cent, while in the least developed countries the figure was 3.7 per cent). Nevertheless, these data tell us something about the most general structural changes in the economy.

Priority development of the services industry is considered justified if average per capita income is \$1,000 or over. But since in Africa this indicator has not been achieved even by all the oil-producing countries, this economic law has been obviously violated. Both traditional and, under Western influence, new services, mainly satisfying the needs of the parasitic, exploiter classes, are increasing in number. In view of the low level of economic development, this is a sure sign of the limited possibilities for productive accumulation.

It is no accident that the oil-exporting countries are firmly in the lead in the field of industrialisation which, ever since independence, most African states regard as a priority task. The hopes of other countries to use their mineral wealth as a stable source of foreign currency earnings to diversify their economies have often mostly failed to materialise. In the 1970s, the overall African growth rates in the mining industry were only 0.12 per cent a year. Practically speaking, production went up in several countries only (the Ivory Coast, Ghana, the Congo, Mozambique and some others), while Zaire, Zambia, Mauritania, Liberia, Senegal and Sierra Leone witnessed a long stagnation in or curtailment of mineral raw materials extraction. Such are the consequences of dependence on the situation in the world capitalist market, and on the dictate of the transnationals.

Nonetheless, some countries succeeded, to a certain extent, in expanding their industrial base and creating manufacturing industries. Their rather fast growth has resulted in a greater share of industry in the total GNP of Africa. However, its share of the world industrial production is still less than one per cent.

The sharp drop in the share of agricultural produce in the GNP of Africa is a most alarming fact: it fell from 42.3 per cent in 1960 to 33.9 per cent in 1970, and to 24 per cent in 1978. This is due not so much to an upswing in other branches as to the stagnation in agriculture. Per capita agricultural produce is diminishing. Another important factor is that many countries emphasise the production of export crops, hoping thereby to increase their hard currency

earnings. Their hopes have not materialised owing to the extremely unfavourable situation in the world market. At the same time, the dependence of African states on food imports has sharply increased: in 1970-1978, it grew by 9.6 per cent annually. The possibilities of agriculture as a source of accumulation have considerably shrunk, and it itself requires "transfusions" of means from other branches of the economy.

The social remaking of the countryside is coupled with the overcoming of the peasants' inertia, and of rather stable archaic traditions. The tribal nobility, the feudal lords and other exploiter elements zealously preserve outdated customs and resolutely oppose any kind of "novelties" which may undermine their power. The present writer is convinced that the future of most African countries and their progress largely depend on the outcome of the struggle against the vestiges of patriarchal and feudal relationships in agriculture, and on the fashion in which millions of peasants are involved in social transformations.

However, the tendencies prevailing in Africa's economic life mirror not only great difficulties and setbacks inherent in the accelerated solution of the continent's socio-economic problems in the present-day international situation. They also testify to the implementation of many prerequisites that have occurred as a result of the historical victories won by the national liberation movement. Such forms of struggle for economic independence as the enhancement of the role played by the state in economic management, nationalisation of the property of foreign companies, establishment of sovereignty over national natural resources, and radical land reforms have emerged and acquired concrete content during past years.

Why are the achievements still far from what has been desired? First of all, this is due to the fact that newly-free countries remain within the system of the world capitalist economy, although they occupy a special (inequitable and subordinate) place in it.

The African states of progressive orientation which have been implementing the above-mentioned measures most consistently and purposefully are subjected to the fiercest onslaught by imperialism, which undermines their economies by prices manipulation, limiting or discontinuing financial and technical aid, and using overt sabotage. It is not always possible to avoid subjective errors in the building of a new society.

The leaders of the countries which have embarked on a capitalist road are acting half-heartedly and inconsistently due to their class convictions. For example, in many cases priority is given first to private enterprise, then to public sector, and attempts are being made to expand the latter on a "mixed", rather than on a national basis, i. e., using the capital of the transnationals, this resulting in their greater expansion. While carrying out land reforms and declaring land to be state property, the governments of those countries encourage private capitalist enterprise instead of co-operative agriculture, giving communal lands to individual farmers, sometimes even to the corrupt bureaucracy or the tribal upper crust, thus intensifying the impoverishment of peasantry.

No wonder the ideological struggle in Africa around choosing the way of development is becoming more intense, and the quest for more radical forms and methods of overcoming backwardness is under way. In this struggle, the progressive forces of the continent have even greater possibilities than was the case prior to their independence, for they can rely on the experience and support of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. In his message to the states and peoples of Africa on the occasion of Africa Liberation Day, Leonid Brezhnev stated on May 25, 1982: "The Soviet Union is on the side of the African states in their striving, freely and in conformity with their own discretion, to dispose of their natural resources, work for their economic independence, and genuine equality in international economic relations."

A GLANCE AT THE FUTURE

What lies ahead? Or, to be more precise, what socio-economic processes are to occur on the continent in the 1980s, i. e., during the UN's Third Development Decade?

To answer this question, it is imperative first and foremost to learn what steps the Africans themselves are going to take during the Decade. Let us turn to the decisions of the Extraordinary Session of the OAU Assembly of Heads of State and Government (Lagos, April 1980) which adopted a plan of action to implement the Monrovia strategy for Africa's economic development. This document which, according to competent specialists, has a more realistic foundation than the programmes of the two previous decades which were largely unfulfilled, declares the principle of everyone's responsibility for the destiny of all, and sets forth national and collective self-reliance as a principal factor in African progress. According to

Secretary-General of the OAU Edem Kodjo, it is a matter of replacing aid with confidence in one's own forces.

Of course, this in no way means that Africa has renounced the bill for its backwardness it has confronted the imperialists with. The gist of the plan consists in radically altering the strategy of development to which African countries have adhered for two decades, weakening the influence of crisis processes which have swept the centres of capitalism on their economies, and counteracting the imperialist attempts to perpetuate the neocolonial order.

Correct lessons have apparently been drawn from the mistakes and setbacks of the past, and this certainly contributes to solving more efficiently the urgent tasks facing Africa, which are also promoted by positive elements in national economy and progressive social changes. Here African states can rely on the administrative machinery, the public sector in the economy, national personnel and the intelligentsia, which simply did not exist two decades ago.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to point out some negative factors, at least the basic ones, which will influence the carrying out of the Lagos Plan.

First, approximately fifty per cent of all African countries are among the least developed and have small populations. They feel especially acutely the burden of the backward forms of production relations in their multisectoral economies. The problems they are facing include low per capita income which fails to create conditions for accumulation; weak industry; utter dependence on the export of a limited number of raw materials and the ensuing sharp fluctuations in currency earnings and difficulties in planning; poorly developed economies and infrastructures; low marketability of agricultural products and food storages. All these characterise both the countries of capitalist development and the states of socialist orientation where the struggle for a new society is proceeding under unusually complicated conditions.

In view of the contemporary requirement that the level of initial accumulation should correspond to the size of the domestic market, the possibilities for creating an independent (even minimal) economic complex without "overcoming" national borders are highly limited in most above-mentioned countries.

It is evident that in such conditions, the key to progress is in the fastest overcoming of disunion, the establishment of regional and subregional economic integration, and the weakening of the current lopsided dependence of

African countries on the markets of the former mother countries. The Lagos plan of action contains corresponding recommendations. The large-scale awareness of this need, and efforts to make the already existing integration associations more efficient are capable of neutralising the negative influence of the "Balkanisation of Africa" on the latter's economic development.

Second, the continent ranks first in the world in population growth (about three per cent annually), which limits economic development and sometimes outstrips the latter. The coming generations will experience the negative aspects of this problem, but it is clear today that due to the population explosion and the pressure brought to bear by archaic socio-economic structures, Africa will continue to encounter great difficulties in increasing the internal accumulation and satisfying the subsistence-level needs of the masses. The food shortage will apparently be aggravated in the coming years. The share of "surplus" labour resources which now amount to from one-third to two-thirds of the rural population will tend to increase. Their migration to towns may result in considerable increases in the marginal strata which, due to the limited nature of the labour market and the absence of any skills, will join the army of unemployed.

There are no simple solutions to these problems. According to some Soviet economists, it is necessary, first and foremost, to carry out a fundamental reform of the countryside, to give land to the "surplus" rural residents and to organise them on a collectivist basis so that pauperised dependants who consume food turn into producers of it (even if they just produce it for themselves irrespective of market prices), and become involved in social life. Naturally, this demands political solutions the possibility for which is directly connected with the general orientation of a given state. Certain prospects are opened up by the use of more labour-intensive (the so-called "intermediate", or "corresponding") technology instead of the capital-intensive technology borrowed from industrialised countries. Direct methods of limiting population growth are in no way ruled out, but experience shows that they produce little effect if not coupled with social measures.

Third, though the Lagos plan rightly stresses the priority of the internal factors of development, external factors must also play an important role. As part of the contemporary world, Africa

is constantly subjected to the impact of diverse external forces, and it cannot ignore the global problems facing mankind as a whole. Apart from the main issue of war and peace, these are problems concerned with energy and raw materials production, ecology, demography, food output and others. They are extremely serious, and, moreover, they will be even more acute unless a reasonable collective solution be found involving consistent international co-operation.

Let us take the fuel and energy problem as an example. Presently, most African countries' outlays for oil imports run up to 20-50 per cent of their export earnings. If African oil importers fail to reduce these expenditures (for example, by securing the right to purchase at lower prices), they will hardly be able to step up their economic development rates.

The majority of states there, especially those of Tropical Africa, cannot get along without financial aid from abroad, which, in 1980, accounted for about 50 per cent of the investments in their economies.

As has already been mentioned, "life on credit" leads to a fast increase of the unbearable burden of foreign debt. In a bid to find a way out, African states will have to seek repeated assistance from the very capitalist countries which are behind their troubles.

However, the question is whether the West will render them as much aid as before?

This is highly problematic. Further exacerbation of the crisis phenomena in the capitalist world, the unprecedented growth of inflation, the departure of the USA and some of its allies from the policy of detente and a huge increase in their military spendings leading to a stepped-up arms race cannot but diminish the solvency of the industrialised capitalist states. As a matter of fact, this is what is taking place now and, unless common sense and the policy of detente prevail, the terms of obtaining credits and loans in the West will become even more rigid and burdensome.

The fanning of tensions and the attempts by imperialist quarters to draw African countries into military and political blocs lead to greater imports of armaments to the continent. Correspondingly, the possibilities for importing machinery, equipment and other commodities needed for peaceful economy are reduced. By using their vast colonialist experience of exerting political

and economic pressure, the imperialist powers are striving to retain at any cost their positions in Africa, to discredit socialist orientation, to prevent from disintegrating the apartheid regime which is supplying them with strategic raw materials and ensuring fabulous profits to their monopolies, artificially to counterpose the interests of the developing countries to those of the socialist community, and to urge those countries toward voluntary isolation from their natural allies.

Thus, despite rather modest achievements, zero progress in some cases or even regression, the main trend determining the character of social development in Africa consists in the buildup of the revolutionary process. It is precisely for this reason that Africa is united with those struggling for a cardinal solution to the problem of curtailing the arms race, reducing the military budgets of the great powers and using the money thus saved to increase aid to the developing countries. Africa supports the elimination of hotbeds of tension and respect for the rights of all countries to sovereign existence without outside interference.

This is an earnest of the successful solution of many problems of socio-economic development in contemporary Africa.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

STRUCTURE, ACTIVITIES OF MODERN TNC'S EXAMINED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 13-15

[Article by Gleri Shirokov, doctor of science (Economics): "Present-Day Transnational Corporations"]

[Text]

Transnational corporations (TNC), which appeared on the international economic scene in the late 1960s, are characterised by an enormous concentration of capital, a broad field of operations, which in the case of the largest of them are spread out over dozens of countries, production facilities abroad, splitting of technological processes among foreign subsidiaries, almost no visible connection with the countries of origin in matters of supply resources, a burgeoning share in world production and trade and, most serious of all, increasing interference in political processes both in the host countries and the countries of origin.

The attention of politicians and economists alike was drawn to the TNCs due to these and other characteristics. They have become a subject of study for many national and international organisations: a commission on transnationals has been set up at the United Nations; similar centres exist in other international organisations or as governmental departments in a number of countries. The TNCs and their operations are constantly referred to in publications, studies, at seminars and conferences. The author of this article was a participant in the Second International Conference on the Role of TNCs and a Strategy of Economic Development held by the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation in Addis Ababa in April-May 1982. The conference was attended by scholars and public figures from 30 countries as well as by representatives of international organisations. The exchange of views brought forth some of the most important aspects of the TNCs activities, primarily those connected with the developing countries. The conference also drew up a number of measures designed to help these countries stem the tide of TNC expansion. At the same time, the discussion revealed the existence of a number of controversial, little studied problems. These latter are dealt with in this article.

Many Western scholars consider that three factors contributed to the emergence of the TNCs: the completion of the postwar recovery in major capitalist countries, the introduction of convertible currencies there, and the first postwar economic crisis which combined to facilitate export of capital. This latter factor was primarily responsible for the appearance of the TNCs. Though these causes are undoubtedly important, in our view, they were but a reflection of a number of deeper processes in the world capitalist economy.

First, the second stage of capitalism's general crisis saw the completion of a transition from monopoly to state-monopoly capitalism. The greatly heightened role of the state in economic regulation, development of production and social infrastructures, scientific research, and, in a number of European countries, in the development of the spheres of material production, contributed to the further growth of productive forces and the socialisation of production. However, this enormous socialisation of production increasingly came in conflict with the private mode of appropriation and existing production relationships.

Secondly, the birth of the world socialist community resulted in a situation when the main antagonism of capitalism—that between labour and capital on the domestic scene—was increasingly exacerbated by capitalism's antagonism to socialism in the international arena. The shrinking domain of capitalist rule, the attractive example of world socialism, and the growing organisation of the working-class movement at the national and international level compelled imperialism to seek new forms and methods both at home and abroad.

Thirdly, the collapse of imperialism's colonial system resulted on the one hand in the elimination of barriers between colonial empires and the freer movement of monopoly capital within the world capitalist economy. On the other hand, the emergence of more than 100 sovereign states, their desire to attain accelerated economic growth rates and achieve industrialisation as well as the growing democratisation of international economic relations compelled imperialism in general and monopolies in particular to abandon non-economic methods of exploitation and to look for new spheres of application of capital, and new relationships with national entrepreneurs—in short, to effect the transition from colonialism to neocolonialism.

Finally, technological progress and the heightened role of the state in financing and organising scientific research produced qualitatively new technologies, new materials and equipment. The introduction of the latest technological achievements called for much larger initial investments and a bigger optimal physical size of production facilities, which, in turn, contributed to the greater concentration and centralisation of production and capital, as well as to a growing international division of labour.

Adding to capitalism's internal contradictions, the cyclical and structural crises of the 1970s boosted the monopolies' expansion by heightening their role in the world economy and politics. Consequently, the emergence of TNCs is but a reflection of the characteristic features of the second stage in the overall crisis of capitalism. However, these same characteristics imbued the TNCs with a number of new features, making them vastly different from ordinary monopolies.

Attempts to define this group of monopolies led to prolonged discussion. Usually listed among their characteristics are the high concentration and centralisation of capital, with assets in excess of one billion dollars and operation in several (but no less than two) countries in addition to the country of origin. We think that this purely quantitative approach tends to overlook qualitative differences between TNCs and ordinary monopolies.

It is our view that one of the principal characteristics of TNCs is the nature of appropriation of profit. It is common knowledge that under capitalism, the primary source of profit is not only the appropriation of surplus value but also a redistribution of income on the basis of monopoly price or differential rent. Using this criterion, we can distinguish three types of monopolies.

Monopolies first appeared in the late 19th century as a result of the earlier concentration and centralisation of capital.

The vast majority of monopolies of the period (such as United States Steel in the USA or AEG in Germany) were mostly organised within a single industry, i. e., on a horizontal basis.¹ Hence such household expressions of the period as "the steel king", "the coal king" or "a railway magnate". Although high concentration of production and the resultant possibility of using increasingly powerful machinery and equipment, savings on the creation of a marketing network, and other overhead expenses gave them certain advantages over non-monopolised producers, their big profits largely stemmed from monopoly profit. Driving their competitors out of business and monopolising the production of certain goods, they limited production, breaking the balance between supply and demand, thus creating the conditions for fixing monopoly prices. These prices, in turn, served as an instrument of income redistribution for all consumers and, consequently, as a source of monopoly profit.

Monopoly profits heightened the contradictions in capitalist societies, resulting in the growing community of interests of non-monopolised producers and the working class in their anti-monopoly struggle. The anti-trust movement which emerged on that basis, demanded legislation against industry-type monopolies. In addition, the redistribution of incomes resulted in an artificial narrowing of markets, thus bringing cyclic overproduction crises closer. The sharpening of these contradictions during the 1929-1933 Great Depression resulted in the bankruptcy or reorganisation of a vast majority of industry-type monopolies under the combined impact of the crisis and anti-trust legislation. However, horizontally-organised colonial-type monopolies specialising in primary commodities have survived to this day. This may have been due to the continuing possibility of appropriating the differential rent and exploiting cheap labour.

Industry-type monopolies gave way to concerns with mainly vertical organisation; later in 1960s-1970s, they, in turn, were replaced by conglomerations. Monopolies of this type had to operate in a new situation. On the one hand, after the crisis and depression, the degree of monopolisation of economy in major imperialist countries increased sharply, and competition with primarily non-monopoly production was replaced by competition primarily among the monopolies themselves. On the other hand, to prevent social tensions, the state was compelled to curb monopoly activities primarily designed to extract monopoly profits. As a result, monopoly profit soon became the exception rather than the rule. Maximum profit became the basis of capital reproduction of concerns (and subsequently of conglomerations). The transfer to the state of the most capital-intensive and least profitable facilities, particularly in the sphere of infrastructure, the accelerated turnover of capital owing to growing mechanisation and better construction organisation plus new marketing techniques, greater efficiency of production as a result of new technology, lower production costs due to increasing use of byproducts, greater division of labour, and large regular government orders and a favourable system of taxation—all combined to bring maxi-profits to the concerns.

However, the growing organic composition of capital and the resultant trend toward a lower rate of profit as well as the impossibility of increasing the rate of surplus value as a result of socialism's example and a stronger working-class movement, as well as the impossibility of using traditional methods in former colonies and dependencies combined to bring about a fall-off in the rate of profit in the

¹ Krupp's 19th century empire was in the main vertically organised, however.

mid-1960s in cases where operations were confined exclusively to domestic markets. All this made maximum profits more difficult to obtain. Nowadays, even enormous concentration and centralisation of capital are no longer sufficient to increase the rate of profit using traditional methods.

It is precisely the desire to boost the rate of profit (or, to be more exact, to return to old maximum profits) that gave rise to the transnationals. Along with improved, more efficient technology, TNCs began to resort to the following methods: monopolisation of relatively cheap and, what is more important, stable sources of raw materials, modification of technology toward less skilled but cheaper labour, use of cheaper sources of capital (in cash and in kind), tax concessions in host countries, capturing additional markets abroad.

It is this monopolisation of certain stages in the turnover of capital that enables the TNCs to extract monopoly profits. In other words, today, TNCs make combined profits—maximum profit (due to highly efficient production) and monopoly profit (due to the monopolisation of production, marketing and consumption), which means a return to the earlier stage. It is this combination that assures the TNCs a higher rate of profit than ordinary monopolies. In turn, the higher rate of profit results in the continuing spatial expansion of the TNCs and in the greater centralisation of capital in the advanced capitalist countries.

Another salient feature of the TNCs is their organisational structure. Ordinary monopolies normally set up production or marketing branches abroad which are fully controlled by the mother firm. By way of contrast, the TNCs are effecting a transition from foreign branches to subsidiaries abroad (the process is far from being completed) in which a certain percentage of the shares belongs to private or state capital in the host country. The transition from a system of branches to foreign subsidiaries happens due to the levelling out of industrialised countries' economic, social, and technological development. In other words, the transition is due primarily to economic causes which give the mother firm sizeable advantages resource-wise. As to the developing countries which lag far behind advanced capitalist states in these respects, the transition from branches to subsidiaries is largely due to political causes: considerations of national prestige or the need of the TNC to conform with local legislation.

Although mother companies can effectively control a subsidiary by means of licencing agreements, supplies of component units, spare parts, and technical expertise, etc., irrespective of the size of its holdings,² for the bourgeoisie of the host country, a subsidiary is more attractive than a branch. First, such a company extracts additional profits as a junior partner of foreign capital. Second, when profits are distributed within the country, taxes are slightly higher than in the case of transfer of undistributed profit abroad. Third, as a rule, the utilisation of amortisation money is greater in the host country. In other words, a subsidiary is a compromise form of TNC operations abroad.

The relationship between the TNC and its subsidiaries (branches) differs from that between an ordinary monopoly and its branches. It would seem that this is primarily due to the changing functions of foreign subsidiaries. Branches of ordinary monopolies normally perform the following functions: sale and servicing of products on foreign markets, assembly, packaging and other end stages in production pro-

² In spite of the many controls at its disposal, a TNC cannot afford to hold a portfolio below a certain lower limit. When, in 1973, India passed a law limiting holdings of foreign companies in India-based subsidiaries to 40 per cent, 59 foreign subsidiaries refused to comply and ceased operations.

cesses, production and initial processing of vegetable or mineral raw materials and their shipment to the mother firm or to the world market. This made branches largely depending on the mother firms. Every branch received financial and material resources from the mother firm and the necessary components, parts etc., as well. Total receipts were added to the deposits of the mother firm, thus obviating the need for direct cooperation between the various branches.

In the case of TNCs, subsidiaries primarily perform production functions, although these may be combined with operations in the marketing and servicing spheres. Moreover, individual stages of technological processes are frequently divided between subsidiaries operating in different countries. This permits the most profitable use of factors which make production cheaper. However, with such an organisation of production, subsidiaries must have sufficient autonomy and extensive links among facilities in different countries must be established. This cooperation permits prompt movement of raw materials, semi-manufactured and finished products between countries, using the mechanisms of transfer prices, favourable taxation regimes, low interest rates, etc. Consequently, reserving the right of final decision in key matters, TNCs grant considerable autonomy to their subsidiaries abroad, encouraging production cooperation between them.

Another typical feature of TNCs is the international nature of their activities against the backdrop of their continuing national identity. Western economists frequently pose the question: are TNCs national monopolies or have they already broken away from national soil and become completely international monopolies. In our opinion, there can be no single answer to this question.

Theoretically speaking, the greater the number of cheap production factors used by a TNC, the greater its rate of profit. But since cheap production factors and untapped markets are widespread, this means that the greater the number of countries with cheap production factors which are drawn into the orbit of a given TNC, the greater its capacity for growth. Indeed, in the case of the largest TNCs, the bulk of production and marketing operations is already concentrated outside the country of origin: in the case of Hoffmann la Roche, it is 97 per cent; of Brown Boveri, 95; of Bayer, 68; and of Hoechst, 67 per cent. But at the same time, these monopolies have preserved their national character.

Two factors prevent the TNCs from breaking their national ties. First, the TNC's "departure" from the country of origin would concomitantly reduce tax receipts of the state along with employment level. So, driven by fiscal considerations and under the pressure of non-monopolised producers, trade unions, and other public organisations, the state seeks to limit the TNCs' activities abroad. Second, the TNCs themselves fear the loss of their property in other countries as a result of revolution, nationalisation, etc., and other factors of political risk, particularly in the developing countries. So they have a stake in their home government's political or even military support. And, finally, monopoly giants are interested in orders from their governments and in delivering goods within the framework of the assistance with strings attached.

It should be pointed out, however, that there are vast differences between TNCs in large and small imperialist countries in this respect. In big countries which have ample domestic markets, the existence of effective demand slows down the transfer of production beyond the given country's boundaries, although the state may actually be interested in the foreign expansion of its TNCs. At the same time these latter rely on the support of the state not only in the event

of a difficult situation in the host country but also in opposing penetration of the domestic market by foreign competitors (the "automobile war" between the US and Japan is a recent example).

In contrast, the TNCs of smaller countries (which have limited domestic markets) tend to move the greatest possible segment of their production facilities abroad. Under these conditions, the "departure" of TNCs from the national soil may prove a serious blow at the state's fiscal interests, thus disrupting its potential for performing its social functions. Consequently, in the case of such countries, measures aimed at preventing the departure of TNCs are of a more pronounced nature. In addition, the TNCs in these countries can hardly count on sizeable support of their government in case of difficulties in the host country. As a result, the TNCs of smaller imperialist states tend to weaken their links with the country of origin. But since the economic power of these monopolies is particularly great with respect to the national state this contradiction is ever more frequently resolved by making the regime more favourable to TNC operations.

Consequently, in spite of the fact that they transcend national boundaries, TNCs remain primarily national monopolies—American, British, Japanese or French ones. But this does not mean that there is a harmony of interests between the TNC and the country of origin. The profit motive can make the TNC act both in the interests of its country of origin and contrary to them. It is precisely for this reason that the TNCs activities lead to deeper contradictions under capitalism.

Another typical feature of the TNCs is their active involvement in politics. Although their activities on the domestic and international scenes are closely interrelated, it is simpler to analyse them separately.

Under state-monopoly capitalism, the activity of the state on behalf of monopolies is simultaneously designed to prevent social tension and political upheavals. However, the growing internationalisation of economic life, particularly under the impact of mushrooming TNCs alongside the remnants of old methods of economic and social management, has produced a crisis of state-monopoly economic regulation at the national level. It manifested itself in the increasing frequency of cyclic and structural crises in the 1970s, skyrocketing inflation and unemployment, cuts in social spending, etc.

These antagonisms could be eased at least partially by bringing state-monopoly regulatory mechanisms in line with the growing internationalisation of economic life through economic integration. However, in view of the new upsurge in imperialist rivalry among the three main centres of world capitalism, and between them and the rest of the capitalist world, such an integration would be a very protracted process, if workable at all.

In these conditions, world capitalism tends to maintain social stability by violent means rather than by social manoeuvring. The TNCs have added to imperialism's internal contradictions, and are thus one of the main causes of this development. They can preserve their privileged position only through the suppression of other classes and strata of bourgeois society. In addition, as the most powerful group of monopoly capital they can influence the state and extract concessions from it.

In the case of TNCs, reproduction and accumulation of capital involve scores of countries. This determines their close interest in the political situation in a large number of countries. More than that, the TNCs also follow political developments in neighbouring countries either as potential targets for expansion or because political changes there could lead

to destabilisation in countries where the TNCs already have a foothold. Unlike the recent past, nowadays TNCs have a stake in preserving their positions not just in individual countries but in the world capitalist system as a whole. Hence their desire to maintain the status quo.

There has been another important change. When their investments abroad were small, most monopolies refrained from direct interference in the internal affairs of countries in which political changes affected their interests. They relied on their governments to do the arm-twisting, because their own expenses might prove incommensurate with possible lost investments. To-day's multinational giants, in contrast, maintain economic links with scores of countries; their subsidiaries ensure broad contacts with local bourgeoisie, government officials, etc. They now have much vaster resources at their disposal. All this encourages them to interfere directly in the internal affairs of host countries. TNCs have become an instrument of destabilisation, particularly in the developing world. The final document adopted by the Addis Ababa conference says, among other things, that the expansion of transnationals in the developing world has changed imperialism's mode of functioning without altering its nature. The document stresses that "internationalisation of capital not only fails to advance capitalism, it actually makes the crisis of state-monopoly capitalism worse, posing a serious threat to national sovereignty, development and peace."

In character, organisational structure, and methods of operation, the TNC is a qualitatively new type of monopoly and a product of the second stage of capitalism's general crisis. The TNCs have become a factor contributing to the worsening of all of capitalism's contradictions—those between labour and capital, between capitalism and socialism, between the centres and the periphery of the world capitalist system. And, what is particularly important, having vastly improved their position vis-à-vis both the state and other groups of bourgeoisie, the TNCs support and encourage the most reactionary trends in the world of capital. This may well be the reason for the growth of reactionary trends in the domestic policies of imperialist states as well as for attempts to disrupt detente and to start a new round of the arms race.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

UZBEK ACADEMICIAN HITS WESTERN WRITINGS ON MUSLIMS IN USSR

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 28-29

[Article by Academician Erkin Yusupov, vice president, Uzbek Academy of Sciences: "Instigators Posing as Defenders"]

[Text]

Talk is cheap, but facts are facts. For all the predictions of its inevitable demise, the Soviet Union has existed for more than 65 years now and is still engaged in building a new society.

The mass media and Sovietologists of all stripe do not tire of calumniating our country and make wide use of sophisticated forms and methods of misinformation and deception, confusing public opinion with blatant lies. They are especially zealous in distorting the essence of the Soviet nationalities policy and the nature of relations between the peoples inhabiting our country.

The problem of Islam features prominently in the ideological subversion organised by imperialism.

Modern Islam is, beyond doubt, a complicated phenomenon, comprising at times conflicting political, social and economic ideas. Western leaders now prefer to pose as "friends" of the Muslims and "defenders" of Islam. In reality, this is but a ploy designed to achieve certain political and economic goals. In point of fact, imperialist policy in the Near and Middle East always smells of oil.

Needless to say, Western strategists take account of the developmental prospects of the Muslim states in their calculations. At present, there are more than 800 million Muslims in the world; they form the overwhelming majority of the population in 34 countries and an influential minority in 14 countries. Bearing this in mind, the capitalist states are seeking to consolidate their positions in the Muslim countries.

These self-proclaimed "defenders" of Islam pose as "fighters" for the interests of the Muslims in the USSR, alternately trying to prove that religion and believers are persecuted in our country and setting forth the inflammatory thesis of the revival and development of Islam and the idea of "Muslim solidarity". In August 1981, the London-based *Economist* carried an article "Soviet Muslims", which asserted that official and unofficial Islam now exists in the Soviet Union. The leaders of official Islam, the author wrote, are loyal and even submissive to the godless authorities. They make no protest against the anti-religious propaganda. In one of its articles *Der Spiegel* (FRG) even said that there are allegedly "red mullahs" in this country, who proclaim pro-Soviet slogans on behalf of all Muslims in the USSR and "pray for the victory of the Soviet cause in the few surviving mosques". The "red muffis", the author writes, are ready to rage on

order, branding first British colonialists then the American war-mongers...

How could it be otherwise if the clergy and religious people in this country chose to serve their homeland faithfully rather than opposing it? This is the manifestation of the Soviet people's sincere feelings and not the result of any sort of diktat! This is precisely what evokes impotent fury among the unasked-for "defenders". Hence the concoctions about an "unofficial Islam" which allegedly preaches a "holy war" against Soviet rule. But where have they found this or the "brotherhood of the Sufis" in the Central Asian Republics? The more objective Western correspondents have been forced to admit that their vigorous quests in this direction have been fruitless.

The allegations that the peoples of the Soviet Central Asian republics lead "double" lives and are "inwardly devoted" to Islam are just as spurious. To substantiate these wild inventions, detractors often make note of persisting national traditions, especially those connected with the observance of different religious rituals of the past. But it is common knowledge that it is not necessarily the religious who adhere to various traditions.

Many Western authors recognise this fact. For instance, David Montgomery writes in *Asian Affairs* that though the Uzbeks have their Muslim cultural heritage, he found it difficult to determine the profundity of their loyalty to Islam as a religious system.

Freedom of conscience is one of the historic accomplishments of the Soviet people. All citizens of the USSR are guaranteed the right to profess or not to profess any religion, and to conduct religious worship or atheistic propaganda, of course, without insulting believers or their feelings. There are four Muslim boards in our country. Religious establishments in Tashkent and Bukhara train Muslim clergy, and mosques function freely. Religious organisations have their own publications, like the journal *Muslims of the Soviet East*, which is published in several languages. The Koran has been reprinted time and again.

In the past few years, much has been written in the West about the religious and national "roots" of population growth in the Central Asian republics. Claims have been made that the growing birth-rate here runs counter to the interests of the Russian people and the Soviet state. National and religious differences alike are allegedly to become increasingly acute precisely as a result of this. The author of the article "Soviet Muslims", claims that the number of the Muslim population is one of the reasons for its cool relations with its northern neighbours, the Great Russians.

It is clear to everyone that the birth-rate in our country has nothing to do with religion or nationality. Many of the Russians, Ukrainians, Koreans and Byelorussians living in Uzbekistan also have large families. Family size here is above all a result of the constantly growing material well-being and higher cultural standards of the Soviet people. The Communist Party and the Soviet state do not "fear" the growing population in the southern republics. On the contrary, they provide ample opportunities for its further growth. As a matter of fact, this process is observed not only in the Central Asian republics.

Our country does everything to aid, both materially and otherwise, mothers of large families who are held in great respect. About 630,000 mothers in Uzbekistan alone get government allowances. In the 11th Five-Year period (1981-1985) the state allocated much more in terms of milk products and medicines on a preferential basis, and for the creation of new pre-school child care centres. In 1980, Uzbekistan

had more than 7,200, catering for about 1 million children, while more than 4 million attended secondary schools... These are the facts Western "experts" are constantly "forgetting" about our way of life.

Western ideologists bend over backwards in their fruitless attempts to use Islam and religious feelings to whip up nationalistic and chauvinistic passions. Richard Owen wrote an article under the provocative headline "Why the Islamic Revival Worries Moscow" published in the *British Times* of March 30, 1981, and said that the "Islamic revival" or "nationalism" could easily become the genuine driving force in Soviet southern republics at present. In her article "Muslims in Russia" (*The Daily Telegraph*, April 16, 1980), Diana Spirman even delves into "history" and draws the conclusion that Islam in its orthodox form never stimulated an uprising against foreign rule in the past without being supplemented by nationalism.

However, the hard facts refute these statements. No matter how hard Western specialists seek to reshape history to suit their masters, the peoples' struggle under the banner of Islam is often directed against imperialist domination, and in this case belongs to the anti-colonial movements of a revolutionary and democratic nature. Even more laughable and futile are the efforts of those who, without much hope of success, are looking for similar nationalism in the Soviet Union where more than 100 nations and nationalities live as a close-knit family.

The bourgeois press puts out many articles on Islam gaining strength in the USSR under the impact of developments in the Arab countries, Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan. These events allegedly affect Soviet Muslims and deepen their religious feelings. Articles of this ilk have been published by *Der Spiegel*, *The Economist*, *The Observer*, *The Daily Telegraph* and so on. Diana Spirman was fairly outspoken in the article "Muslims in Russia" when she said that it would be good if the "revival of Islam" which causes so much trouble to the West, proved even more discomforting for the Soviet Union! No comment necessary. The undisguised principal aim of imperialist ideologists is to use religious feelings for anti-Soviet purposes.

The radio stations Liberty, the Voice of America, BBC, and others devote much space in their programmes to the plight of "Soviet Muslims" and "Muslim Solidarity". Voice of America broadcasts in Uzbek harp on the problem of Islam, monotonously keynoted by "the USA is a friend of the Muslims", and "the Soviet Union is an enemy of the Muslims". These programmes are based on what those who betrayed their homeland say and on the falsifications of history and give a distorted picture of religion and believers in the USSR.

Despite all these provocative "voices", the socialist peoples of the Soviet Union are steadily drawing closer together. This process encompasses all aspects of social, economic and cultural life and creates favourable conditions for every nation to develop progressive traditions and culture. Mutual respect, readiness to help one another, heartiness, and trust are the key features of relations between different nationalities in this country. We are most grateful to the Russian people, the first among equals and indeed superior in their revolutionary experience, and the contributions they have made to our common cause both in labour and in battle.

"The Russian people cement our brotherhood", Sharaf Rashidov, Alternate Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Uzbek Communist Party, said in an interview. "At meetings and rallies and when speaking about the Russian people in general we in Uzbekistan call them our great and elder brother. These words come out just as naturally as "salaam", "light", and "homeland". It is not so much for the Russian people that we say these words as for ourselves, and not only to be polite and grateful but rather to be even stronger. The Russians and the Russian language have given us the joy of communicating with and making friends with other nations."

The friendship among our peoples became especially manifest during the 1966 earthquake in Tashkent when the entire country gave Uzbekistan a helping hand. It took only a short period to rebuild Tashkent, which is even more beautiful today. Fraternal aid also allowed the emergence of some industrial sectors in the republic, including machine-building, non-ferrous metallurgy, the chemical industry and gas extraction.

We are heartened by the fact that now the Central Asian republics are also capable of rendering aid to other regions and areas in the country. For instance, for many years now land improvement specialists, irrigation experts and construction workers from Uzbekistan have been helping Russian farmers develop the vast expanses of the non-black soil area where new settlements and state farms have been formed, some of them bearing the symbolic names of Friendship, Uzbekistan, and Tashkent.

All attempts of Western radio stations and other mass media to sow discord and distrust among the Soviet peoples are doomed to failure. The further progress of the equal nations inhabiting our multinational state is ensured by the truly internationalist essence of the nationalities policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state, rather than by the notorious "Muslim solidarity" or other religious slogans.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

ETHIOPIAN SOCIOECONOMIC PROGRESS, ERITREAN SITUATION DESCRIBED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 34-36

[Article by Yuri Pichughin and Boris Bogdanov: "Ethiopia: The Ninth Year of the Revolution"]

[Text]

On a September morning in 1974, a battered Volkswagen escorted by Army jeeps left the National Palace. Weaving its way through a dense crowd, it reached a broad street and sped toward the barracks of the Fourth Army Division. In the back seat, squeezed between two uniformed men was former emperor Haile Sellassie I. Ten minutes before, representatives of the Derg—committee in Amharic—the organ heading the revolutionary forces, read "the King of Kings" the decree on his deposition from the throne. Thus, September 12, 1967 the first day of the Ethiopian new year, marked the beginning of a new era for the people. The feudal monarchy had been put an end to and the goal of building in perspective a socialist society proclaimed.

...Eight years have passed since then, and they have proved to be the most stormy ones in the three thousand years of Ethiopia's recorded history. They were filled with the joy of victory and the bitterness of setbacks, cannonades of combat and peaceful toil. Backwardness, hunger, poverty, disease and illiteracy were the legacy of centuries of imperial rule. Resisting progressive changes in Ethiopia, internal and external reaction used every means—including bloodshed, terror and outright aggression—to force the country's people leave their chosen path. But all in vain.

Despite all obstacles, the Ethiopian revolution stood its ground. Many industrial enterprises were nationalised, and many new ones are being built; one of the most radical land reforms in Africa was carried out; the foundations of modern, collectivised agriculture are being laid, illiteracy is being stamped out, and the formation of the working people's vanguard party, true to the precepts of scientific socialism, is underway.

In these travel notes we shall try to share some of the impressions of today's Ethiopia which we put together after driving hundreds of miles along dirt roads and talking to the country folk who, as yet unspoilt by frequent contacts with journalists, speak their minds freely and simply.

SLOWLY BUT SURELY

We have left the capital far behind. A smooth asphalt road takes us to Ethiopia's westernmost province of Illubabor. Along the roadside we frequently see small villages consisting of a few tukuls—typical local dwellings under cone-shaped thatched roofs. As far as the eye can reach stretches a carpet of carefully cultivated land—a patchwork of freshly

ploughed black squares and green ones with tender young shoots. Bent figures of farmers leaning on buffalo-drawn wooden ploughs are seen here and there. In 1975 after the revolution, this land, which formerly belonged to the emperor, aristocracy, church and big landowners, was given to those who tilled it—the hitherto landless peasants who constituted about 90 per cent of the population.

The agrarian problem still remains one of the prime concerns of the revolutionary administration. The cooperative movement has made great headway during the last few years—from easy-to-organise consumer cooperatives to the highest form of voluntary production cooperatives with jointly owned land and implements of labour. The government has deliberately taken its time in carrying out the reform, seeing that every cooperative is not only a profitable, but also an exemplary venture. Though the bulk of agricultural output is still produced by small private farmers, every year sees the appearance of hundreds of new cooperatives, which are playing a central role in the transformation of Ethiopian villages.

While our car is lapping up the miles, let us make an imaginary trip to the opposite end of the country—the eastern province of Hararghe where we were invited to visit the recently formed Finkil Cooperative (Finkil means “forward” in the local Oromo language.)

At first we were not particularly impressed by the cooperative which consisted of about fifty farmers, had an administrative board of three, and owned a score of wooden ploughs and 18 hectares of land. However upon saying good-bye to the chairman of this seemingly small and ill-equipped farm, we decided to save our impressions for future reference should we have a chance to pay a second visit to those parts.

At the beginning of 1982 we got our chance. If it had not been for the familiar road and the sign indicating the Alemayo agricultural college, we wouldn't have believed we were being taken to the same place. What we saw was a largish village with about a hundred tiled cottages—not the usual thatched huts, mind you—a spacious storehouse, a shop and a board office.

Ahmed Doro, the cooperative's 24-year-old chairman told us that six months after the founding of the cooperative, several households quit, leaving only 19 members and 6 hectares of land. The reasons for this withdrawal varied from not being used to collective work to slanderous propaganda by local kulaks. “We did not keep anyone by force,” continued the chairman, “we just worked hard. When we sold part of the first crop to the state we could buy hybrid seeds from it. The second crop was twice that gathered on private plots.”

“This was already the following year, then,” we wondered.

“No, in almost all of Ethiopia, the climate permits two crops a year. Although we continued our consciousness-raising campaign among the reticent peasants, our bumper crop proved to be the best argument. Private farmers quickly put two and two together and came back: now we have about 300 households and 350 hectares of land. Recently we have been registered as a ‘walba’—a top-grade production cooperative. We have put up central office buildings, drilled artesian wells, dug irrigation canals, and bought our first tractor. All this was done with state assistance, but we are repaying our debt and have no arrears in deliveries of agricultural produce to the state.”

Ethiopia has more than 50 such cooperatives. Another 800 are vying for “walba” status. Altogether, there are an additional 3500 consumer and supply-and-marketing cooperatives in the country.

A FRIEND IN NEED...

Wherever you are travelling in Ethiopia, you are bound to meet Soviet people: teachers, doctors, engineers, mechanics, planning specialists and geologists. Like their colleagues from other socialist countries, they have come to Ethiopia to put their knowledge and expertise to the building of a new society in Ethiopia.

Mengistu Haile Mariam, Chairman of PMAC and the Commission to Organise the Party of Working People of Ethiopia, stressed repeatedly that the USSR's internationalist assistance during the time of struggle against armed aggression and counterrevolutionary terror, as well as during the years of peaceful toil will forever be remembered by Ethiopia's people. Soviet-Ethiopian links have become stronger, extending into new spheres of political, economic and cultural life. They are an important factor in foiling imperialism's attempts to fan tensions in the Horn of Africa and to destroy the Ethiopian revolution.

Today, when Ethiopia has launched a nationwide revolutionary campaign of development and central planning, and a plan of socio-economic development for 1984-1993 is being drawn up, cooperation with the USSR has become indispensable for the development of industry, energy and modern agriculture.

During the last year alone, the two countries signed a number of contracts for such projects as the construction of a tractor-assembly plant, a hydroelectric power station of 150,000 kWt capacity at Melka-Vakan (when it is commissioned, the country's electricity generation capacity will increase by 50 per cent), five vocational training schools, prospecting for oil, gas and other mineral resources, as well as feasibility studies in connection with developing the Gambela virgin lands—all with Soviet assistance. This last project, a complex but promising one, deserves additional discussion.

At Mattu, the administrative centre of the province of Illubabor, we were received by Simeon Gallore, COPWPE Central Committee member and the Commission's representative in the province.

"Illubabor," he told us, "is one of Ethiopia's wealthiest provinces; yet in many respects, it is one of the poorest. Although it is rich in natural resources, it has always been an economically backward outlying area. It is symbolic that the Soviet Union, with its vast experience in developing outlying areas, has agreed to help us conquer Gambela's virgin lands.

A few words about the project. Its first stage, which is to be carried out by the Soviet side free of charge, envisages prospecting and survey work for the construction of a dam, an irrigation system, and the ploughing of 10,000 hectares of land in the Baro Valley. This will be followed by a master plan for the comprehensive development of a region with an area under cultivation to be extended to 60,000 hectares. All in all, according to preliminary estimates, Gambela has up to 1 million hectares of arable land. Although the completion of the project will take a few years, its potential benefits are immense: the area can well become one of the country's main granaries, growing agricultural produce for export.

MEETING WITH THE FUTURE

We were on our way from Zway, a township which holds Ethiopia's first orphanage. It was opened two years ago to give food, shelter, care, and education to children whose parents had died defending the revolution.

"Of course," the centre's director Tsehai Feleke smiled sadly, "it is impossible to replace a child's parents, but we

are doing everything possible to make our charges feel at home and forget that they are orphans. We pay a great deal of attention to their vocational education. They have daily classes in the fields, at animal farms, and in workshops. In a few years' time, the training received here will make them specialists in a variety of fields. Not only we are self-sufficient in food, we also sell our surplus product, earning cash for the centre's expansion."

"Here," says our host, opening a small room in one of the dormitory buildings, "we keep vital statistics on every child: age, parents and their occupations, medical checkups."

We look through the cards. With unemotional accuracy, they testify to the hardships, misfortunes and heart-breaks of the children who are now happily playing outside: "Parents assassinated by separatists", "All relatives killed", "Father killed on the Somali front, mother died of hunger"... When they were brought here, many of the children were nothing but skin and bones.

Today, their childhood has been returned to them, with all pain, terror, and suffering left far behind. Although most of them have not yet chosen a road in life, one thing is certain: they will grow up to become men and women of integrity—masters of Ethiopia's future.

THE RED STAR

Dazzling the onlookers with its brass, the military band struck up Ethiopia's national anthem, and the country's green-yellow and red flag was slowly and majestically raised to the mast-top of a ship docked at the pier of Massawa. Ethiopia's merchant marine has another new vessel, christened Kay Kokeb—the Red Star.

These two words have become a household expression. They designate a revolutionary drive launched in January 1982 aimed at comprehensive development of Eritrea—the country's northern province. To understand the importance of the campaign, we must examine Eritrea's past.

...From the top corner of the triangle formed by Ethiopia there stretches for 800 kilometres along the Red Sea coast (or Mare Eritreum as it was called by ancient Romans) a strip of mountainous, sun-scorched land. It was here, in the country's north, that Ethiopian civilisation was born nearly two thousand years ago. Its centre—ancient Axum—was situated farther south. At the time, between the first and seventh centuries A. D., what is today Eritrea and other parts of Ethiopia were united into an Axumite state—one of the strongest and most prosperous in all of North and East Africa and the Middle East.

Italian colonialists who conquered the north of Ethiopia in the 1880s and gave in the name of Eritrea did everything to sow discord between the population of the annexed territory and the rest of Ethiopia. They encouraged tribalist sentiments and set Muslims, who formed the majority of Eritreans, against the Christians. The British military administration which governed Eritrea after 1941 used similar methods. Reunited with Ethiopia, in 1952, along federal lines, Eritreans continued to be brutally oppressed—this time by the feudal monarchy.

As a result, when emperor Haile Sellassie incorporated Eritrea into his domain as its 14th province, it already had an armed movement demanding secession from Ethiopia. A progressive factor in its first stages, after the national-democratic revolution it degenerated into a reactionary force which, in the final analysis, played into the hands of imperialism, contrary to the interests of its own people.

The historic September 1974 revolution brought equality

and broad prospects for development to the ethnic and religious minorities of the country. The revolution's programme recognised every nationality's right to self-determination, to preserve its way of life and traditions, to send representatives to the organs of people's power, and to use its own national language. Regional autonomy was chosen as the form of self-determination most suited to Ethiopia's present-day conditions. It secures the interests of all nationalities and the state as a whole, preserving its territorial integrity.

The revolutionary government's practical moves provided convincing proof of its intention to find a democratic solution to the nationalities problem, one of the most challenging in the country. The state budget allocates vast resources for the development of hitherto backward areas. A campaign to eradicate illiteracy is underway, with the Voice of Revolutionary Ethiopia and a number of local radio stations broadcasting in several languages, and newspapers, books and textbooks are printed for the country's multinational population. Work is underway on a new administrative and territorial division of the country, which will bring together the largest nationalities into autonomous regions.

However, this radical turn in the nationalities policy after the revolution has been disregarded completely by the leaders of the Eritrean separatists. In spite of the Ethiopian government's repeated calls for them to lay down arms and begin negotiations, they stepped up their subversive activities, aided and abetted by imperialists and conservative Arab regimes. In this, they are banking on the difficulties of the transition period in Ethiopia. Official estimates put damage due to their subversive activities at billions of dollars.

The recent developments in Eritrea show, however, that the base of support for the separatists and nationalists is shrinking. This is a natural process, for the separatists' leaders can counter the government's popular measures only with rhetoric about "independence at any price".

... In January 1982, 1,500 representatives of state and public organisations from every corner of Ethiopia converged in Asmara, Eritrea's administrative centre. The purpose of the conference was to draw up a comprehensive programme for the province's reconstruction and rehabilitation. At the conference, the Asmara Manifesto, which set forth the tasks of the Red Star drive in the political, economic and social spheres, was adopted. The participants expressed their resolve to stamp out the remnants of separatist bands, to restore Eritrea to its earlier role in the country's economy (it used to account for 35 per cent of the country's gross output), and to create conditions for the cultural development of its population, which has rich historical traditions.

Although some work along these lines had been done during the last few years, the Red Star drive has given them a truly massive and organised character. Schools, hospitals and factories are being built or reconstructed in Asmara, Keren, Massawa and other places in Eritrea. The province has joined the rest of the country in campaigns for the eradication of illiteracy and collectivisation of agriculture; its public organisations are growing stronger. It is symbolic that the first provincial branch of the Ethiopian Writers' Union was founded in Eritrea. In short, peace has finally come to the long-suffering north of Ethiopia.

Our journey has come to an end. We are back in Addis Ababa's crowded streets with their daily dynamic rhythm of building a new, socialist Ethiopia.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

DISCUSSIONS, REPORTS AT INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ASIAN PROBLEMS

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 38-43

[Conference review by A. Notin, Y. Mironova, A. Granovsky and I. Zevelyov:
"Current Problems of Contemporary Asia"]

[Text]

Our readers already know (see No 6, 1982) that last summer, Moscow played host to the international conference on current problems of contemporary Asia. The conference attracted the attention of a large number of scholars and specialists. Below we publish information on the section meeting of the conference.

ASIA IN CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The international problems of the region were examined in the section on "Asia in Contemporary International Relations" headed by *Nguyen Khanh Toan*, Chairman of the Committee of Social Sciences, SRV, and *Georgy Kim*, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Deputy Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences.

First and foremost, the discussion concentrated on problems of ensuring peace and security in Asia which, the participants unanimously agreed, is inseparably linked with the struggle for peace the world over. In his report, *Georgy Kim* (USSR) stressed: "Asian countries need peace and security desperately as a precondition for their economic and cultural development, and for complete emancipation from the vestiges of colonialism. Possessing huge natural resources, the developing Asian countries (and here, I mean only the non-socialist part of Asia with the exception of Japan) provide only 2.6 per cent of the world industrial output."

Asian countries' contribution to the establishment of the lofty principles of peaceful coexistence as a basis of international relations can be

increased tangibly. The participants in the discussion agreed with the viewpoint put forth by Academician *Yevgeny Primakov*, Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences, that "the transformation of the Oriental countries into subjects of history has been realised to the greatest extent in the sphere of world politics and international relations. This has found its expression in the fact that first, they themselves have begun playing an active role on the international scene and, second, their positions are increasingly taken into account in working out all global decisions" (see report by *Yevgeny Primakov*, *Asia and Africa Today*, No. 6, 1982).

At the same time, the extreme aggravation of international tensions witnessed in recent years, especially after the Reagan Administration took office, has caused the political situation in Asia to change for the worse. This was pointed out by *Dr. K. P. Misra*, Dean, School of International Research of Jawaharlal Nehru University (India). He named the unprecedented growth of US aggressiveness in the Asian-Pacific region and the buildup of the American military and political presence there as the main reason for negative developments in Asia. Under such conditions, he emphasised, it is necessary to find new ways of strengthening unity and consolidating all peaceloving forces, and to elaborate common constructive approaches to the solution of Asian problems. The Asian countries, *K. P. Misra* went on, do not confine detente to a particular sphere, as for example, the relations between the USSR and the USA, between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and

NATO; while supporting the stand of the Soviet Union, they call for the spread of detente to all regions and continents, including Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In his report, Professor *Vladimir Lukin* (USSR) analysed US Asian policy in the 1980s. He noted that the present US Administration tends to gear all particular (including regional) problems to the overall task of countering the Soviet Union and world socialism, this being what differentiates its policy from that of its predecessors.

According to *Lukin*, the main trend in current American policy in the Asian-Pacific region is an attempt to restore the system of military blocs and bilateral alliances set up mainly during the Cold War, which became the principal means of implementing it. This global approach of US imperialism is manifested in the form of pressure brought to bear on Japan by Washington to make it carry out a programme of military buildup; the more active relations between the USA, Australia and New Zealand within ANZUS; the desire to turn ASEAN into a military and political counterbalance to "communist Indochina"; the refusal to withdraw US troops from South Korea, the attempts to play the so-called Chinese card, and many other things. *V. Lukin* maintains that this policy is based on an obviously overrated assessment

of US possibilities in the world in general and in Asia in particular. It signifies a departure from the line at adapting to objective reality in favour of an attempt to adapt reality to its own interests.

The conclusions drawn by the Soviet scholar were on the whole supported and developed further in reports by *Chitta Biswas* (India), Deputy Secretary-General of the AAPSO, *Sen Gupta Bhabani* Professor, Centre for Policy Research (India), *Sisana Sisane* (Laos), Minister of Culture, Dr. *Vladimir Moskalenko* (USSR), Dr. *Irina Zuyagelskaya* (USSR) and others. They noted that, in translating its aggressive designs into reality US imperialism assigns a special role to Asia. In recent years, alongside its military and political buildup and presence, US imperialism increasingly combines policy of strength with certain compromises, zigzags, and new tactical means and methods different from those applied under colonialism.

In this connection, Dr. *V. Tikhomirov* (USSR) noted the palpably greater activity of the USA aimed at

setting up non-formal global-regional structures in Asia. In his opinion, there exist differences in the political geometry of international relations in West Asian and African regions where a system of countries which are mere US satellites is taking shape today (Israel, Somalia, Egypt, Oman, and others) as well as in East Asia and the Pacific, where some countries have become involved in the large (USA-Japan-Australia) and small (USA-Japan-South Korea) triangles. The purpose of the spheres of military-political presence and influence in Asia set up by the USA is to isolate and undermine the national liberation movement of Asian peoples.

While dealing with the consequences of the policy pursued by the Reagan Administration in Asia, Professor *Sen Gupta Bhabani* (India) stressed that it yields certain positive results for imperialism, leads to the weakening of progressive and revolutionary forces in India, and facilitates the activities of pro-imperialist quarters. However, according to many scholars, the revolutionary anti-imperialist forces have no grounds to be pessimistic. Though the conditions for the development of the national liberation movement in Asia and other areas have become more complicated in the second half of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, that

same period witnessed a number of major revolutionary developments of worldwide significance (the emergence of a united socialist Vietnam, the collapse of the bloody Pol Pot regime in Kampuchea, the revolution in Afghanistan, the overthrow of the Shah's regime in Iran, and the birth of a number of progressive states in Southern Africa). Therefore, the current policy of US imperialism is nothing more than a "convulsive attempt to preserve its shattered positions in Asia" (*G. Kim*, USSR).

Asian international problems, in particular, so-called conflict situations, the emergence of which has been largely determined by aggressive US policy, were dealt with in detail.

Professor *Fadie Rauf Al Ansari* of Damascus University (Syria) summarised the situation in the Middle East, analysing at length the motives of US strategy there. He noted that US policy is aimed, first, at completing the modernisation of the Israeli Army; second, at "pacifying" the Arabs, and politically weakening Arab-Israeli contradictions by drawing new Arab states into the notorious Camp David deal; third, at weakening and bleeding white the Arab national libera-

tion movement, and undermining the unity of its components. With this purpose in mind, US imperialists and their stooges in the Arab world provoke and fan up imagined inter-Arab differences, for example, between Algeria and Morocco, Egypt and Libia, Iraq and Syria, and so on; and, fourth, at imposing the arms race on the Arab countries. *F. R. Ansari* also stressed that the Iraqi-Iranian military conflict has inflicted great damage on the Arab national liberation movement.

The barbarous aggression of Israel in Lebanon caused deep concern among the progressive forces of the region and the world over. Like other aggressive acts of Israeli militarism, this aggression would have been impossible without direct US support. The strategic military scheme of the USA and Israel is as follows: 1) to eliminate the positions of the PLO in Lebanon and split the Lebanese national patriotic forces supporting the Palestinians in their just struggle; 2) to set up a cantonal state torn apart by religious contradictions instead of an independent, democratic Lebanon; 3) to draw Lebanon into the Camp David process or impose some other variant of a "settlement" on the Arab countries, for example, the "Fadh Plan" which would give the US new possibilities for political manoeuvring; 4) to provide a bridgehead for US military presence in the Lebanon.

I. Zvyagelskaya (USSR) dwelt on the tactical differences between the approaches of the Reagan and the Carter Administrations to the Arab-Israeli conflict. While examining the role of the oil factor in the changes in the Middle East situation, she pointed out that presently a reduced US dependence on deliveries of Middle East oil is matched by a growing dependence experienced by its allies on it.

Professor *V. P. Dutt* of Delhi University (India), Dr. *Vladimir Kisilev* (USSR) and others expressed solidarity with the views of *F. R. Al Ansari* and *I. Zvyagelskaya*. Many speakers, including *Shawkir Omari*, of the Palestine Liberation Organisation pointed out that the negative developments in the Middle East are caused mostly by the lack of unity among the Arab countries.

A lively discussion on the problems linked with the activities of the regimes inclined to support imperialist designs in Asia arose within the section.

The proposed establishment of a new international economic order and the restructuring of world economic ties in the interests of economic and cultural progress of the Asian states loomed large in the proceedings of the section. A report on this subject was made by Dr. *Andrei Chekhutov* (USSR). Among the major prerequisites for such a restructuring he mentioned first the expansion of international positions of socialist mode of production as represented by world socialist community; second, the shaping of a new geographic pattern of world exchanges (economic exchange between the main groups of

countries—capitalist, developing and socialist—in the opinion of Dr. *Chekhutov*, has not only reached particularly large absolute volumes, but also, for the first time since the 1950s, began to grow faster than intragroup exchange); and, third, the general improvement in the international political climate which emerged in the 1970s and which cannot be obviated even by the current attack of imperialism upon the achievements of detente.

In his report, *Leslie Gunawardana* (Sri Lanka) examined some aspects of the TNCs' subversive activities in Asia; he noted that in the light of their activities, the cooperation between Asian and socialist countries on a bilateral and multilateral basis is acquiring great significance. The same conclusion followed from other scholars' reports, such as those by Dr. *V. Ivanov*; (USSR), Professor *Chai-San-Lan* (SRV) and others. The speakers stressed the important role played by the socialist countries in the three-pole arrangement of the new international economic order; consequently, the stronger the position of world socialism becomes, the greater the achievements which can be expected from the new international economic order. *Amatya Soorya Lal* (Nepal) noted that economic cooperation plays an important part in promoting relations between the states of the Far East and Southeast Asia.

A number of reports analysed current problems involved in the activities of the nonaligned movement as the principal form of anti-imperialist anti-colonial solidarity of the developing countries. One of these was made by Dr. *Vsevolod Benevolensky* (USSR). After praising the obvious achievements of the movement (for example, the number of participants has increased from 25 to 92), he dwelt on several factors undermin-

ing the unity of its ranks. "On the whole," he stated, "the political course of the nonaligned movement retains features crucial for the further progressive transformation of the world: the struggle against colonialism and racism; the desire to strengthen peace and international security; the struggle to restructure international economic relations... and the striving to settle conflicts between participants in the nonaligned movement by peaceful means."

Dr. *Anatoly Khazanov* (USSR), *Chitta Biswas* (AAPSO), Dr. *Vladimir Koiylarov* (USSR), and other speakers in the discussion refuted imperialist propaganda's claim that the non-aligned movement has allegedly outlived itself. In the long run, the differences and conflicts between participants in the movement recede into the background, as there still exists a community of political and economic interests of a higher order.

One of the practical ways for eliminating tensions and the threat of war as well as for curtailing the arms race, which has proved so pernicious to the Asian countries, is through consolidating unity of Asian countries and overcoming differences between them artificially fanned up by imperialism and other reactionary forces. Such unity is a reliable guarantee of the implementation of the important long-term task of turning of Asia into a zone of peace, stability, and cooperation. (This was pointed out by Dr. *Chai-San-Lan* (SRV), Dr. *T. Sulitskaya* (USSR) and others.)

The participants followed with keen interest the discussion of peace proposals made by a number of Asian states, including the socialist countries of Indochina, and aimed at turning Southeast Asia into a zone of peace. Mongolia's proposal to conclude a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between the states of Asia and the Pacific, as well as initiatives by a large group of nonaligned states for turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

Many speakers pointed to the peaceful, constructive activities of the Asian socialist countries as having special significance for improving the international climate in Asia. In particular, *Fam Dyk Zyong* (SRV) stressed the existence of this group of countries and its consolidation is an earnest of peace and stability in Asia.

The participants praised the consistently peace-loving policy of the

Soviet Union as a determining condition for peace and stability in Asia. The basic trends of that policy were formulated in the Peace Programme advanced and further developed at the 24th, 25th and 26th Congresses of the CPSU, in speeches by Leonid Brezhnev, and in his Message to the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament (1982). In upholding peace in Asia, the Soviet Union is safeguarding not only its own interests as a state the major part of which lies in Asia but also the vital interests of all Asian countries. The Soviet Union's announcement of the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons evoked immense response the world over.

While emphasising the importance of Soviet peace initiatives, such as the set of Soviet proposals on ensuring the sovereign rights and security of the Persian Gulf countries, on settling the chronic Middle East crisis and the problem of Lebanon, on the turning of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, and others, Asian scholars Prof. *Fadil Rauf Al Ansari* (Syria), *Leslie Gunawardana* (Sri

Lanka), *Shagdari Bira* (Mongolia) and others pointed to the need for the Asian countries to strengthen cooperation with the Soviet Union and the world socialist community, the reliable allies of all peoples fighting for national and social liberation and for peace throughout the world.

INTERNAL PROCESSES IN ASIAN COUNTRIES

The reports and speeches in this section which functioned under the chairmanship of *Rasheeddin Khan*, Professor of Political Science, Jawaharlal Nehru University (India) and Professor *Gleri Shirokov*, Deputy Director, Institute of Oriental Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences, examined the key problems of economic and socio-political progress in the Asian countries along with the development of ideology and culture in them.

In the economic sphere (main speaker Dr. *Vladimir Yashkin*, USSR) attention was devoted to the restructuring of the system of reproduction and the technological basis of the economies of the developing Asian countries, the social consequences of the acceleration of capitalist economic growth, and ways and means of expanding the massive basis of economic development. Problems of the interconnection between internal and

external factors of economic development were also discussed.

It was pointed out that the role of the public sector and state regulation of the economy as a major instrument for further economic and social progress has increased substantially. However, in a number of Asian states developing along capitalist lines, the acceleration of economic growth took place on an enclave basis, without involving the bulk of the able-bodied population and, therefore, was accompanied by greater inequality in the distribution of national income, by the concentration of economic might in the hands of foreign and local big capital, and rises in unemployment. The market mechanism and the principles and methods of management borrowed from the developed capitalist countries were unable to transform the entire economy or draw the whole of the population especially the poorest strata in the countryside, into the process of development. The narrowness of the domestic market, as was pointed out in a number of speeches, is the main factor limiting expanded capitalist reproduction. This is another evidence of the worsening crisis attending attempts at capitalist transformation of the colonial socio-economic structure, which is in itself an element in the general crisis of capitalism.

At the same time, Professor *Ahmed Bashiruddin* (India) stated that the difficulties in selling the production of modern capitalist sector in the relatively developed Asian countries are of a transitory nature being a sign of the structural changes in the economy. Another viewpoint, supported among others, by Professor *Akhlaqur Rahman* (Bangladesh) and Dr. *Viktor Rastyanikov* (USSR), was that the formation, under the influence of local and world capitalism, of the sector of traditional productive forces and relations of production makes it impossible to regard this sector as a transitory structure, inasmuch as under the existing socio-economic system it cannot evolve toward higher types of production relations or modern means of production.

Much time was devoted to ways of accelerating economic growth. The participants unanimously agreed that the expansion of the material basis of development is one such method along with drawing the main bulk of the population, especially the poorest strata, into it. The immense importance of greater employment within that process was emphasised. In his speech Dr. *Oleg Malyarov* (USSR) gave a critical ana-

lysis of the concepts of redistribution of financial and material resources in favour of the poorest groups while preserving the existing socio-economic structure of production. In his report Professor *Renato Constanino* (Philippines) laid bare the palliative character of such measures proposed, in particular, within the content of the "basic needs" concept.

The participants arrived at a conclusion that the tasks of expanding the massive basis of economic development require the implementation of socio-economic changes, including the redistribution of land, other means of production, and financial resources in favour of the rural and urban poor. The need for a system of state and state-cooperative institutions to deal exclusively with these tasks, including a special network of cooperatives for the poorest strata, was pointed out.

The participants in the discussion in particular Dr. *Ilya Redko* (USSR), made a special point of the need to analyse the model of development of small and least developed Asian countries-existing on the periphery of both the developed capitalist countries and larger neighbouring states.

Much attention was also given to problems of socio-political and ideological development in Asian countries. These problems were dealt with in reports by Dr. *Vladimir Li* (USSR), *Abdalla Hanna* (Syria), *Seysal Muntaz* (Turkey), *Elahi Homayun* (Iran) and Dr. *Lyudmila Polonskaya* (USSR). The participants in the discussion pointed to the organic link between the internal socio-economic problems and the key issues of international life.

Special attention was devoted to the emergence of new political structures and a modern political culture in the states of socialist orientation, in particular, revolutionary power, progressive political parties and mass organisations which appear in the course of radical social transformations. These problems were examined by *Abdel Kader Berraga* (Morocco) and Dr. *Veniamin Chirkin* (USSR). They pointed to the multi-class character of power in the countries of socialist orientation, its internally contradictory nature, and the combination of general democratic and pre-socialist elements.

In their reports, *Nyambuugiyn Ishjamts* (Mongolia) and *Lê Thanh Khiết* (SRV) analysed the problems of socialist construction in Asian countries. They noted the cardinal advantages of socialism in solving basic problems of social and economic development. Much attention was

given to the scientific division into periods of the stages of socialist construction and the principles of combining the advantages of socialism with the achievements of technological progress.

The participants in the discussion examined various religious movements pursuing different social and political ends. Under the concrete conditions of individual countries, they may act both as a brake to social progress and as a factor contributing to the growth of anti-imperialist and anti-exploiter sentiments among the people.

In this connection, the Islamic ideological trends in countries of the Arab East and the experience of the Iranian revolution were analysed in detail (reports by *Abdalla Hanna* and *Eluhi Homayun* respectively). Dr. *Orest Marlyshin* (USSR) and others pointed out that in a number of countries, the massive movements under religious slogans are an expression of social protest of the people as a result of the exacerbation of class contradictions predetermined by accelerated capitalist development. This thesis was counterposed to contentions of the possibility of a purely religious revolution and the negation of the class content, in particular, of the Iranian revolution. Representatives of some Asian countries described the Iranian Islamic revolution as a movement of the exploited people against the exploiter "modernised" elite, which assumed a religious form, and thereby stressed its socio-class nature. The speakers pointed to the tendency toward using religion in the interests of reactionary pro-imperialist forces.

Dr. *Yaropolk Guzevaty* (USSR) made a report on the socio-demographic problems faced by the developing countries of Asia. He noted that the complicated demographic situation has made a deep imprint on all aspects of social life in those countries. The aggravation of contradictions between the qualitative and quantitative aspects of reproduction of workforce is a major factor exacerbating the economic and demographic situation in the region.

Dr. *Yury Alexandrov* (USSR) said that the economic system cannot develop within the framework of market methods of functioning. If the current rates and (what is even more important) the structure of economic growth in the majority of developing countries are preserved, the measures to limit population growth alone cannot resolve the internal socio-economic problems, and the employment problem in particular. The solution of these questions calls for a radical transformation of back-

ward social structures, the creation of a powerful mechanism of redistribution which would ensure the inclusion of workers of all socio-economic sectors in national economic construction.

The participants in the conference stressed the considerable role played by the international migration of the workforce for a number of Asian countries and the contradictory character of the influence exerted by migration on the situation in the countries exporting workers. Dr. *Othman Abdull Ali* (Yemeni Arab Republic) stressed that, while contributing to the increase of the overall incomes and currency earnings, the remittances of hard currency from persons working abroad, is a factor which intensifies inflation. The immediate economic advantages from export of workers are largely offset by greater disproportions in the economy and growing social tensions.

The reports of *Abdul Habibi* (Afghanistan) and *Ahmed Dergam* (Syria) were devoted to the problems of cultural development in the emergent countries of Asia. The reports and speeches concentrated on the problems of cultural synthesis. The speakers emphasised the syncretic character of the cultures of the peoples of Central Asia, revealed the pre-Islamic features inherent in the cultures of the peoples of the Near and the Middle East and Central Asia, and showed the organic link between Arab and local substrata in the formation of that culture.

Ethnic problems are a most important aspect of the socio-demographic situation in the developing countries. In his speech, Dr. *M. Lazarev* (USSR) stressed that until these problems are solved, many social and economic problems simply cannot be dealt with. It should be pointed out that in a number of Asian countries, a consolidation of nations dominating ethnically and linguistically is occurring. In other states, the processes of national consolidation result in the emergence of several nations, while in a third group of countries, the disjointed nature of ethnic groupings substantially impedes the formation of nations. In Arab countries, an accelerated shaping up of the local Arab nations is observed. The reports in this section stressed the need for the developing Asian countries to study the experience gained in the solution of the nationalities problem in the USSR.

COOPERATION IN THE INTERESTS OF PEACE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

Practically all aspects—economic,

political, cultural and scientific—of the Soviet Union's cooperation with the Asian countries were discussed in the "Relations of the USSR with the Asian Countries" section headed by prominent public and political figure of the Kingdom of Nepal *Hari Bahadur Basnet* and Professor *Nodari Simonia* (USSR).

In his speech Academician *Shagdar Zjavyn Natsagdorzi*, Vice-President of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences, pointed out that the policy of the USSR with respect to the Asian countries differs radically from the course of the imperialist powers which is directed at intensifying the exploitation and subjugation of the young states to the selfish interests of the West. Since the very first years of its existence, the Soviet state has supported the national liberation aspirations of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries.

Taking Soviet-Nepalese relations as an example, *Hari Bahadur Basnet* demonstrated that the principles of equality, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, respect for national sovereignty, and mutual benefit serve as the basis for the cooperation of the Soviet Union with the developing countries of Asia. In their speeches, Dr. *Nodari Simonia* (USSR) and Dr. *V. Pavlov* (USSR) said that in the course of broader cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Asian countries, a new type of relations between states with different socio-economic systems is now taking shape. The significance of this mutually beneficial cooperation cannot be evaluated in purely quantitative indices alone. After the USSR emerged on the international scene in the mid-1950s proposing a large-scale programme of cooperation, the imperialist powers were compelled to change their relations with the newly-free countries somewhat and make a number of economic concessions to them. Countries of socialist orientation and all states seeking to create independent national economies and pursue independent policies are partners of the USSR. The assertions of bourgeois experts that the cooperation between socialist and developing countries is allegedly of a selective character were exposed as false with concrete examples from the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and the Republic of India, so different in size, political structure and political systems. Dr. *Hasan Azazi* (PDRY) and Professor *K. P. Misra* (India) showed the essence of the friendly relations with the USSR

which are of primary significance for the consolidation of political and economic independence, as well as the stronger defence capability of the Asian countries.

It was pointed out that the experience of economic and political relationships between socialist countries is of universal importance and has already become implemented in many developing countries. In this connection, the discussion of the problems of cooperation of the CMEA countries and its significance for the restructuring of international economic relations loomed large in the debates. It was noted in the main report made by Dr. *Igor Yegorov* (USSR) that relations within the framework of CMEA are based on the principles of comradesly mutual assistance, bringing economically backward countries up to the level of the more developed ones, observing the equality of states, respecting their national sovereignty, and full-fledged participation of all countries in solving problems of economic integration. It was stressed that the international economic practice of the USSR and other socialist countries continues to be used by many newly-free countries today as an example in the elaboration of their own foreign economic policies.

The participants in the discussion were deeply impressed by the facts testifying to the scope of economic and technological ties of the USSR with the Asian countries. These facts and figures were cited in the speech by *Illkodor Kulyov*, Deputy Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Ties at a plenary sitting of the conference: in conformity with intergovernmental agreements, the Soviet Union renders assistance in the building of more than 2,100 projects in Asian countries. Today 1,387 projects are already in operation and contribute to the development of their economies; some 800 projects are either in the blueprint stage or are under construction (for details see No. 6, 1982).

The discussion confirmed that the characteristic features of the USSR's assistance to Asian countries are priority in building key projects in the public sector; its long-term character (as a rule, on the basis of intergovernmental agreements), and the comprehensive character of cooperation, which makes it possible, stage by stage, to form large-scale economic complexes in the Asian countries to solve the most important tasks of socio-economic development.

In his speech, Dr. *M. Aidogdyev* (Institute of History, Academy of Sciences, Turkmenian SSR) noted that in the early 1920s, Soviet diplomacy elaborated a broad programme of expanding economic relations with Eastern countries. The aim of the programme was to assist them in winning genuine independence. It was shown on the strength of Soviet-Iranian trade relations in the 1920s-1930s that, despite immeasurable difficulties, the Soviet state strove to render internationalist aid to Oriental countries in their struggle for emancipation from the imperialist yoke. Dr. *Seif Ali Mukbil* (People's Democratic Republic of Yemen) analysed the selfless character of Soviet assistance to the Yemeni people in the creation of their modern economy. Using as an example the development of trade and economic ties between the USSR and Northern Yemen, which started back in the 1920s, and with the PDRY, he showed that the aid given by socialist countries to the developing states (unlike the policy pursued by imperialist powers) has no political strings attached affecting the sovereignty of a given country.

Despite a number of unfavourable political factors, the USSR is prepared to expand mutually beneficial cooperation with the ASEAN countries (Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines) *V. Teperman* (USSR) examined the most promising forms of such cooperation (production cooperation, compensation agreements, scientific and technological ties). Dr. *Gennady Starchenkov* (USSR) emphasised that in spite of the existing difficulties, the large-scale economic cooperation between the USSR and Turkey which has taken place over many decades, has made a palpable contribution to transforming Turkey into an agrarian-industrial country and alleviating the problem of employment of the able-bodied Turkish population.

The relations between the USSR and the least developed Asian countries are of a special nature: here the economic and technical assistance given by the Soviet Union is on especially favourable terms in full accord with one of the demands voiced by the developing countries concerning the establishment of a new international economic order. In her speech, *L. Chistyakova* (USSR) pointed out that having concluded agreements on the economic and technological cooperation with the USSR, the least developed Asian countries (Afghanistan,

Bangladesh, the Yemeni Arab Republic, Laos, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Nepal) were given unhindered access to modern technology, enabling them to reduce the terms of drafting and building the production of new types of commodities and ensuring substantial savings. These countries are granted favourable terms (12-15 years) and terms of repayment of Soviet credits.

The possibilities for further expansion of direct mutually beneficial ties between certain areas of the USSR and Asian countries were broadly discussed in the section. For example, in their speeches, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences *V. Chichkanov* and *N. Shlyk* (Institute of Economic Research, Far Eastern Scientific Centre, USSR Academy of Sciences) showed the favourable possibilities for expanding economic ties between the Soviet Far East and the Asian countries of the Pacific.

The achievements in expanding the cooperation between the USSR and the Asian countries and the genuine mutual benefit in no way signify that there are no problems in this field. In his speech, Dr. *Stanislav Bylinyak* (USSR) noted that such factors as the protracted isolation of the Asian countries from the socialist world, which was predetermined by their colonial status, their inclusion in the world capitalist economy, and the policies of the imperialist powers and the transnationals have exerted an adverse influence on the expansion of mutually beneficial trade and economic ties between the socialist and the developing countries. The possibilities for limiting these negative phenomena, as well as ways to enhance the efficiency of cooperation between the USSR and the Asian states and the improvement of new forms of economic ties were examined in detail in the speech of Dr. *Ruben Andreasyan* (USSR) who stressed, among other things, that new principles, including cooperation on the basis of long-term inter-governmental agreements, mutual account of the plans of economic development, multilateral agreements with the participation of several socialist countries, and broad cooperation in production, are being successfully introduced in the relations between the Soviet Union and the Asian countries.

Yevgeny Chelyshev, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, noted that the development of cultural and scientific cooperation of

the USSR and the Asian countries creates the necessary prerequisites for the peoples to draw closer together culturally and lays the foundation on which genuine mutual understanding can be built. He told the audience about the immense amount of work done in the Soviet Union to study and popularise the extremely rich cultural heritage of the Asian countries. Professor Alexander Kheifets (USSR) drew the attention of the participants to the study of the history of the USSR's relations with the Asian countries, which is underway in the Institute of Oriental Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences. The team of authors of the fundamental publications *Russia and the Oriental Countries* and the *USSR and the Oriental Countries* is seeking to demonstrate the historical significance and mutual benefit of these relations which have been forming between the peoples of the USSR and the Asian countries over many decades.

The cooperation between the USSR and the socialist countries of Asia as well as the states which have embarked on socialist orientation is also expanding in the sphere of theory of social progress and the practice of building a new society. Dr. *Alexei Kiva* (USSR) stressed in this connection the significance for the economically backward Asian countries of the experience gained by the Soviet Republics of Central Asia which reached socialism by-passing capitalism.

In her report Dr. *Lyubov Chernorutskaya* (USSR) emphasised that since its inception, Soviet Russia has been working for new and equitable international relations, and therefore it will never agree with attempts to make it share "equal responsibility"

for colonial plunder and neocolonial exploitation.

The USSR has been rendering assistance to many Asian countries in developing their systems of education and training national personnel. With Soviet assistance, 143 educational institutions, including 21 higher educational establishments and 18 secondary specialised institutions, were set up in 26 young states. By 1981, over 40,000 citizens of developing countries had graduated from Soviet higher educational establishments and secondary technical schools. *Ek Sam Ol* (Kampuchea) expressed heartfelt gratitude to the Soviet Union for its invaluable contribution to the development of the educational system in Kampuchea. The Khmer people inherited a mere shambles from the criminal Pol Pot regime, which was overthrown in 1979.

All the participants of the discussion were firmly convinced that further expansion of cooperation of Asian countries with the USSR and other socialist states in such a crucial sphere as the struggle for peace, disarmament and prevention of a nuclear war will create favourable conditions for the acceleration of the socio-economic and political progress in Asia. While discussing these problems, Dr. *Sergei Stoklitsky* (USSR) cited the following facts: if military expenditures in the world were reduced by a mere five per cent, assistance to the young states in their struggle against poverty and backwardness could be increased fourfold.

A detailed and frank exchange of opinion showed that the participants in the conference hold similar or identical views on problems pertaining to relations between the USSR and the Asian countries.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

INTERNATIONAL BACKING FOR SIHANOUK, CAMBODIAN RESISTANCE SCORED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 44-45

[Article by Vladimir Viktorov: "Kampuchea: A Nonexistent Problem"]

[Text]

Although the nightmarish bloody experiment in Kampuchea, a hare-brained scheme executed by maniacs, ended more than three years ago, "impossible dreams" are still haunting those who would like to turn back the clock of history and put puppets whose strings can be pulled from distant places back in power. That is the essence of the campaign launched against the People's Republic of Kampuchea after the victory of the revolutionary patriotic forces.

The spectrum of provocations against the young republic includes incursions by the remnants of Pol Pot's troops and other counterrevolutionary gangs, attempts to organise this scum into a "united front", withholding recognition of the People's Republic of Kampuchea at the United Nations, rail-roading anti-Kampuchean resolutions through at three sessions of the UN General Assembly in a row, holding a so-called international conference on Kampuchea, interference in the country's internal affairs, prevarications about Vietnam's "aggression" against it, etc.

It would be simplistic to say that the campaign against people's Kampuchea has the sole objective of restoring the old regime.

The annoyance caused by the collapse of the cannibalistic regime is due to the general discontent of those who claim to domination in Indochina with the developments in that region. It is not only the matter of the defeat of US aggression and the policy of "containment" of socialism in Indochina. Some lament that the collapse of the Pol Pot regime deprived them of "an argument" in their attempts to discredit socialism, others mourn the shattering of their hopes of encircling Vietnam and isolating it from other countries of Southeast Asia.

While the United States is fanning up tensions around the new Kampuchea to facilitate its military and political comeback in the region after the collapse of SEATO, the ring-leaders of the emigre scum are cherishing hopes that this will help them again seize power in Phnom Penh.

The communique issued after the talks of Andrei Gromyko, Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Foreign Minister of the USSR, with Hun Sen, Member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and Foreign Minister of the PRK, noted that the reactionary forces in the region do not want peace and stability in this part of the globe, and stand to profit from maintaining tensions here. The imperialists and their

allies are displeased with the emergence in the region of a group of states which have opted for a road of progressive transformations, peace and socialism.

When it had become clear during the first few months after the formation of the PRK that the attempts of Pol Pot's forces and other counterrevolutionary bands to return to Kampuchea by force of arms were doomed to failure, their backers were compelled to look for other methods. One such device was an attempt to knock together a "united front" of counterrevolutionary forces led by figures not directly implicated in the mass murders in that country. However, since the authors of the plan, envisage a key role in the "front" for Pol Pot's men, the whole scheme is essentially a desire to dress the criminal regime in the garb of a "third force", thus creating the illusion of a broad opposition to the people's government of Kampuchea—an opposition which could be legitimately supplied with arms. Politically speaking, the "front" idea was supposed to provide a ready replacement for Pol Pot's representative at the United Nations should he be kicked out of the organisation.

A major "argument" used by international reaction to justify its interference in Kampuchea's domestic affairs is the presence of Vietnamese troops in the country. What is deliberately ignored, however, is that these troops were sent to Kampuchea at government's request and in accordance with the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation between the two countries. The sole purpose of the Vietnamese troops' presence in Kampuchea is the defence of its borders from armed provocations by Pol Pot's and other reactionary bands, a fact which is conveniently disregarded. Vietnam's leaders have repeatedly declared that as soon as the threat of outside interference ceased to exist, Vietnam, in consultation with Kampuchea and Laos, would withdraw its troops (a partial withdrawal has recently taken place). The time of withdrawal of the remainder of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea depends directly on the cessation of hostile acts against that country and of the fanning up of tensions in the area.

Recent developments, however, show that Kampuchea remains a target of subversion and continuing attacks by the armed groups of Pol Pot and other runaway reactionaries aided and abetted from outside. They are assisted politically and materially, receiving armament and military hardware.

The Soviet-Kampuchean joint communique also noted that "the states in the region [Southeast Asia. — V. V.], first and foremost Kampuchea, Vietnam and Laos, still remain targets of dangerous intrigues and gross pressures applied by the imperialist quarters, which bear responsibility for fomenting tensions in relations between the two groups of states comprising ASEAN and Indochina".

Lately, the anti-Kampuchean campaign has consisted largely of efforts to knock together a coalition government of sorts from Pol Pot's men and other emigré scum salvaged from the jungles and far-off capitals. The task proved a difficult one in view of the animosities and bickering among the emigré leaders. According to T. Terzani, correspondent for the Italian newspaper *Repubblica* in Bangkok, those who are to make up the coalition are suspicious of one another and their entire past is characterised by mutual betrayals and assassinations.

Let us take a closer look at the "politicians" who announced the formation of the coalition in Kuala Lumpur last June. One of them is the self-appointed "president of the coalition government" and runaway ex-monarch Sihanouk whose "patriotism" could be easily calculated in cash and whose contradictory statements embarrass even his foreign patrons. At different junctures in his career he retired from

political activity, branded the Pol Pot clique as "the bloodiest, cruellest and most inhuman tyranny in history", then referred to Pol Pot as "a charming person", met his emissaries and agreed to act as a ringleader for his bandits, demanding, however, that he be the sole beneficiary of military and financial assistance. When Pol Pot was in power in Kampuchea, Sihanouk was isolated and many of his relatives, including sons, physically annihilated.

Sihanouk's rival and the "prime-minister" is the 72-year-old Son Sann who served under the prince back in the 1960s and has spent most of the last eleven years in France, following the developments in his home country from newspaper accounts. His right hand man—one Dien Del—is one of the generals who organised the 1970 coup against Sihanouk.

As for Pol Pot himself, he has been temporarily shelved so as not to scare away other associates. Last April he checked into a Bangkok private clinic, under an alias, allegedly ill. Meanwhile, his successors particularly that ideologist of genocide Khieu Samphan, are openly demanding control over the coalition, claiming, according to the *Bangkok Post*, that Son Sann as prime-minister is "nonsensical".

Seeking to put this riff-raff of traitors, royalists, ultranationalists and outright criminals into the same harness, their backers spared no effort to prove that their charges had "reformed". A desperate attempt in this direction was the self-dissolution of Pol Pot's "party".

The *Irish Times* correspondents who visited the secret bases of Pol Pot's soldiers in Thailand wrote that years of blind obedience, animal fear, and threats had turned them into "a sect of beast-like, and feelingless obscurantists".

According to US journalists who talked to Kampuchean refugees, practically all peasants and former city dwellers who were forcibly taken out of the country by Pol Pot's retreating troops are psychologically crippled and live in fear for their lives. They have to live in an atmosphere of all-pervasive suspicion amid informers and torturers whom unlimited freedom to kill has turned into maniacs.

Although Pol Pot's camps are patrolled and have minefields around them, there are desperate attempts to flee, in spite of the fact that such actions are punishable by death.

For those who had to live through the horrors of Pol Pot's rule, death seems preferable to grisly tortures. That is one of the reasons why the Kampuchean hate Pol Pot's infiltrators so. Even Western observers admit that the population's hate of Pol Pot's men is so great that one Kampuchean out of two can be relied on to show the murderers and secret agents to the authorities. As *Indochina Issues*, a bulletin published by the International Affairs Research Centre in Washington, wrote small groups of Pol Pot's men infiltrating deep into Kampuchea, fear not only government troops but the population itself.

Although it took more than a year to hatch the "coalition government" of counterrevolutionary rabble it is nevertheless a still born creature. The main reason is not only the continuing bickering among its members, but also the various objectives pursued by their backers.

The "coalition government" is not only called upon to provide a new "front" for Pol Pot's men and other Kampuchean reactionaries. It is designed, along with the possible variants, to start an armed conflict along the Thailand-Kampuchean border and to prevent dialogue and normalisation of relations between the ASEAN member-states and Indochina. While the imperialists seeking domination of Southeast Asia really do stand to profit from such a development, this is hardly true of the ASEAN countries, particularly Thailand, which would most probably dislike the role of

"front-line state". As prominent Indonesian scholar Lee Teck Cheng remarked, it is time for the ASEAN nations to choose a more realistic and independent approach to the "Kampuchean problem".

The developments in Southeast Asia are not at all to the liking of the forces inimical to the socialist countries of Indochina. The anti-Vietnamese hue and cry raised in connection with the events in Kampuchea is petering out. All attempts of reactionaries to artificially revive interest in the "Kampuchean problem" have failed.

Those who were planning to play the "Pol Pot trump" in their own anti-Kampuchean and anti-Vietnamese game begin to realise that the paymasters of the Pol Pot gangs are not going to hire them out. Moreover, the gangs themselves are becoming less and less suitable for armed pressure on Kampuchea and Vietnam.

The reason for this is not only the growing desertion rate among battle- and jungle-weary fighters decimated by malaria and dysentery, but also the series of major defeats sustained by Pol Pot's gangs in the course of the last few months. According to the *Far Eastern Economic Review*, the successful operations of Kampuchean and Vietnamese forces have reduced the area on the Thai-Kampuchean border controlled by the gangs to 100 square kilometres, and their strength is estimated by Thai Army officers at 20,000 men or fewer.

In addition, the resolution of the Kampuchean refugee problem in Thailand, with most of them returning to their home country, is depriving the Pol Pot bands of potential recruits. Chak Sari, Sihanouk's representative in Paris and political consultant of the "Molinkaka" movement, admitted that the influx of "volunteers" to the bands has "practically ceased".

The number of Kampuchean refugees in Thailand who served as a source of replenishment for Pol Pot's bands is shrinking inexorably. According to the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees 90,000 Kampucheans returned to their villages in 1981. It has been reported that the Thai authorities are planning to close the remaining refugee camps. Some of the refugees will go to third countries, but the vast majority will return to Kampuchea. An agreement in principle about their repatriation has already been arranged between Thailand and Kampuchea by UNOHCR regional coordinator Zia Rizwi. What remains to be done is to arrange the technical details of repatriation, such as the mode of transportation. Last year alone six centres for displaced persons were closed in Thailand.

What is important, however, is not only the military aspect of the process, but also its political consequences. The defeat of the counter-revolutionaries' attempts to regain power in Kampuchea by force of arms, as well as the heavy losses they have sustained have led to a change in attitude among those quarters in the ASEAN countries who had planned to use them as a sort of buffer between Thailand and Kampuchea. There are similar misgivings about the practicability of continuing participation in intrigues against Kampuchea and Vietnam. There is also a growing awareness of the need for dialogue, in spite of past inertia.

The events of the last three years or so show that all the manoeuvrings of the enemies of people's Kampuchea are doomed to failure. No resolutions or lamentations of nostalgic former dictators and their foreign patrons can hide the fact that the expulsion of Pol Pot's obscurantists and the proclamation of the People's Republic of Kampuchea have put the country on the road to social, economic and cultural revival. ■

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

BOOK ON HISTORY OF SOVIET-AFGHAN RELATIONS REVIEWED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 p 62

[Review by S. Gavrilov of book "The USSR and Afghanistan. 1919-1981" by L. B. Teplinsky, "Nauka" Publishers, Moscow, 1982, 294 pages]

[Text]

Issued in the series "The USSR and Oriental Countries", the above publication is the first serious study to give a comprehensive picture of diplomatic, social, political, economic, cultural, scientific and other relations between the USSR and Afghanistan from their inception to our day.

More than 60 years of relations between the two neighbouring states are analysed against a background of vast changes in the international situation. The research was mainly based on documents, including archives. Lenin's documents, messages and other material related to Afghanistan were analysed with particular thoroughness and cited in the book.

The historical approach to the genesis of Soviet-Afghan relations adopted by the author has enabled him to show their roots and the consistent, truly Leninist course of Soviet foreign policy and its continuity during the decades from the first Decree on Peace, to the Peace Programme for the 1980s, adopted by the 26th Congress of the CPSU. This publication devoted to relations between the two countries convincingly proves that the formation of the USSR, the 60th anniversary of which was recently celebrated, was of paramount importance to Oriental countries and peoples. At the same time, the author justly states that the class essence of the feudal monarchy, and later, of the Daud regime that ruled the country, largely hindered the development of bilateral relations and prevented the Afghan people from taking advantage of the benefits they could have gained from cooperation and friendship with the USSR.

The chapters dealing with the period preceding the April 1978 Revolution in Afghanistan describe in full the economic cooperation which helped to lay the foundations of Afghan national industry. Material showing how both countries settled mutual differences through negotiations is also of interest. The successful settling of the border issue goes beyond the framework of bilateral relations as it shows that even the most complicated international problems can be resolved if the two sides follow the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The span of time under consideration, which covers more than six decades, has enabled L. Teplinsky to propose and substantiate the division of Soviet-Afghan relations into certain periods, to consider the main stages of their development, and to single out their major characteristics. The author should receive due credit for tracing the development of social, political and economic processes in Afghan society throughout the existence of independent Afghanistan and for leading the reader to the understanding that the April 1978 Revolution is a logical consequence of these processes. This is of special importance now that ideological opponents insist that the Afghan Revolution is a result of Soviet interference.

The author makes a justified attempt to give the fullest possible analysis of relations between the USSR and Afghanistan since the April 1978 Revolution, when these relations were placed on a qualitatively new footing and are now exemplified by deep, sincere, lasting friendship imbued with

the spirit of comradeship and revolutionary solidarity. This part accounts for about one-third of the monograph, though it covers a comparatively short period. The new stage in Soviet-Afghan relations, which began after the victory of the national democratic revolution in Afghanistan, is viewed from a correct, clearcut position. The legal aspect and the internationalist nature of Soviet aid to the revolutionary Afghan people are forcefully demonstrated. All data in the book, particularly in the section on the profound social and economic transformations occurring in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, refute the slanderous fabrications by our class enemies who make every attempt to distort the essence of the revolutionary processes in Afghanistan.

The study rightfully emphasises that Soviet-Afghan relations are attractive to those developing countries which are resolutely advancing toward social progress and national liberation. As is clearly seen from the book, cooperation between the USSR and Afghanistan graphically illustrates the great significance for today's world of the alliance between the forces of socialism and the national liberation movement.

On the whole, the publication is a useful contribution to Oriental studies in the USSR and promotes further rapprochement between the peoples of the USSR and Afghanistan.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

BOOK BY HUSAYN'S BROTHER ON PALESTINIAN PROBLEM REVIEWED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 62-63

[Review by Y. Mikheyev, V. Naumkin, doctor of science (History), of book "Palestinian Self-Determination. A Study of the West Bank and Gaza Strip" by Hassan Ben Talal, Quartet Books, London-Melbourne-New York, 1981, 138 pages]

[Text]

This book is written by the crown prince of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Hassan ben Talal, brother of King Hussein.

Hassan ben Talal, a prominent statesman, is also known as a scholar who largely contributed to the progress of science in the country and the study of the Middle East problems. In 1970, he founded the Royal Scientific Society of Jordan and was responsible for the elaboration and implementation of long-term plans of national economic development. He is also the author of a monograph devoted to the legal status of Jerusalem. Referring to this monograph, Hassan ben Talal justly points out that the future of the West Bank and Gaza Strip is inseparable from the future of Jerusalem" (p. 23).

Drawing on a wealth of factual material, the author traces the history of the problem and analyses its political and legal aspects, the Palestinians' just demands and the prospects for establishing peace in the Middle East.

Examining the situation which took shape after the Second World War, he graphically shows the groundlessness of the Zionists' claims to possess all of Palestine as the Jews' "Biblical homeland". The Zionist aggression spawned the Palestinian refugee problem. Early in 1949, nearly 90,000 former Arabs of Palestine were driven out of their homes (p. 64). The first Arab-Israeli war of 1948-1949 further altered the demographic situation in Israel in favour of Jews: some 210,000 of them had immigrated to the country by April 20, 1949. Israel's aggression against Arab states in June 1967 re-

sulted in the establishment of its control over the West Bank of the Jordan River and Gaza Strip. The author thoroughly analyses the military occupation in the light of relevant provisions of international law, international agreements, conventions, and historical analogy.

Both Israel's occupation of Arab lands and its activities there are illegal. The building of settlements on the occupied territories is a gross violation of the Palestinians' rights. The author stresses that the creation of 106 more Jewish settlements on the West Bank, now inhabited by nearly 91,000 people, with some 1,000 on the Gaza Strip, as well as the plan to set up ever more settlements to be populated by 120,000 to 150,000 people by 1985, are a violation of Article 49 (6) of the Fourth Geneva Convention to which Israel also was a signatory (p. 73).

The author considers the problem of the Palestinian refugees as part of the Middle East issue. By November 1980, the number of refugees registered by a UN agency reached 1.8 million, while their total figure is twice as large, some 3.6 million, the author believes (p. 100). He rightly states the refugee problem is the most complicated one in the Middle East, and that peace cannot be ensured in the region without its instant solution.

The author substantiates the legitimate nature of the Palestine Arab people's rights and analyses the positions of various social and political forces with respect to this issue. Today, Palestinians' just struggle is increasingly winning recognition all over the world, and the prestige of the Pa-

lestine Liberation Organisation as the only legitimate representative of the Palestine Arab people is enhancing. Of great importance was the granting to the PLO of the status of UN observer.

The author points to the world community's growing awareness of the Palestinian Arabs' just struggle for independence. In this context, the concept of autonomy provided for in the Camp-David agreement is unacceptable logically, legally and politically, the author states (p. 94).

As to the prospects of establishing peace in the Middle East, the author states that this is impossible unless the legitimate national demands of the Palestinians are satisfied and their independent state is formed. To "protect" its own "security" Israel launches fresh acts of aggression and annexation, thus hampering peace in the region. Its claims to the West Bank and Gaza Strip run counter to international law (p. 127). Hassan ben Talal writes that the fundamental security for the peoples of the region is indivisible. Their striving for self-determination, peace and justice must be equ-

ally taken into account (p. 130).

It should be noted that the Soviet Union gives full backing to the Palestinians' resolute struggle. Last year the PLO representation in the USSR was granted the status of a diplomatic mission. Working to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, the USSR proceeds from the interests of the peoples, and the lofty ideals of peace and justice. During the negotiations between Leonid Brezhnev and King Hussein Ibn Talal of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in May 1981, the two sides reaffirmed their determination to continue working for the implementation of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to self-determination and independent statehood on the liberated Palestinian territories, as well as the right to return to their homes as provided for by UN resolutions.

This can be achieved only through negotiations with all the countries concerned, including the Soviet Union. This idea can be traced in the book under review.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

BOOK ON AFRICAN 'REVOLUTIONARY DEMOCRATS' REVIEWED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 pp 63-64

[Review by I. Yusupov, candidate of science (History), of book "Ideology of Revolutionary Democrats in Africa" by researchers from the Institute of Africa, USSR Academy of Sciences (editor-in-chief G.B. Starushenko), Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1981, 288 pages]

[Text]

The collective monograph under review (Editor-in-Chief G. B. Starushenko) was written by researchers from the Institute of Africa, USSR Academy of Sciences, together with their colleagues from socialist countries. It is a continuation of numerous Marxist writings dealing with the present-day revolutionary democracy, a qualitatively new socio-political force, tackling, under the historical conditions prevailing in the young states, the tasks which were formerly handled in the developed states by national bourgeoisie. It also solves in part the tasks which were resolved by the proletariat. The hallmark of this book is that the subject of research, which has been singled out from broader political and sociological problems, has been examined in a comprehensive manner. Drawing on facts and figures and works by their predecessors, the authors tried to describe objectively and realistically the ideology of African revolutionary democrats in its practical implementation.

G. B. Starushenko rightly points out that this ideology in its most general version is characterised by consistent anti-feudalism and anti-imperialism, rejection of capitalism as a system, and recognition of socialism as an ultimate goal of social development and of the revolutionary methods of struggle for its attainment (p. 277). World socialism, its revolutionary practice and advanced theory have exerted a decisive influence on the emergence and formation of this

ideology. However, the rates of evolution of the revolutionary-democratic ideology towards scientific socialism should be neither underrated nor overrated. "Today, too, cooperation with revolutionary democrats is not a simple thing, and it requires a sound knowledge and profound understanding of their ideology and politics" (p. 4). The book under review is designed to facilitate this task.

I think that chronologically, the monograph should have been started with the section written by M. Y. Frenkel, which deals with radical trends in the early African nationalism. The author cites little-known facts concerning the emergence of the first concept of "national socialism" in Northern Africa at the junction of the 19th and the 20th centuries. It also deals with the appearance of socialist groups in Southern Africa and the formation there of the associations of "coloured" and Africans, with the role of Afro-American Communists in the African national liberation movement in the 1920s-1930s, and the activities of the left-wing nationalists in the British and French colonies in the same period. The author regards the representatives of the above-mentioned movements as the immediate forerunners of the revolutionary democrats.

The entire book is permeated with the idea that the ideology of the revolutionary democrats in Africa was formed mainly as a political ideology in the course of solving practical tasks of national emancipa-

tion and cultural construction. (This thesis is thoroughly analysed by N. D. Kosukhin.) Sometimes outstripping social reality, the leaders of the revolutionary democrats were still unable to ignore it completely. Hence, apparently, the historically inevitable stage of "national socialisms" which has already become obsolescent, and the complicated, sometimes agonising search for the ways of adapting the provisions of dialectical and historical materialism to social conditions which differ radically from those in the industrialised countries. The results of this search have been analysed, for example, in the articles by V. S.

Kovalsky, who examined the philosophic views of Kwame Nkrumah and Sekou Touré in connection with the impact exerted on them by the ideas of scientific socialism, and in the article by N. I. Vysotskaya, who studies nationalism of revolutionary democrats. They, as she puts it, "cease to be nationalist, first of all, but this does not mean that they consciously free themselves from the elements of nationalism...it should be said instead that they are trying to reconcile nationalism with Marxism-Leninism" (p. 49).

The articles by L. M. Sadovskaya and Y. V. Šmirnova leave no doubt about the theses concerning the

danger of the right-wing trends and the "leftist" deviation for the revolutionary democrats. Unfortunately, in my opinion, these sections of the monograph somewhat gloss over the absolutely correct provision on the "historical and social preconditionality of the positions of revolutionary democrats", as well as the fact that "their weak points are primarily objective and only then subjective later" (pp. 285, 286).

The theoretical propositions substantiated in Chapter 1—"Formation of Ideology"—are made more concrete in subsequent chapters dealing with the concept of social and economic development advanced by the revolutionary democratic parties of some states of socialist orientation, and with the world outlook of some outstanding leaders of African revolutionary democracy. I believe that the articles by K. Houtchnroiter (GDR) "The Concepts of 'People', 'Party', State' in the Political Ideology of Ahmed Sekou Touré", by B. V. Bilevich and N. I. Vysotskaya, "The Traditional Community in the Documents of the Malagasy Revolution" and by Y. N. Vinokurov, "Patrice Lumumba's Revolutionary Democracy" are especially informative.

The monograph is of interest to specialists, on the whole.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

BOOK ON IRANIAN REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS 1905-1979 REVIEWED

Moscow ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY in English No 1, Jan-Feb 83 p 64

[Review by V. Plastun, candidate of science (History), of book "Iran: Past and Present (Ways and Forms of the Revolutionary Process)" by S. Agayev, "Nauka" Publishers, Moscow, 1981, 270 pages]

[Text]

Most important in the book is the author's desire to provide an answer to the question: why did strikingly similar phenomena which took place (though non-simultaneously) in European countries and Iran produce quite different results in the process of capitalist development?

The author traces the emergence of "historical media" (Marx's term) on the territory of present-day Iran by applying the method of historical comparison. Basing himself on the types of evolution of bourgeois society in Europe and Japan, and in parallel with them, Agayev has analysed similar processes in Iran, including such events as the Babid uprisings, the revolution of 1905-1911, the "Gilan revolution", the "coup of the 3rd Hout", the struggle for the nationalisation of oil resources during Musaddiq's rule, the "white revolution", and the revolution of 1978-1979.

The process of involving Iran in the world capitalist market in the 19th century was accompanied by definite socio-economic shifts in Iranian society; these shifts are carefully examined by the author. Agayev shows that the social content of the revolution of 1905-1911 was dictated by the interests of the upper crust of tradespeople, leaving the position of other privileged strata practically intact. For this reason, the Shia clergymen who sought to weaken secular power and increase their say in state affairs played an important part in the movement.

The "Gilan revolution", the 1921 coup d'état, and the dynasty coup of

1925 which brought Reza Shah Pahlavi to power are assessed by the author as Iran's transitory stage from feudalism to capitalism or the stage of semi-feudal absolutism (p. 83).

With Musaddiq's advent to power in the early 1950s, the anti-imperialist national-democratic movement took the form of a struggle for nationalisation of oil. The clergy gradually became an opposition force, a fact which added "to nationalistic ideas a religious colouring popular with traditionally-minded masses" (p. 124).

Of much interest is the study of further steps taken by the Iranian monarchy which faced the choice of

either quitting the political scene or spurting ahead to become a bourgeois monarchy. The Shah preferred the latter and made use of the upsurge in the national-democratic movement in the early 1960s to carry out his reforms and defeat the right-wing opposition. It was at this time that the first clash between the Shah and the clergy, headed by Khomeyni, took place.

The author considers the role the Shia clergymen and their leaders played in Iranian politics in the 19th and 20th centuries. Proceeding from concrete facts, Agayev analyses state policy under the Shah with respect to the clergy and the latter's methods of influencing the masses, and addresses the reasons behind the growing anti-imperialist sentiments among the clergy.

The author could not examine all facets of the Iranian problem in a single work. This will require further studies to be sure. But there are some

inaccuracies in the monograph which need to be made more specific.

First, the author should not so categorically call the 1978-1979 developments in Iran a "truly popular" or "deeply popular" revolution without explaining that he has in mind the scale of the people's involvement rather than the nature of socio-economic and political changes carried out (or intended) by the present regime.

Second, the assertion that leftist sentiments prevailed in the Iranian Communist Party in 1920 as a result of its "social structure" (p. 67) is not well-grounded, the more so since Agayev is coauthor of an article on this subject published in *Comintern and the East* (Moscow, 1978).

On the whole, the monograph, the first after the overthrow of the Shah's regime, is an important work, a result of many years' painstaking research.

COPYRIGHT: Asia and Africa Today, 1983

CSO: 1812/144

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF 'LATINSKAYA AMERIKA' JOURNAL

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 83 pp 3-4

[Text]	Page
A.V. Berezhnoy, "On the Problem of Manipulation of the Mass Consciousness (the Activity of Advertising Transnational Corporations in Latin America)"	5
M.L. Chumakova, "Mexico: Oil and Foreign Policy"	21
Yu.A. Shashkov, "Committees for Defense of the Revolution on Cuba: From the First to the Second Congress"	37
Debate, Discussion	
A.A. Oleynikov, "Production Concentration and the Formation of Monopolies in Latin America"	42
Meetings, Interviews	
"Ousting the Dictatorship--The Main Goal" (interview with Victor Gonzalez, representative of the Paraguayan Communist Youth Federation)	61
The USSR-Latin America	
A.A. Avetisyan, "Cooperation in the Energy Sphere"	98
Art and Literature	
Henry Luque Munoz: "Freshness of Rhythm and Meaning...." Introduced and Translated by Pavel Grushko	104
I.K. Shatunovskaya, "Report from the Artist's Studio"	115
Publications	
From the archives of David Vygodskiy. Introductory article and notice by B.V. Lukin	119

Surveys

Yu.V. Vannikov, "Alcira Legaspi de Arismendi: Pedagogics
as Creativity" 131

Reviews

"The Food Problem and Agriculture of Latin American Countries,"
Exec. Ed. Yu.G. Onufriyev, Moscow, "Nauka," 1981,
reviewed by A.S. Pervushin 138

"Playa Giron: Historical Significance and Lessons," Exec. Ed.
A.D. Bekarevich, Moscow, USSR Academy of Sciences
Institute of Latin America, offset duplicator, 1982,
reviewed by Ye.A. Larin 140

Carlos Huneeus, "Collapse of Democracy in Chile. Comparative
Analysis," Heidelberg, Esprit Verlag, 1981, reviewed
by V.V. Razuvayev 141

Christian A. Girault, "Coffee Trade on Haiti. Peasants,
Middlemen and Exporters," Paris, reviewed by Yu.N.
Paniyev 143

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka," "Latinskaya Amerika," 1983

8850

CSO: 1807/190

MEXICO'S NEW STATUS AS OIL POWER EXAMINED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 83 pp 21-36

[Article by M.L. Chumakova, "Mexico: Oil and Foreign Policy"]

[Text] On the eve and at the outset of the 1980's the Mexican state's foreign policy activity, which is aimed at easing economic dependence on the United States, consolidating political independence and sovereignty and increasing the country's role in world politics, experienced the impact of a number of factors, among which Mexico's conversion into a major oil producer and exporter was of particular significance.¹

The "Oil Boom" and New Expectations

The decade of the 1970's was an important stage in the development of Mexican society characterized by the search for the optimum version of the association of state and private capital with the transnational enterprises and the country's further integration in the world capitalist economy. Attempts were made in this period at a partial renewal of the "Mexican development model" on the paths of preventive reformism. The ruling circles gambled on oil as the stimulator of economic upsurge and the conversion of Pemex into "the dynamic center of the Mexican economy."² The oil wealth fired new expectations with respect to the creation of a just and prosperous society. Hopes for the elimination of economic dependence were linked to the growth of the oil industry, and the oil resources were regarded as a "historic opportunity" to surmount the barrier of underdevelopment and join the developed states. The first report of President Lopez Portillo noted the importance of the Pemex program, which guarantees "a degree of economic independence unprecedented for the country."³ The leadership of this state corporation publicized official data on the oil and gas reserves. Proven reserves of 40 billion barrels and potential reserves of 120 billion were reported in 1978, and in 1980 proven reserves were put at 60 billion and potential reserves at 250 billion barrels⁴ (a barrel equals 159 liters).

Oil exports began to increase rapidly with the increase in production: whereas in 1974 oil exports (in terms of value) constituted 4.7 percent of total exports, in 1978 they amounted to 31.5 percent and in 1980 to 65 percent.⁵ Revenue from black gold exports increased by a factor of 13 from 1977 through 1981, constituting \$13 billion. However, as the president and statesmen have emphasized

repeatedly, Mexico does not aspire to become a typical oil producer exporting capital but intends to use the proceeds from oil for the rational development of other sectors of the economy. The government decided that the level of oil exports would be determined by the national economy's capacity to absorb the petrodollars.

The proposition of the use of energy resources in accordance with national interests and not in the interests of foreign powers became the leitmotiv of state figures' statements. Lopez Portillo spoke directly of the "power" which the oil gives his country and asserted that "oil is our potential for self-determination since it makes us less dependent on foreign financing and will improve our foreign economic relations."⁶ Thus the ruling circles endeavored to use the oil factor to strengthen Mexico's positions primarily in relations with the developed capitalist countries.

The New Tasks of Foreign Policy

The discovery of giant deposits of oil and its increased production and export began to exert a considerable influence on foreign policy. The formulation of a foreign policy strategy oriented toward the further strengthening of the country's international positions began in Mexico's ruling circles with regard for this new advantage. The emergence of the oil factor entailed a renewal of the conceptual basis of foreign policy and introduced new elements to the practical activity of diplomacy also.

The prominent lawyer and international affairs expert Jorge Castaneda, who was appointed foreign minister in the summer of 1979 and who became the proponent of a more flexible and active foreign policy and the "father" of Mexican oil diplomacy, was a supporter of the renewal of foreign policy and the instruments of its realization. Insisting on Mexico's active and aggressive role in international affairs and a departure from the previous passiveness, Castaneda declared that the new international realities also demand of the country a "new foreign policy" based on traditional principles but consonant with reality.⁷

Lopez Portillo's proposal at the UN General Assembly 34th Session on the adoption of a world energy plan should be put among the most important Mexican initiatives of an international scale. The draft provides for the incorporation in the energy plan of programs designed to guarantee countries' total sovereignty over their natural resources; the rationalization of the prospecting for and production and distribution of energy; determination of methods contributing to the production of producer goods in the developing states; the establishment of a system guaranteeing oil supplies to the developed countries; the formation of financing and development funds; and the creation of an international institution for power engineering problems.⁸

Advocating the establishment of a "new energy order," Mexico continued the policy of implementation of the principles of the Charter of States' Economic Rights and Duties and the new international economic order. For the practical realization of the provisions of the energy plan Mexico concluded an agreement with Venezuela on oil supplies on favorable terms to the countries of Central America and the Caribbean which stipulates that 30 percent of the resources

obtained from the countries of the subregion for oil exports will be deducted into a fund for these states' development. The Mexican president termed this agreement an example of effective international cooperation and support for the oil-importing developing countries.

Mexico's endeavor to perform the role of "bridge" in the negotiations between the industrially developed capitalist countries and the developing states has also come to be displayed increasingly distinctly. The efforts made by Mexican diplomacy for the convening of a conference of heads of capitalist and developing states in Cancun and resumption of the "North-South" dialogue are indicative in this respect.

Together with the international initiatives and stimulation of Mexican diplomacy on a multilateral level the practice of bilateral relations was reassessed and the priority directions of foreign policy were distinguished: relations with the United States, Canada, West Europe and Latin America. The development of relations with the socialist community countries, particularly the USSR and Cuba, acquired new impetus.

Dynamics of Mexican-American Relations

The Lopez Portillo government endeavored to mend relations with the United States, which had deteriorated in the mid-1970's as a result of the exacerbation of conflicts on questions of trade and the immigration of Mexican workers to the United States and as a consequence of the Third World orientation of the Echeverria government. At the meetings with U.S. presidents Lopez Portillo strove for American ruling circles' greater attention to Mexico and an understanding of the socioeconomic problems confronting it and insisted on fair terms of trade relations and the preservation of opportunities for Mexican workers' immigration to the United States.

An important element of the government's new approach to the problems of trade relations with the northern neighbor was the policy of diversifying the oil sales markets. Realizing that the concentration of Mexican oil exports on the American market were fraught with the danger of new ties of dependence, the government resolved to reduce the United States' share in oil exports from 86 percent in 1977 to 50 percent by 1982. Implementation of this decision led to the United States accounting for 44.3 percent of contract oil exports by the start of 1982.⁹

The policy of using oil resources to overcome the economic crisis and the resuscitation of business activeness in the country introduced new elements to the practice of Mexican-American relations. Both sides displayed higher-than-usual interest in the development of bilateral relations: the United States endeavored to secure for itself guaranteed oil and gas supplies, Mexico to solve a number of contentious problems engendered by neighborhood with the United States.

Mexican-American relations are becoming a "fashionable topic" in both countries' ruling, business and academic circles. Washington is displaying increasingly great concern at the problems of the "oil colossus," and the significance of

the southern neighbor in the system of the United States' foreign policy priorities is increasing in connection with the stunning oil reserve estimates. "Mexico--Oil Superpower in the Making," "The New Saudi Arabia"--such evaluations have led American politicians to the conclusion of the possibility of using it as an important supplier of oil to the United States, and Presidential Memorandum 41 described it as "the most promising oil source in the 1980's."¹⁰ Mexico is becoming Washington's "valued ally" in Latin America, and particular attention is being paid to it in U.S. ruling circles. American legislators are discussing the possibility of reduced U.S. dependence on Near East oil exports, noting regretfully that, as distinct from Saudi Arabia, Mexico is following an independent policy in the development of its oil and gas wealth. U.S. ruling circles' interest in Mexico increased even further following the revolution in Iran. As U.S. Ambassador P. Lucey observed in this connection, "Fernando Cortez discovered Mexico in 1519, and the United States, it seems, in 1978."¹¹

Washington attached particular significance to the use of instruments with which it might force Pemex to expand oil production and also to study of the problem of Mexico's preferential access to the American market. The influential American foreign policy journal FOREIGN POLICY called on the Carter administration to restrict imports from Taiwan, Hong Kong and South Korea in order "to afford Mexico broader opportunities" in view of the fact that it is of far greater significance for U.S. security than the Asian countries.

The discovery of the huge oil deposits forced Washington not only to reevaluate Mexico's role but also prompted it to search for a new approach to the "oil superpower". Henceforward Mexico would be viewed in the context of U.S. global strategy. The proposition of the "interdependence" and "interpenetration" of the economies of both countries is becoming increasingly popular in American ruling circles, and appeals are being heard increasingly often for the establishment of "extraspecial relations" with Mexico and the conclusion of long-term agreements on oil and gas supplies.

In turn, prominent Mexican diplomats are endeavoring to achieve the more equal and balanced nature of relations with the northern neighbor. "Our methods of operation and our positions and directions and even forms of communication with the United States should be subordinated not to the highest goal of maintaining friendly relations but to the imperative of our own goals,"¹² J. Castaneda emphasized.

Taking advantage of its increased foreign policy potential, Mexico succeeded in achieving certain concessions from the United States in the trade sphere: a trade agreement was signed in December 1977 providing for exports of Mexican vegetables, fruit and light industry products; as a result of talks lasting 2 years an agreement on natural gas supplies was concluded in September 1979 on favorable terms for Mexico. Evaluating the results of these long and difficult negotiations, J. Castaneda observed that Mexico does not now feel so dependent on the United States. "...We know," the minister emphasized, "that it needs oil and that we can supply it. This ensures better foundations for our relations."¹³ The negotiations were an important landmark in strengthening Mexico's independent position in problems of bilateral relations with Washington. The essence of the Mexican position was formulated by Lopez Portillo: "Mexico will develop its deposits in accordance with its own interests."¹⁴

Abiding by this policy, back in the summer of 1979 Mexico rejected an American plan for the creation of a North American common market. The plan for the creation of a North American economic community aimed at securing for Washington access to the energy resources of Canada and Mexico and representing, as the Swiss newspaper JOURNAL DE GENEVE wrote, "A prelude to the inevitable Anschluss of the two neighboring countries,"¹⁵ which had been put forward by Reagan, was turned down later, in 1981. The Mexican Government rightly saw the Reagan plan as a threat to national sovereignty.

The country's increased independence was also manifested in such a complex question of bilateral relations as the problem of Mexicans' illegal migration to the United States. The Lopez Portillo government turned down the American plan for the creation of an American-Mexican fund to finance development projects of the areas from which the bulk of the Mexican workers were coming, considering it an infringement of national sovereignty and interference in its internal affairs. Employing the proposition of protection of the rights of Mexicans migrating to the United States in search of work, the Lopez Portillo administration managed not only to neutralize the threat of their mass deportation but also to persuade Washington to negotiate on a regulation of the status of Mexican workers. A wide-ranging propaganda campaign exposing the actions of the U.S. authorities in the border states was developed in Mexico, and demarches were undertaken in the OAS and United Nations proposing the adoption of a code of immigrant workers' rights.

Mexico's active position in international organizations in defense of the Mexican workers' rights served as a kind of counterweight to the ongoing debate in the U.S. Congress "on the silent, unchecked and illegal invasion" of Mexicans, confronted the U.S. Administration with the need to adopt a more cautious approach to this problem, forced it to refrain from threats to close the border and from mass roundups of Mexicans and so forth.

Defending its natural resources and championing national sovereignty, Mexico opposed American fishing vessels' violation of the 200-mile economic zone. In the summer of 1980 seven ships were detained by the Mexican authorities, which was a reason for the "tuna war" and an exacerbation of bilateral relations. Touching on this new contentious issue, Lopez Portillo emphasized that this was not only a question of an economic nature but also a "problem of sovereignty."¹⁶

Mexican diplomacy in negotiations with the United States began to put forward a "packet" of problems, taking advantage of the oil factor and striving for concessions in questions of immigration and trade policy. Occupying a tough position in negotiations with Washington, Mexican diplomacy expressed the position of groups of the party-state upper stratum which "aspires to maintain some sphere of autonomy with the United States."¹⁷ This autonomy has been underpinned by the increased relative significance of Pemex and its influence on the shaping of government policy and by the traditional role of exponent of nationalist aspirations and the symbol of the country's sovereignty over its own natural resources.

Mexico's increased foreign policy potential has come to be reckoned with by Washington, and American statesmen have mentioned increasingly often Mexico's "exclusive role" in international affairs. U.S. ruling circles' attention to

Mexico increased even more with Reagan's assumption of office. It is significant that Reagan's sole foreign trip following his election, but prior to his inauguration was a visit to Mexico. However, the more frequent meetings and top-level negotiations revealed new spheres of conflict between the countries on problems of a political nature.

They have been manifested particularly strikingly in the approach to the crisis situation in Central America. Throughout 1979-1982 Mexico consistently opposed American military intervention in the region and disputed the proposition that the events in Central America have been caused by "Cuban interference," supported the national reconstruction government in Nicaragua and insisted on a political settlement of the Salvadoran conflict.

At the time of preparation of Reagan's "Caribbean initiative" Mexico made it clearly understood that it would only support this plan given observance of the following conditions: if the plan included no military component, would not become an instrument of political pressure and would not be discriminatory in the sense of the exclusion of any country of the region from the assistance program.¹⁸

It is significant that not long before Reagan's proclamation of the said plan in the OAS in February 1982 the Mexican president had put forward comprehensive proposals for a relaxation of tension and the settlement of conflict situations in Central America. The Mexican initiative was greeted with approval by the governments of a number of Latin American and West European states. Lopez Portillo's words to the effect that U.S. military intervention in the region would be a "colossal historical error" sounded as a warning to Washington. The point about "agreement to differ" became the leitmotiv of the commentaries of international observers evaluating the results of the top-level meetings and the current state of Mexican-American relations.

The political disagreements with the United States were only intensified by the growth of the country's "negotiating potential" as a consequence of the oil factor. They were brought about by the adherence of Mexico's ruling circles to the principles of noninterference and self-determination based on the historical experience of the country, which has known the ruinous consequences of American intervention and actively condemns all forms of interventionism (we recall that a National Museum of Intervention has been created in Mexico), and, finally, by the very fact of Mexico's conversion into a regional power with its own interests in contiguous regions which sometimes differ from America's. Mexico's growing independence in the negotiations with the United States was also explained to a considerable extent by the development of contacts with the remaining industrial capitalist countries. Taking advantage of the oil "lever" as an important instrument, Mexico's ruling circles endeavored if not to eliminate, then to ease dependence on the United States and partially overcome the "asymmetry" in bilateral relations by means of the development of economic and political relations with the West European countries, Canada and Japan.

In the Search for New Economic Partners and Political Allies

A principal condition of the diversification of Mexico's economic relations beyond the Western hemisphere was the accelerated growth of the oil industry. Relying on the growing role of Pemex, the Lopez Portillo government embarked on an expansion of the circle of economic partners among the industrially developed capitalist countries, striving for their assistance in the development of the priority sectors of industry, an inflow of capital and the receipt of modern technology. Simultaneously there was a strengthening of contracts between the PRI and the social democratic parties of West Europe, which served as the basis for the organization of cooperation with the West European countries in the political sphere also.

A kind of "touchstone" of Mexico's new approach to the West European countries was the organization of all-around cooperation with Spain. In March 1977, when the process of democratization had begun in the country, diplomatic relations were normalized¹⁹ and steps were taken to broaden economic relations and cultural cooperation. Spain was the first West European country to which Lopez Portillo paid an official visit--in October 1977. Agreements were concluded in 1977-1978 on most-favored-nation status in trade and on industrial-power engineering cooperation, and contacts between the two countries' financial-industrial circles came to life noticeably. An arrangement covering oil supplies to Spain was supplemented by an agreement between Pemex and the Spanish PETRONOR oil corporation in accordance with which the Mexican company purchased 15 percent of the stock from the Spanish company for a sum of \$300 million. Mexican oil began to arrive in Spain for subsequent refining at PETRONOR enterprises, which was evaluated as undermining the international oil corporations' monopoly.

The stimulation of Mexico's policy in Europe occurred against a background of growing interest therein on the part of the capitalist oil importers. At the end of the 1970's visits by statesmen and representatives of finance-industrial circles of Western industrial countries increased markedly. A graphic example of their heightened interest in Mexico was the visit of French President V. Giscard d'Estaing in October 1979. As a result of the talks 10 agreements were signed on various aspects of economic cooperation and French credit amounting to \$1 billion was obtained.²⁰ These agreements laid the foundation for long-term economic and scientific-technical cooperation and ensured the inflow into Mexico of capital for the financing of development projects.

While making efforts to expand economic relations with the West European countries the Mexican Government at the same time endeavored to consolidate the country's international positions, believing, as J. Castaneda observed, that "economic diversification means less political dependence."²¹

Mexico's interest in attracting the West European countries' capital and technology in exchange for oil was manifested during Lopez Portillo's visit to France, the FRG and Sweden in May 1980. During the talks spheres of prospective cooperation were analyzed and agreement was reached on the adoption of measures to expand Mexican exports.

The Franco-Mexican rapprochement which had been discerned on the eve and at the outset of the 1980's was given new impetus with the assumption of office in France by F. Mitterrand. The community of positions of the French Socialist Party and the PRI on a number of international problems served as the basis for the expansion of political cooperation between the two states. In the atmosphere of the increased aggressiveness of Reagan's foreign policy course and the escalation of American military preparations in Central America and the Caribbean a Franco-Mexican declaration was adopted on 28 August 1981 calling for a political settlement of the Salvadoran conflict and recognizing El Salvador's revolutionary-patriotic organizations as a representative political force. This political-diplomatic initiative, which drew great international comment and ran counter to Washington's policy of support for the antipopular junta, reflected the qualitatively new level of interstate cooperation and the increased international authority of Mexico.

The policy of diversifying foreign relations was reflected in the organization of bilateral relations with Canada, which also failed to concur with the policy of Washington, which was unwilling to abandon the plan for a North American economic community. Mexico displayed increasingly great interest in Canadian technology and in obtaining credit. An agreement on cooperation in the nuclear power sphere was concluded between the countries in 1979. Agreements were reached in May 1980 as a result of Lopez Portillo's visit to Canada on supplies of Mexican oil, joint ventures, the granting of Canadian technology and the allocation of credit for Mexico's purchase of industrial equipment. In the period 1979-1981 mutual trade increased more than fourfold, exceeding \$1.5 billion.²²

The top level meetings of leaders of both states assumed a regular character. The community of positions on a number of international problems and interest in strengthening cooperation was displayed at the time of Lopez Portillo's talks with P. Trudeau in 1982 in Mexico. The endeavor to resist Washington's economic and political pressure and common problems in mutual relations with the United States are serving to stimulate Mexican-Canadian rapprochement.

Mexican-Japanese relations have also developed within the channel of the diversification policy. As a result of Lopez Portillo's visit to Japan in the fall of 1978 Mexico began to supply oil to Japan and obtained credit amounting to over \$1 billion and agreements were also signed on cooperation in the sphere of the steel industry, petrochemistry, power engineering, construction and tourism.²³

The development and formation of relations with new economic partners was characterized by the use of oil supplies to cater for the country's capital and technology requirements. Considering the significance of oil a sufficiently effective instrument at negotiations compensating for the weakness of Mexico's position with respect to other questions of interstate cooperation, Mexico gave preference to the achievement of bilateral accords, while its position in respect of multilateral agreements remained guarded.

The Lopez Portillo government's refusal to join the GATT, which followed several months of discussion in government, business and academic circles of the possibility of joining it, was indicative in this respect. The government's decision

was influenced by fears concerning the negative consequences of such a step (competition on the part of the developed capitalist countries) and the democratic public's opposition to this measure.

A consequence of the policy of diversification of relations with the industrial capitalist countries was an expansion of the spheres of economic and scientific-technical cooperation, the establishment of political and diplomatic contacts and recognition of Mexico's growing role in the Western hemisphere and its new place in the world.

Mexico's Latin American Policy

The increased independence in the pursuit of the foreign policy course as a consequence of Mexico's conversion into an oil power has also been manifested distinctly in its policy on the continent: the significance of political aspects of interstate relations is growing, bilateral ties are being stimulated and increasingly extensive use is being made of PRI channels for setting up contacts with the reformist and revolutionary parties. Together with the traditional principles of foreign policy Latin American policy is built with regard for the concepts of political and ideological pluralism and the principle of selectivity presupposing a selective approach in the development of relations with the countries of the continent.

An indication of Mexico's assertiveness on the continent and implementation of the principles of political pluralism as a "rule of foreign policy" was Lopez Portillo's trip to a number of Latin American countries in August 1980 (Cuba, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Panama, Nicaragua and Brazil). While developing bilateral relations with the Latin American countries Mexico continued to advocate the strengthening of economic solidarity within the SELA framework and the reorganization of the Latin American Free Trade Association and the creation on the basis thereof of the ALADI and championed the principles of a new international economic order.

The stimulation of Mexico's Latin American policy occurred against the background of the PRI's increased contacts with the Socialist International and the participation of Mexican representatives in the work of the Permanent Conference of Latin American Political Parties which was created on its initiative. The process of intrapolitical transformation was brought about by the increased interest of the ruling circles and the Mexican public in problems of the political development of neighboring states, and the toughening of Washington's Latin America policy and its interventionist thrust predetermined the decisive significance of the principles of noninterference and self-determination in the ideological arsenal of Mexican diplomacy.

Mexico's support for the revolutionary-democratic forces in Central America and the Caribbean countries was brought about both by the ideological imperative (the adherence of party-government circles to the idea of permanent Mexican revolution) and concern for the establishment in adjacent countries of democratic regimes more independent of the United States capable by way of reforms of removing sociopolitical tension and creating more favorable conditions for the development of cooperation with Mexico in all spheres. In addition, it should not be forgotten that an independent position on a number of

international problems is often used by Mexico's ruling circles to secure mass support for government policy and neutralize the opposition. A more differentiated approach to bilateral relations has been manifested in an expansion of the close contacts with representative democratic governments and a sharp condemnation of reactionary dictatorships.²⁴

In May 1979 Mexico was the first Latin American country to break off diplomatic relations with the Somoza dictatorial regime. After the victory of the Nicaraguan revolution, the Mexican Government granted the revolutionary government material and technical assistance and embarked on the path of development of all-around interstate cooperation. A number of agreements was concluded in 1980-1981 on financial-economic, technical and cultural cooperation, which are being implemented successfully.

The constructive position of Mexico, which consistently opposes the plans to destabilize the Sandinista government and the threat of military intervention, has assumed particular significance under the conditions of the United States' pursuit of a broad anti-Nicaragua campaign. Defending the Nicaraguan people's right to self-determination, Mexican diplomacy has exerted considerable effort for a peaceful settlement of the conflict situation in the subregion and talks between the United States and Nicaragua.

In relation to the conflict in El Salvador Mexico has occupied a position of defense of the principles of self-determination and noninterference and condemnation of the Salvadoran junta's genocide policy. It has refused to accept Washington's version that the civil war in this country was caused by the "interference of international communism" and not internal factors. Unequivocal condemnation of the ruling junta were Mexico's vote at the OAS General Assembly 11th Session against a resolution in support of the election plan in El Salvador and the Mexican Government's refusal to send people to observe the "elections" in El Salvador. In December 1981 Mexico, in conjunction with a number of other countries, submitted in the United Nations the draft resolution "The Situation Concerning Human Rights and Basic Freedoms in El Salvador," which contains a condemnation of the policy of the junta and calls on all states to refrain from interference, and in the fall of 1982 presented together with Venezuela proposals for a settlement of the crisis situation in Central America.

In a difficult period for Jamaica Mexico rendered the M. Manley government, which was a principal target of the U.S. policy of destabilizing progressive regimes in the Caribbean, economic (oil supplies) and political support. After the victory of the revolution on Grenada, the Lopez Portillo administration offered the new government, which had adopted a policy of radical transformations, economic and technical assistance. During Grenada Prime Minister Maurice Bishop's official visit to Mexico in September 1981 Lopez Portillo supported his proposal concerning recognition of the Caribbean as a zone of peace, opposed the policy of blackmail and threats and supported the right of this country's people to determine their fate themselves.

Mexico's increasingly assertive position in Central America and the Caribbean is leading to its increased influence in adjacent regions and is forcing

Washington to heed the voice of the new regional power, which is insisting on a relaxation of tension and peace. Mexico's policy of developing interstate cooperation with socialist Cuba is also contributing to an improvement in the international atmosphere in this part of the world. Cultural relations are strengthening together with economic cooperation, and top-level contacts have assumed a permanent nature.

The anti-interventionist and antifascist traditions of Mexican foreign policy and the Lopez Portillo government's realistic approach to the social and political changes occurring on the continent have brought about positive shifts in Mexico's international policy and confirmed its sovereign nature.

The "Oil Boomerang"

The emergence of the oil factor made adjustments to the government's foreign policy strategy, consolidated the state's positions in the face of local influential pressure groups and gave Mexico a "convincing argument" at negotiations.

True, these processes occurred under conditions of the deepening of the "structural dependence" on imperialism,²⁵ a consequence of which was an economic crisis and a catastrophic growth of the foreign debt.²⁶ The ruling circles' hopes that the "black manna" would be a stimulator of economic development and would ease dependence on foreign financing, as also the confidence that Mexico, as distinct from Iran and Venezuela, would succeed in avoiding the negative consequences of the oil boom, were dispelled in connection with the sharp deterioration in the financial situation in 1982.

The initial euphoria engendered by the oil boom was replaced by more restrained assessments of the future prospects of the country's economic development. This was caused by the decline in revenue from oil exports as a result of a certain reduction in demand for and a lowering of the price of oil on the world market as a consequence of shifts in the industrial oil importers' energy balance. In 1982 Mexico's revenue from oil exports amounted to \$14 billion instead of the planned \$27 billion. The \$13-billion shortfall proved particularly perceptible in connection with the fact that \$14 billion were needed just to pay off short-term loan debt.

Thus the Mexican economy's excessive dependence on oil revenue (progressive Mexican expoerts had warned repeatedly of the danger of the "oil gamble") was a principal reason for the financial-economic crisis which embraced the country in the final year of Lopez Portillo's term.

Under these conditions the Mexican Government was forced to request assistance from international financial organizations. "The foreign banks will readily refinance the gigantic debts and extend new loans," the American NEWSWEEK commented on Mexico's talks with the international financial organizations.²⁷ The United States also "readily" offered Mexico a "comprehensive program of assistance," including loans and commercial credit. This position of the White House was brought about by no means by philanthropic considerations but the United States' "strategic interest" in Mexican energy resources. Washington made available \$1 billion for future supplies of Mexican oil for the American "strategic reserve".

In the fall of 1982, following nationalization of the banks and the imposition of exchange controls, Mexico requested from the IMF two credits totaling \$5.3 billion and began negotiations with Saudi Arabia on obtaining a \$12-billion loan. The need to resort to new billion-dollar loans to pay off foreign debt and extricate the country from the crisis again showed the vulnerability of the Mexican development model; the crisis state of the economy posed with all seriousness the question of Mexico's dependence on imperialist centers. A real danger arose that the United States would take advantage of Mexico's economic difficulties to put pressure on it not only in the sphere of economic relations (relying on the pro-imperialist circles of the Mexican bourgeoisie upset at the nationalization of the banks and the measures to halt the flow of capital from the country) but also to change its foreign policy orientation.

The IMF's recommendations on the lifting of exchange controls as a condition of granting assistance were a disturbing symptom. However, as Reagan's October 1982 meeting with Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado, who had been elected president, showed, the latter insisted in the course of the talks on the balanced and equal nature of bilateral relations and defended Mexico's right to tackle independently problems of an economic and foreign policy nature which arise.

This position was possible thanks to the continuity of the foreign policy course and also in connection with the increased national self-awareness of Mexicans and their aspiration to strengthen economic and political independence. In becoming one of the top five oil powers Mexico has acquired new status in the international arena.

And although Mexican oil has not been a panacea against the chronic illnesses of a dependent capitalist economy, its significance for increasing the "negotiating potential," ensuring greater freedom of maneuver at negotiations with the imperialist centers and pursuing an independent foreign policy line is difficult to overestimate.

Ensuring the diversification of foreign economic relations and laying the foundations for long-term economic and scientific-technical cooperation with the capitalist countries, Mexico's oil diplomacy eased the country's one-sided dependence on the United States somewhat and thereby strengthened its positions at negotiations on problems of Mexican-American relations, which, in turn, created new opportunities for increased independence in international affairs. These processes developed under the conditions of Mexico's increased economic potential, were caused by the need for foreign policy to conform to the imperatives of domestic policy and the economic course and were underpinned by the assertiveness and high professional level of diplomacy and also the giant energy resources.

Mexico's foreign policy is assuming an increasingly diverse and sovereign nature, being subordinated to the basic strategic goal of Mexico's ruling circles--the transition to state-monopoly capitalism and the establishment of equal relations with their economic and political partners.

FOOTNOTES

1. By 1982 Mexico was fourth in the world in oil production and fifth in proven reserves.
2. "Lecturas de politica exterior mexicana," Mexico City, 1979, p 258.
3. J. Lopez Portillo, "Primer Informe de Gobierno," Mexico City, 1977, pp 57-58.
4. FORO INTERNACIONAL No 78, 1979, p 318; J. Lopez Portillo, "Cuarto Informe de Gobierno," Mexico City, 1980, p 43.
5. COMERCIO EXTERIOR No 8, 1979, Mexico City, p 841; EL INFORME. RELACIONES MEXICO-ESTADOS UNIDOS No 1, 1981, p 90.
6. "America Latina. Proyectos de recambio y fuerzas internacionales en los 1980," Mexico City, 1980, pp 181-182.
7. COMERCIO EXTERIOR No 6, 1980, pp 615-616; EL DIA, Mexico City, 22 March 1980.
8. EXCELSIOR, Mexico City, 29 September 1979.
9. West Europe 29.6 percent, Latin America 8.5 percent, Japan 8.2 percent, Israel 4.6 percent and Canada 3 percent. See THE FINANCIAL TIMES, London 22 March 1982.
10. "Congressional Record," Washington, 1978, vol 124 No 168, p E-5666; NEWSWEEK No 15, New York, 1979, p 25; FOREIGN POLICY No 29, 1977-1978, Washington, p 83.
11. FORO INTERNACIONAL No 74, 1978, p 291.
12. Ibid., p 297.
13. TIEMPO No 1952, Mexico City, 1979, p 7.
14. NEWSWEEK No 8, 1978, p 13.
15. JOURNAL DE GENEVE 15 January 1982.
16. J. Lopez Portillo, "Cuarto Informe de Gobierno," p 62.
17. FORO INTERNACIONAL No 74, 1978, p 290.
18. EL INFORME. RELACIONES MEXICO-ESTADOS UNIDOS No 1, 1981, p 82.
19. Mexico did not recognize the Franco regime, but maintained for 40 years relations with the Republican government in exile in Mexico.
20. EL DIA, Mexico, 26 October 1979.

21. COMERCIO EXTERIOR No 6, 1980, p 616.
22. THE FINANCIAL TIMES 3 February 1982.
23. LATIN AMERICA. ECONOMIC REPORT No 42, 1978, London, p 329.
24. However, it should be noted that Mexico continued to supply oil to countries with antidemocratic regimes such as Haiti, Guatemala and El Salvador also. COMERCIO EXTERIOR No 8, 1981, p 870.
25. ESTRATEGIA No 37, 1981, Mexico City, p 36.
26. In 1982 the public sector foreign debt had reached \$60 billion and that of the private sector \$20 billion. THE FINANCIAL TIMES 21 July 1982.
27. NEWSWEEK No 1, 1982, p 141.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983

8850

CSO: 1807/190

NATIONAL CAPITAL FORMS MONOPOLIES DESPITE UNDERDEVELOPMENT

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 83 pp 42-60

[Article by A.A. Oleynikov: "Production Concentration and the Formation of Monopolies in Latin America"]

[Text] The world capitalist economic system is characterized by an expansion of the circle of countries in which monopolies predominate. On the one hand the expansion of monopoly capital is a result of the foreign expansion of the monopolies of the leading imperialist states. Opening affiliates or daughter companies on foreign territory, the biggest corporations of the developed capitalist states are increasingly losing contact with the national economy. The capital of these corporations is becoming international in terms of the sphere of functioning and composition, and their business is assuming the form of world production.¹

On the other, national monopolies and a national finance capital are emerging and strengthening in many countries of middle-development capitalism, among which are, as a number of Soviet scholars believes, the most developed Latin American states also--Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Chile.² This group of countries accounts for 80 percent of the territory of the continent, 75 percent of the population and 86 percent of the aggregate gross product; their share of processing industry output is over 88 percent.³ The concentration and monopolization of the economy in these countries have reached a relatively high level, affecting practically all the basic sectors.

Many Soviet authors and Latin American Marxist experts believe that a national finance capital was formed and established its domination, a transition to the stage of monopoly capitalism occurred and the development of a system of state-monopoly relations began roughly in the 1950's in the said states.⁴

However, not all authors share this viewpoint. Some believe that despite the increased level of their development, the Latin American countries have yet to reach the said stage. Starting from certain facts characteristic of the economic backwardness and dependence of the Latin American countries on the imperialist powers, some experts reach the conclusion of the "in-built," "in-grown" nature of the Latin American monopolies,⁵ while some authors deny their existence altogether.⁶ The opinion that the processes of the concentration and monopolization of the economies of these countries are almost entirely the

result of the effect of foreign capital is widespread. Whence the conclusion as to the weakness of national capital and the absence of a relatively independent system of monopoly capitalism.

It is essentially a question of a concept according to which economic backwardness and dependence are leading to the qualitative deformation of the general regularities of the capitalist production mode and the formation of a particular, "dependent" capitalism and impeding the development of national monopolies and the formation of monopoly capitalism.

The Latin American countries are indeed developing under conditions of economic backwardness and dependence on the imperialist powers. This is an objective reality. However, taking this as a basis, would it be correct to claim that capitalism in Latin America is developing almost entirely under the influence of foreign capital and that "since the latter half of the 1960's inter-nation monopolies, in which part of the local bourgeoisie has been integrated with 'junior partner' status, have essentially headed the struggle in the most developed Latin American countries (Brazil) for a capitalist development alternative"?⁷

The essential differences in the views on the processes of the concentration and monopolization of the economies of the Latin American countries are caused, we believe, by the fact that different authors interpret the role of foreign capital in these processes dissimilarly.

Foreign Capital and the Process of Concentration and Monopolization of the Economy

While emphasizing the exploiter essence of foreign capital it has to be seen that it simultaneously accelerates the capitalist development of the backward capital-importing countries, which V.I. Lenin pointed out repeatedly.⁸ Imports of capital have led to the transfer to these countries (Latin American included) of modern technical achievements and organizational forms of large-scale capitalist production. As a consequence it has not been necessary for many sectors of the national industry to pass through all the stages of the development of capitalism. "The development of capitalism in the young countries is /accelerated/ [italics] considerably by the example and assistance of the old countries," V.I. Lenin emphasized.⁹ It is obvious that the more rapidly capitalism develops, the more actively the process of the concentration of production and capital engendering a monopoly proceeds. The laws of capitalist concentration and competition inevitably lead to medium-sized and, from these, large-scale enterprises separating out from the small-scale enterprises' milieu. The large-scale and biggest enterprises suppress the weakest ones in competitive struggle and subordinate them to themselves, capture the bulk of production in the leading sectors, establish control over trade and the banks and become monopolists in these spheres.

The development of this internal process reached a relatively high level in a number of Latin American countries in the first decades of the 20th century even. In Brazil, for example, in 1920 just 482 of the biggest factories and plants (with over 100 employees) employed 61.1 percent of the country's workers,

who produced 55.3 percent of total industrial output.¹⁰ In terms of the extent of concentration of manpower Brazil had by 1920 overtaken such developed capitalist countries as Germany and France, in which the biggest enterprises (with over 50 employees) concentrated 47.6 percent and 44.8 percent of the manpower respectively, while in Brazil 69.7 percent.¹¹

The foreign monopolies, which opened affiliates and daughter companies in the Latin American countries, contributed to the acceleration of the process of the concentration of production and capital there. Many of them reduced free competition in the controlled sectors of the economy to nothing and achieved a monopoly position. At the same time imports of foreign capital led to the transfer to these countries of the experience of monopolization which had already been accumulated in the developed capitalist countries and to big national capital's perception of the organizational forms of the modern monopolies already well known in world practice.

Foreign capital contributes to the increased level of concentration of production and capital in the countries into which it is channeled, but does not substitute for this internal process. It should also be considered that the industrial enterprises directly created with the aid of foreign capital abroad are part of the internal production and socioeconomic structure of the states in which they are located, although the mother companies retain control over their activity.¹² As part of the internal production structure of the host country, the foreign monopoly companies are a part of its monopoly structure also. For example, Ford do Brasil or Ford Motors of Canada--daughter companies of the American Ford corporation--are a part of the monopoly structure not of the United States but of Brazil and Canada respectively.

In the circulation process the capital of the foreign monopolies merges with that of the national monopoly industrial and banking companies. The creation of joint ventures and the establishment of credit and other long-term financial ties could result from this process, for example. While emphasizing that the participation of foreign capital in the share capital of the national industrial and banking companies testifies to foreign investors' introduction and capture of important positions in the economy of Latin American countries we should not lose sight of the fact that the "system of participation" is primarily a most important element of the development of national finance capital and also a principal factor accelerating the merger of the local with foreign capitalists.¹³ Relatively often here the national companies find themselves in the position of "junior partner" of foreign capital. However, none of this goes beyond the framework of the general regularities of the development of finance capitalism. The basic prerequisite of the formation of the "system of participation" is the **INEQUALITY** of the sums of capital, as a result of which some are subordinated to others, and the hierarchical nature of the structure of financial groups in all capitalist countries is graphic confirmation of this.¹⁴

The proposition is sometimes advanced that the "system of participation" and other forms of the relations and association of national Latin American monopolies with foreign monopolies lead to the so-called "denationalization" and a certain "dilution" of national capital in the capital of the imperialist

powers. However, this proposition fails to consider, in our view, the simple fact that the development of these relations testifies primarily to the natural and objective growth of the internationalization of production and capital and that under the conditions of imperialism capital assumes an increasingly cosmopolitan nature. Speaking of the increasing international interweaving of finance capital cliques, V.I. Lenin emphasized: "This is the sole, truly universal and indisputable trend not of a few years and not of two countries but of the whole world and all capitalism.¹⁵ Of course, not only the United States, the EEC countries and Japan but other less developed capitalist states also are involved in this process under current conditions.

The Level of Concentration of Production and Capital in Certain Latin American Countries

When analyzing data on the concentration of production and capital it is necessary to examine its absolute and relative level separately. Whereas in the first case it is a question of the absolute dimensions of enterprises and firms, value of the product produced and so forth, in the second it is a question merely of the proportion of the biggest enterprises and firms in aggregate capital, in sectorial production and so forth.

The highest absolute level of the concentration of production and capital has been reached in the United States, which is considerably ahead of the West European countries, not to mention the Latin American countries, in these indicators. As far as relative concentration is concerned, it is not directly dependent on the level of development of the production forces and could be relatively higher in countries which are less developed and whose domestic market is narrower.

However, some authors fail to consider this fact. The conclusion as to the weakness of the Latin American monopolies is usually corroborated by references to the fact that they are as yet insufficiently large compared with international "standards" and that in the level of development of the production forces the Latin American countries lag considerably behind the leading capitalist countries. The following facts, for example, are cited. In 1974 the total sales of Brazil's 426 biggest corporations, state included, were \$3 billion less than those of the single American EXXON monopoly, while total sales of just two American monopolies--General Motors and EXXON--are in excess of Brazil's entire gross domestic product.¹⁶ All this appears highly convincing. However, it should not be forgotten here that in 1974 EXXON was the world's leader among the biggest corporations in terms of volume of capital. In 1975 its assets constituted \$32.8 billion. It may be noted for comparison that in 1976 the gross domestic product of Sweden (in 1970 prices) constituted \$37.6 billion, South Africa \$21.8 billion, Greece \$13.5 billion and Portugal \$8 billion, but Brazil \$84.3 billion.¹⁷ In 1974 the American IBM Corporation alone had a share capital twice as great as the leading 10 Japanese corporations.¹⁸ However, this fact hardly proves the weakness of the monopoly structure in Japan.

Obviously, the absolute amounts of the assets of the American monopolies, their sales volume and other such indicators cannot serve as a criterion for an evaluation of the maturity of the national monopolies in any capitalist country.

Given such an approach, national monopolies are essentially wrested away from the system of internal production relations and quantitative comparisons of the financial power of the latter with the gigantic might of the biggest international monopolies are substituted for a real analysis of their position in this system. Nor may references to the fact that in the Latin American countries "small-scale commodity production and small-scale private enterprise continue in striking preponderance" serve as a criterion for an evaluation of the level of concentration and monopolization of production. It should not be forgotten that the development of monopoly capitalism does not lead to the total elimination either of small-scale commodity production or small- and medium-scale enterprise. The latter, incidentally, "continues in striking preponderance" not only in the Latin American but also in many developed capitalist countries. In France, for example, of the 1.8 million industrial and trading enterprises, 1.4 million are in the category of the smallest (employing up to 5 persons).¹⁹ In Japan small- and medium-scale enterprises constitute 99.5 percent of all industrial enterprises. The state renders these enterprises appreciable support, endeavoring to apply the brakes to the process of their mass impoverishment and "preserve this stratum as a sociopolitical reserve of the monopoly bourgeoisie."²⁰

When analyzing the role of large-scale and small-scale production in the economies of the capitalist countries it is essential to examine primarily the proportion of the one and the other in total production. At the start of the 1970's the large-scale enterprises (employing over 100 persons) in the production of industrial products was 59 percent in Venezuela, 68 percent in Brazil, 69.8 percent in Chile, 70 percent in Argentina, 70.4 percent in Colombia and 76 percent in Mexico. It may be noted for comparison that in the United States this indicator constituted 79.4 percent.²¹ It follows from the adduced data that the relative concentration of production in a whole number of Latin American countries has reached a high level. As of 1970 in 176 of 302 sectors of Brazilian industry the four biggest companies accounted for over 50 percent of the production in each sector. And, furthermore, only 1 percent of the country's industrial companies manufactured 42.3 percent of all output.²²

The following comparative data attest the high level of concentration of industrial production in Mexico. The average production concentration factor in the processing industry of the United States (determined as the average arithmetical from the relative significance of the four biggest companies) has in recent years constituted 35-39 percent, but in Mexico 43 percent. And, furthermore, in 114 of the 230 of the country's industrial sectors this indicator is over 50 percent and in 46 sectors 75 percent. It is important to stress that the proportion of the four biggest companies in the production of 114 sectors of Mexican industry has constituted 40 percent of the gross volume.²³

In Argentina, according to the 1963 industrial census, the proportion of sectors with a high level of concentration (the eight biggest companies account for over 50 percent of sectorial production) constituted 59.4 percent. At the end of the 1970's just 0.82 percent of companies concentrated 53.2 percent of industrial production and 40 percent of those employed in the country.²⁴

In 1968 Colombia's National Statistics Board conducted a special study in 89 of 110 sectors on the industrial census. These 89 sectors constituted the basis

of the country's industrial production: they accounted for 99 percent of it. The results of the study showed that in 16 sectors the three biggest companies produced from 75 percent to 100 percent of the aggregate sectorial product, in 26 sectors four companies concentrated from 50 to 75 percent of output, in 29 sectors from 25 to 50 percent and in 18 up to 25 percent. The four leading companies in the first two groups of sectors (16 and 26 respectively, 42 altogether) produced 42.8 percent of the country's industrial output and 53.2 percent of all added value.²⁵

A similar situation is taking shape in the industry of Venezuela, Chile, Uruguay and a number of other Latin American countries. All the data adduced above testify not simply to the high level of concentration of production in the countries in question but also show that this level is of a strikingly expressed monopoly nature. They prove the existence of the monopoly organization of production and sectorial monopoly structures. This is also confirmed by the economic domination in each sector of a limited number of large-scale companies (4, 5, 6 or 8, as a rule) and also their shares of production, sales, total capital and such.²⁶

By monopoly capital V.I. Lenin implied "the capture of such a large part of a certain sector of industry that competition is replaced by a monopoly."²⁷ It is thus that the position of a large-scale company in the system of production relations and in production itself changes. Reserving for itself preferential conditions of self-growth, the large-scale company uses them to obtain monopoly profits.

Thus a quantitative description of a monopoly should be supplemented by an analysis of how the inequality of capital in the production sphere is realized in the inequality of the profit norms obtained by monopoly and nonmonopoly capital.

The Question of Monopoly Profits

The proposition of the weakness and immaturity of the national monopolies in Latin American countries is sometimes corroborated by references to the fact that they do not obtain monopoly profits. "Obtaining monopoly (or supermonopoly) profits is the 'prerogative' of foreign monopoly capital," while the profits of the national monopolies, as V.M. Davydov emphasizes in the article "Degree of Maturity and Singularities of 'Latin American'-Type Capitalism," only "approximate to the average norm or exceed it somewhat...." This is a result, the author believes, of the fact that "a considerable proportion of the profits of the 'associated' local bourgeoisie is confiscated by the transnational monopolies."²⁸

What we have here is an attempt to provide the proposition of the weakness and immaturity of the national monopolies in Latin American countries with a theoretical basis. In addition, if the author is right, the very fact of the existence of these monopolies is questionable.

As we saw for ourselves earlier, the author is equating monopoly superprofits and monopoly profits and explaining the latter merely as surplus above the average profit norm. Proceeding from this theoretical premise, the monopoly nature

of the profits of Latin American monopolies, which allegedly merely "approximate to the average norm," is denied.

Such an approach to the question of monopoly profits has already been seriously criticized in Soviet scientific literature. Many economists have rightly emphasized that monopoly profits cannot be regarded merely as monopoly superprofits, that is, as profits more or less considerably above their average level.²⁹ Monopoly profit incorporates both average profit (which, while not representing under imperialism the general profit norm as a whole, nonetheless retains tenability as the objective relationship of social surplus value to aggregate social capital) and monopoly superprofit, but does not amount merely to the latter. "The essence of monopoly profit," Ya.A. Pevzner emphasizes, "is not that this profit is unfailingly superprofit but that it is of a monopoly nature. The essence of a monopoly consists primarily of magnitudes of its capital whereby it occupies in the corresponding sectors the dominant position."³⁰ It is theoretically incorrect to deny the monopoly nature of the profit of any monopoly only on the grounds that this profit is quantitatively equal to the average norm.

Superprofits, S.M. Nikitin and Ya.A. Pevzner believe, are ceasing to be a necessary attribute of all monopoly companies without exception. They are obtained primarily by companies which occupy the highest stories in the hierarchical monopoly structure, but "companies constituting lower levels of the monopoly hierarchy may often obtain profit norms lower than the average, thereby creating a source for the superprofits of the large-scale monopoly companies."³¹

The intensification of the exploiter essence of capitalist production relationships has led to the point where monopolies with a relatively small amount of capital in comparison with the monopoly giants even could end up in the "exploited" category, which is a result of the redistribution of the aggregate surplus value primarily to the benefit of the giant monopoly corporations.

Thus the fact of the Latin American monopolies obtaining even a relatively low profit norm (at the average level) does not mean that this profit is not of a monopoly nature.

In addition, an analysis of actual data shows that the biggest national companies in reality frequently obtain not the average profit norm but superprofits. Thus a survey in 1974 of 5,113 of Brazil's biggest industrial companies (with capital in excess of \$1 million each) showed that the profit norm in state companies constituted on average 10.96 percent and in private national companies 15.45 percent, but in companies under the complete or considerable control of foreign capital 19.73 percent.³² Evidently, the profit norm in the private national companies was 4.28 percent lower on average than in the foreign companies. A random survey of 100 of the country's biggest companies also showed that the profit norm in the period 1968-1974 of foreign companies was somewhat higher than of the private national companies (only by 2 percent, it is true). However, does this mean that the profit norm in the latter was only at the average level?

Unfortunately, we do not have data on the average profit norm in Brazil. In Venezuela, for example, it constituted 8 percent in 1978.³⁴

Table 1. Dynamics of the Profit Norm in Brazil's 100 Biggest Industrial Companies, %³³

Company	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1968-1974 on average
State	6.7	7.7	7.6	9.3	10.1	10	11.28	8.96
Private national	8	5.5	10.4	14.1	15.5	15.8	18.40	12.53
Foreign	8.1	9.7	14.8	18.3	19.4	20.1	20.41	15.83

In Mexico, according to data of the Private Sector Economic Research Center, in the period 1970-1974 the private national companies' average profit norm constituted 6.8 percent.³⁵

Table 2. Profit Norm in Different Groups of Brazilian Companies in 1974, %³⁶

Companies	<u>Number of Companies in Group</u>		
	100	200	5,113
State	11.28	11.07	10.06
Private national	18.40	19.96	15.45
Foreign	20.41	21.27	19.73

It is perfectly probable that it is 7-8 percent in Brazil also. However, if it is assumed that the average norm in this country is higher and equals, say, 10-11 percent (which is not all that likely), even in this case the excess of monopoly profit over the average level, that is, monopoly superprofit, constitutes quite a considerable magnitude in the private national companies.

Table 3. State, Private National and Foreign Companies' Share of Total Profit for Different Groups of Brazilian Companies, Cruzeiros, Millions, 1974³⁸

Company	<u>Number of Companies in Group</u>					
	100		200		5,113	
	<u>Profit</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Profit</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Profit</u>	<u>%</u>
State	14,836	62.6	15,301	52.5	16,848	28.03
Private national	3,564	15	6,616	22.7	30,432	51.75
Foreign	5,296	22.4	7,239	24.8	11,893	20.22
Total	23,969	100	29,156	100	58,809	100

Data on the national and foreign companies' share of the total profit they obtained are also of interest. As can be seen from Table 3, the foreign companies account, as a whole, for a larger share of the profit in the 100 and 200 biggest company groups. Thus in 1974 the private national and foreign companies' share of the aggregate capital of the country's 100 biggest companies

constituted 28 and 27 percent respectively, but in total profit 15 and 22 percent. In the group of 200 companies the local bourgeoisie had 76, and 55 were controlled by foreign capital. Their share of this group's total assets constituted 16.1 and 16.6 percent respectively. However, in total profit they accounted for 22.7 and 24.8 percent, but in total sales for 23.1 and 41.6 percent respectively.³⁷

At the same time, as can be seen from the data of Table 3, in the entire group of 5,113 companies the private national companies account for a far greater profit volume. This testifies, we believe, to the fact that the private companies compensate with interest for losses at the upper levels of the monopoly hierarchy by squeezing superprofits at its middle levels.

The data pertaining to Mexico also confirm the fact of monopoly profit being obtained by the private national companies. Thus in 1973 the American economist L. Fairchild made a comparative analysis in Monterrey, one of the country's biggest industrial centers, of the activity of 25 large-scale national firms and 25 companies of similar size with the participation of foreign (American) capital. According to the data of the study, the profit norm (before taxes) in the first group constituted on average 13.3 percent, but in the second 17 percent.³⁹ Although the difference is impressive, it does not follow from this that the national companies were not obtaining superprofits.

A study was conducted at the start of the 1970's in Mexico's processing industry which made it possible to reveal the direct dependence of the profit norm on the degree of control over the market (of course, control over production is the basis of market control). The companies which controlled over 50 percent of the market had a profit norm of 15.6 percent, but those which controlled only up to 9 percent had a profit norm of 7 percent, which almost coincided with the average profit norm in the country in the period 1970-1974 (6.8 percent).⁴⁰ Thus the joint-venture companies' profit norm was more than 10 percent above the average and that of national companies 6.5 percent. And these are average data, furthermore.

Obviously, the said dependence is typical not only of Mexico but other countries also. In Brazil, for example, the Industrias Klabin do Parana de Selulos private national company concentrated 80 percent of the country's total newsprint production. In 1977 this company's profit norm constituted 40.8 percent.⁴¹

The above data are grounds for concluding that the national monopolies in Latin America obtain, as a whole, not only monopoly profit but also superprofit. On the other hand, these data show that the profit norm and amount in the foreign monopolies, which, as a rule, are superior to the national monopolies in terms of the absolute magnitude of their capital, are, as a whole, higher than in the national monopoly companies. However, are the Latin American countries an exception in this respect? Obviously, the general laws of capitalism operate identically everywhere--in both the less and more developed capitalist countries. For example, in Italy the affiliates of the multinational corporations are on average four times bigger than the national companies; in the FRG only 250-300 of the 500 biggest companies can be regarded as national; in Britain by the start of the 1970's American capital alone had captured practically half of

all the modern industrial sectors.⁴² Incidentally, in 1970 the share of the daughter companies of American transnational corporations in the production of the modern sectors of the EEC countries was so great that it was possible to speak of "the emergence of distinctive forms of the Common Market countries' economic dependence on the activity of the American production complex which has been created here."⁴³

A general regularity of capitalism is such: the biggest monopoly giant companies in all capitalist countries, irrespective of who controls them--the national or foreign bourgeoisie--obtain superprofits equally, particularly thanks to the redistribution to their benefit of the profit of the monopoly companies occupying lower levels in the monopoly hierarchy. V.I. Lenin wrote: "The multimillionaire cannot share a capitalist country's 'national income' with anyone else other than in the ratio: 'per capital' (and, furthermore, with a further addition to ensure that the biggest capital obtain more than it ought)."⁴⁴

Singularities of the Monopoly Growth of Big National Capital

With the appearance of monopoly ownership, relations of free competition are replaced by relations of monopoly domination, the basis of which is on the one hand big capital's capture of a significant proportion of production and the creation of preferential conditions for self-growth and, on the other, the barring of admittance to these conditions to a considerable mass of capitalist entrepreneurs. Big capital thereby becomes monopoly capital and appears in the form of a monopoly which represents the opposite of free competition and a specific form of capital and production relations. By virtue of this, the level of monopolization of the industry of any country, that is, the degree of limitation of elimination of competition in the basic sectors by big industrial capital, does not necessarily depend directly on the level of development of a given country's production forces. It is important to note that the establishment of the monopoly domination of big national capital in many sectors of material production may also occur under conditions of general technical-economic backwardness and dependence. The example of prerevolutionary Russia is particularly indicative in this respect. V.I. Lenin wrote: "Finance capitalism does not remove the lowest (less developed, backward) forms of capitalism but grows out of them and above them..."⁴⁵ This growth may be secured thanks not so much to technical (of production proper) as to financial (concentration of capital) concentration. "Technical concentration is progressive in technology; financial concentration may strengthen and /does strengthen/ the omnipotence of monopoly capital /given backward/ [*words in slantlines in italics*] technology..." V.I. Lenin emphasized.⁴⁶

Monopolies may, as is known, be created by way of financial control, that is, with the assistance of a holding company. Concerns and sometimes trusts are created in this way in all capitalist countries. As the Soviet economist V.V. Motylev has observed, "the organization of trusts, given the assistance of financial control, does not necessarily require a very high level of the concentration of production either as its prerequisite or its consequence [no end quote]. Whereas enterprises' complete merger in a single company "is usually connected with a certain technical concentration, their amalgamation in a trust

on the basis of financial control is compatible even with backward technology."⁴⁷ Not requiring the obligatory retooling of industry, financial concentration makes it possible to subordinate a large-scale complex of enterprises to the control of a single group of capitalists with the assistance of comparatively little capital on the basis of the "system of participation" and the personal union of the leadership.

The monopolies in Latin America are evidently to a considerable extent the result of financial concentration; it was a factor which accelerated monopolization on an economic basis which was comparatively weaker than in the centers of "advanced" capitalism. Thus in Brazil 274 concerns (106 of them controlled by foreign capital) were operating at the start of the 1960's even. And, furthermore, 138 concerns (1 percent of all joint-stock companies) controlled 1,111 industrial-trading companies and credit-finance establishments whose aggregate capital constituted 73.7 percent of the aggregate capital of all joint-stock companies.⁴⁸

Currently the national monopolies of the Latin American countries predominate in all the traditional sectors (textile, footwear, food, glass, paper, leather and others). They perform a significant role in heavy industry and are strengthening their influence in many modern sectors.⁴⁹ However, the dominant positions in modern complex production are occupied by foreign monopolies, as a rule. The national monopolies are operating in association with them along license agreement and technical assistance lines, allowing them to participate in their capital and so forth, which is making the national companies technically dependent on the powerful foreign (mainly American) partners.

Substantiating the proposition of the absence of monopolies in the Latin American countries, some experts claim that under local conditions big national capital may become monopoly capital, controlling only the key and not secondary sectors, only "when it has a monopoly of the corresponding technology." The latter, as a rule, belongs to the transnational corporations. Indeed, a method of limiting or eliminating free competition is the patenting of new commodities, technical innovations and production processes: the patent rules out competing capital's free access to the patented invention. International corporations practice this method extensively, patenting their technology in countries where their daughter companies operate. However, it is theoretically wrong to suppose that the monopoly domination of foreign companies in the modern science-intensive sectors based to a considerable extent on a patent monopoly impedes the limitation or elimination of the free competition of national capital in other sectors which are less dependent on progressive foreign technology (that is, impedes the formation of national monopolies). Large-scale national companies ("small-scale" compared with the foreign monopoly giants) may perfectly well be big monopolies in certain sectors when patent restrictions are lacking.

As far as technology transfers and license agreements are concerned, they cannot in themselves limit the monopoly position on the domestic market of the national monopoly companies which concluded these agreements. In addition, for the purpose of strengthening and accelerating the rate of development the national monopolies are interested in making more active use of license agreements and other forms of cooperation with the leading foreign firms.⁵⁰ For example, the

Mexican (DIDSA) concern (30 companies operating, mainly, in chemical industry), which is a part of the (Visa-Serfin) (Monterrey) finance group, has extensive relations with U.S. and FRG companies along technology lines. Control of the concern, however, is concentrated in national hands. Thanks to the acquisition of modern technology, the concern is developing at a swift pace and is the most dynamic in the country: from 1972 through 1977 its average annual growth rate was 25 percent.⁵¹

It should be noted that the monopoly structure even in the technologically progressive sectors is characterized, as a rule, by the economic domination of a limited number of large-scale companies controlled not only by foreign but also national monopoly capital.

Table 4. Monopoly Structures in 17 Sectors of Brazilian Industry, 1975⁵²

Sector, production	Four companies' share of production, %	Place of national (state and private) and foreign companies in the structure (in terms of value of capital)*			
		1	2	3	4
Tobacco	99.2	Britain	Private	U.S.	Private
Metallic minerals	81.8	State	Private (U.S.)	Private	State
Rubber	68.6	U.S.	U.S.	State, Private (U.S.)	Private
Nonmetallic minerals	65.6	France	Private	France	Private
Miscellaneous output	59.4	Private	Italy	Private	France
Chemistry and petrochemistry	56.5	State	State	State	Holland
Beverages	49.2	Private	Luxembourg	Canada	Private
Furniture	38.5	Private	Private	Private	Private
Metallurgy	37.2	State	State	State	Luxembourg
Leather products	36.6	Private	Private	Switzerland	Private
Transport engineering	30.7	FRG	FRG	U.S.	Italy
Printing	28.4	Private (U.S.)	Private	Private	Private
Electrical equipment	25.4	Holland	Holland	FRG	U.S.
Mechanical equipment	20.9	Private	U.S.	Private	Private
Wood processing and paper	20.5	Norway, France, Japan, Canada	Private	U.S.	Private
Food Products	15.8	Private	Switzerland	Private	Private
Textile	12.6	Britain	Private	U.S.	Private

* Only the companies in which foreign capital is absent are included in the national state and private companies; the national affiliation of the foreign companies whose share of national capital is negligible is indicated in parenthesis; the companies in which national capital participates, but the controlling block of shares belongs to foreign capital are put in the foreign company category.

In Brazil at the end of the 1960's, for example, in only 3 of the 46 leading sectors were monopoly structures formed exclusively from foreign companies, 5 large-scale national companies were dominant in 12 other sectors and in the remainder the monopoly structures were of the joint-venture kind.⁵³ The data for 1975 testify that the joint-venture monopoly structure was the most prevalent in the country at that time. Furthermore, in a whole number of sectors national companies occupied the highest levels in the monopoly structures.

Soviet scholars emphasize that relations between companies within the framework of monopoly structures are based not so much on competition according to the zero-sum principle as on "cooperation". Under the conditions of the monopoly sectorial structure not only the possibility but also the economic necessity of coordinating their production and market policy and acting as a united front in relation to "outsiders" arise in the leading companies.⁵⁴ This principle of mutual relations between monopoly companies is extending to the joint-venture structures also.

The national monopolies in Latin America "not only in alliance with foreign capital but in themselves are undertaking increasingly extensive operations in terms of the exploitation of the working people directly in the sphere of the production of their own countries."⁵⁵ In recent years the financial might and economic independence of the national monopolies have grown considerably. Merely the fact that, for example, in Mexico and a number of other countries of the continent they have bought controlling blocks of shares in many daughter companies of the transnational corporations, bringing them under their financial control, testifies to this.⁵⁶

At this stage of the analysis it is important for us to emphasize the following: internal production relations in many Latin American countries are characterized by the domination of industrial monopolies and the development of monopoly capitalism.

Economic dependence does not cancel the general regularities of the development of capitalism and, particularly, the internal regularities of the concentration of production and the development of industrial monopolies. The high level of concentration of industrial production in a number of Latin American countries has already led to the formation of industrial monopolies and a monopoly structure of industry as a whole, which is a mature basis for the development of monopoly capitalism in these countries.

Occupying the upper levels of the monopoly structures in a whole number of modern sectors of the Latin American states, foreign monopoly companies also obtain more profit than the norm, as a whole. However, the relations between the national and foreign monopolies which are operating in the countries of the continent and which are part of the internal monopoly structures are characterized more by "cooperation" in the sphere of exploitation of the working people than confrontation.

In Latin America it is not the national and foreign monopolies which confront one another but monopoly capital as a whole and the working people, who are waging an active struggle against the oppression of the monopolies, both their "own" and "others'," and against the domination of the financial oligarchy.

FOOTNOTES

1. Transnational corporations (international in scale of activity, but national in allegiance) and multinational corporations (formed as a result of the international unification of capital) are distinguished among international corporations.
2. See "A Typology of the Nonsocialist Countries: Experience of a Multidimensional-Statistical Analysis of National Economies," Moscow, 1976; M.S. Dragilev, N.I. Mokhov, "Lenin's Analysis of Monopoly Capital and the Present Day," Moscow, 1970, pp 110-114; B.I. Koval', S.I. Semenov, A.F. Shul'govskiy, "Revolutionary Processes in Latin America," Moscow, 1974, pp 47-62; V.L. Sheynis, "The Developing Countries and Countries of Middle-Development Capitalism: Problems of Economic Growth" in "The Developing Countries: Accumulation and Economic Growth," Moscow, 1977, pp 53-58; V.L. Sheynis, "Countries of Middle-Development Capitalism (Some Questions of Typology)" in MEMO No 9, 1977, pp 105-124, 150-157.
3. MEMO No 3, 1979, p 122
4. See "Ruling Classes of Latin America," Moscow, 1978; "Contemporary Stage of the Development of Capitalism in Mexico," LATINSKAYA AMERIKA No 5, 1978; B.I. Koval', S.I. Semenov, A.F. Shul'govskiy, Op. cit.; R. Freitas, "Does State-Monopoly Capitalism Exist in Brazil?" PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA No 4, 1976; T. Araujo, "O capitalismo monopolista de Estado no Brasil e suas particularidades. Tese de doutoramento em candidato de ciencias economicas," Moscow, 1975; J. Carrion, A. Aguilar, "La burguesia, la oligarquia y el Estado," Mexico, 1974; J. Silva Colmenares, "Los verdaderos dueños del país: oligarquía y monopolios en Colombia," Bogota, 1977.
5. See P.N. Boyko, "Latin America: Expansion of Imperialism and the Crisis of the Capitalist Development Path," Moscow, 1973, p 183.
6. See "The Current Stage....," p 89.
7. "The Developing Countries: Characteristics, Trends, Prospects," Moscow, 1974, pp 175-176.
8. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 27, pp 362, 395; vol 30, p 132.
9. Ibid., vol 3, p 490.
10. B.I. Koval', "History of the Brazilian Proletariat (1857-1957)," Moscow, 1968, pp 102-103.
11. "Brazil (Economics, Politics, Culture)," Moscow, 1963, p 98.
12. See I.P. Faminskiy, "Influence of the Scientific-Technical Revolution on the World Capitalist Economy," Moscow, 1976, p 184; MEMO No 3, 1971, p 97. A collective monograph of a number of authors--research assistants of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Latin America--notes in this connection

that "foreign monopoly capital is becoming an integral component of the Latin American countries' national economic organism..." "Economics of Latin American Countries," Pt 2, Moscow, 1974, pp 251-252.

13. "Like absorption, a merger also unites the capital of different countries. Not only the organizational combination of the companies owning the capital but a single common turnover of different national sums of capital arise here," A.Z. Astapovich, "U.S. International Corporations: Development Trends and Contradictions," Moscow, 1978, p 41.
14. See V.V. Motylev, "Finance Capital and its Organizational Forms," Moscow, 1959, pp 33-34, 67-81.
15. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 26, p 232.
16. PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA No 6, 1979, p 50; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA No 6, 1977, p 27.
17. MEMO No 5, 1979, pp 147-148.
18. Ibid., No 1, 1975, p 28.
19. KOMMUNIST No 12, 1978, p 102.
20. "State-Monopoly Capitalism. General Features and Singularities," Moscow, 1975, p 237.
21. B.N. Brodovich, "National Income of the Latin American Countries," Moscow, 1974, p 50; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA No 4, 1976, p 66; COMERCIO EXTERIOR No 7, Mexico, 1977, p 217.
22. F. Fajnzilber, "Sistema industrial e exportacao de manufacturados: analise da experiencia brasileira," Rio de Janeiro, 1971, p 120; "Anuario estadistico do Brasil," Rio de Janeiro, 1975, p 193.
23. ESTRATEGIA, Mexico, No 3, 1975, p 8; ESTUDIOS, Mexico, No 74, 1980, p 66.
24. J. Fuchs, "Argentina: actual estructura economico social," Buenos Aires, 1981, p 20.
25. J. Silva Colmenares, Op. cit., p 23; ESTUDIOS No 74, 1980, p 66.
26. "The Political Economy of Modern Monopoly Capital," Moscow, 1971, vol 1, pp 155-156; "Economic Growth Under the Conditions of Monopoly Capitalism: Problems and Contradictions," Moscow, 1975, pp 79-80.
27. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 28, p 313.
28. MEMO No 3, 1979, p 128.

29. See V.N. Kotov, "Monopoly Forms of Economic Relations," Moscow, 1971, pp 125-126; S.M. Nikitin, "Problems of Price-Forming Under the Conditions of Modern Capitalism," Moscow, 1969, pp 108-111; I.Ye. Rudakova, "The Capitalist Monopoly: its Politico-Economic Nature and Forms of Economic Realization," Moscow, 1976, pp 98-103, 176-177.
30. Ya.A. Pevzner, "Methodology of 'Das Kapital'....," pp 110-111.
31. "Economic Growth Under the Conditions of Monopoly Capitalism....," p 95.
32. VISA0, Sao Paulo, 31 August 1975, p 27.
33. Ibid., p 23. The profit norm is the relationship of gross profit (before taxes) to the sum of assets.
34. PANORAMA ECONOMICO LATINOAMERICANO Havana, 4 June 1979, p 15.
35. OPOSICION 27 April 1978, Mexico City.
36. VISA0 31 August 1975, p 27.
37. Ibid., pp 23, 27.
38. Ibid., p 27.
39. JOURNAL OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES vol 14, No 1, 1977, London, p 32.
40. FORO INTERNACIONAL No 1, 1976, Mexico City, p 124.
41. BANAS No 1159, 1977, Rio de Janeiro, pp 22-48.
42. I.D. Ivanov, "International Corporations in the World Economy," Moscow, 1976, p 108; "Contradictions of Modern Capitalist Production," Moscow, 1971, pp 189-193.
43. V.F. Zhelezova, "American Capital in the EEC Economy," Moscow, 1973, p 66.
44. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 26, p 353.
45. Ibid., vol 28, p 171.
46. Ibid.
47. V.V. Motylev, "Finance Capital and its Organizational Forms," Moscow, 1959, p 35.
48. S.S. Mishin, "The Process of Capital Concentration in Brazil," Moscow, 1972, p 57-58.
49. E.I. Pankov, "National Monopolies in Mexico," MEMO No 6, 1972, pp 122-128; K.S. Tarasov, "Singularities of the Development of Monopoly Capital in Latin America," LATINSKAYA AMERIKA No 2, 1971, pp 31-47.

50. "A method of strengthening local monopolies which are as yet weak on a world scale is association with the transnational corporations," "Argentina: Economic and Sociopolitical Development Trends," Moscow, 1980, p 119.
51. OPOSICION 12 November 1977.
52. ESTUDIOS No 74, 1980, pp 68-69.
53. S.S. Mishin, Op. cit., p 41.
54. See "The Political Economy of Monopoly Capitalism," vol 1, p 157; "Economic Growth...", p 80.
55. M.S. Dragilev, N.I. Mokhov, "Lenin's Analysis of Monopoly Capital and the Present Day," Moscow, 1970, p 113.
56. See LATINSKAYA AMERIKA No 3, 1981, pp 79-82.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1983

8850

CSO: 1807/190

U.S. FOOD EXPORT POLICIES CRITICIZED

Moscow KHOZYAYSTVO I PRAVO in Russian No 1, Jan 83 pp 71-74

[Article by E. Gryaznov, candidate of economic sciences: "International Aspects of the Food Program"]

[Text] The Food Program and the decisions adopted at the May (1982) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee have had immense repercussions throughout the world. Having advanced a program that is purely peaceful, which is centered on concern for man and the creation of more favorable conditions for the all-around and harmonious development of the individual, the Soviet Union, under the conditions of the arms race that has been unleashed by imperialism and the aggravation of international tension, has again demonstrated its unwaivering will and desire for peace and international security.

Many politicians in Western countries clearly did not like the fact that the USSR has announced for all to hear its specific tasks and plans for considerably increasing the production of foodstuffs with an essential expansion of capital investments and concentration of material and human resources on these goals and, finally, a concentration of its scientific and technical potential just at a time when the United States and other countries of capitalism, in the name of profit are aggressively following a course toward limitation of agricultural production. Yet 3 percent of the population in developed capitalist countries constantly go hungry. These diametrically opposed political courses in the area of producing foodstuffs are perceived more distinctly if one takes into account that the long-term tendencies in the international food situation as a whole are extremely unfavorable.

The threat of mass famine and malnutrition in developing countries is becoming more critical. According to estimates of the FAO, by the year 2000 the number of starving people in these countries will increase to 600 million as compared to 400 million at the present time. An immense number of people suffer from chronic malnutrition--about 1 billion people. In individual years of the past decade 30-40 million people annually died from starvation, that is, approximately four-five times more than died annually during the years of World War II.* By the beginning of the 1980's the per capita harvest

*MEIMO, 1980, No 6, p 38.

of grain crops in developing countries remained at the same low level as at the beginning of the 1970's. In Africa this indicator even dropped by 10 percent. Primarily women and children suffer from chronic malnutrition. This has a destructive influence on the child's organism, and its fatal consequences for young and future generations in many developing countries are irreversible in the majority of cases. Each year up to 250,000 children completely lose their vision because of endemic starvation (shortage of vitamins and minerals).

Hunger in developing countries results not only and not so much from inadequate growth rates of food production. It is inseparably related to the concept of "poverty." Poor people are the constant companions of capitalism.

All this makes it possible to draw the conclusion that the present food crisis, like other structural crises of the world of the capitalist economy, is brought about by the vices of the capitalist economic mechanism which is incapable of satisfying the growing need for planned and intelligent regulation of world economic proportions.

Imperialist exploitation of developing countries is increasing, and with it the problem of hunger and poverty is becoming more crucial. Yet one should not discount the fact that the international food problem is simultaneously brought about by such processes as the devastation of immense spaces, the growing shortage of fresh water resources, the clear deterioration of weather conditions, acceleration of urbanization, exacerbation of demographic disproportions, and so forth.

In their totality these facts speak for themselves. Nonetheless the majority of them, apparently, are not accounted for by the imperialists. This is why the staff headquarters of Western anti-Soviet propaganda adopted a decision to falsify the role of the Soviet Union in questions of the world food situation.

One should look elsewhere for factors that disorganize the world food situation. It is no secret that the deterioration of the food situation in the world is related in many respects to the increased activity of transnational corporations (TNK). In order to obtain monopolistic profit, irrespective of the national interests of developing states, they plunder their national wealth, including by the method of "skimming off the cream." TNK's are expanding their plantation sector in these countries, paying no attention to the fact that this causes harm to the production of food crops for the local population and forces developing countries to increase imports of food from the United States and other developed capitalist countries. In the final analysis, this is the purpose of the penetration of private foreign capital into the food industry and into the domestic and foreign food trade of developing states.

An immense amount of harm is caused to developing countries by the actions of imperialist powers to transform food into "agro-power"--into a means of political pressure and blackmail in dealing with those countries that refuse to follow in the wake of their policy.

The United States uses the threat of stopping deliveries of foods in an attempt to influence the position of the OPEC countries in questions of oil prices and the sovereign rights of these countries in the utilization of their own petroleum resources. Washington first appreciably reduced and then curtailed deliveries of food products in order to work against independent Nicaragua. More than 20 years have passed since the blockade was introduced to stop American shipments of food to Cuba. In August 1982 the United States began to threaten Bangladesh with stopping food assistance simply because this country, the majority of whose population is chronically malnourished, forbade American companies to purchase monkeys to be used for testing neutron armament. Disturbance was caused by the announcement made at the 8th session of the U.N. World Food Council (June, 1982, Mexico) by U. S. Secretary of Agriculture Block to the effect that this country has used and intends in the future to use food deliveries as an instrument of political pressure in "extreme situations." In this connection representatives of many developing countries accused the United States of creating difficulties with food--one of the means in Washington's arsenal to which it turns when it decides to vent its wrath against any country. Many participants in this session emphasized the timeliness and importance in this regard of the warning given at the May (1982) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee to the effect that the USSR Food Program is based on the need to reduce food imports from capitalist countries, taking into account that the leadership of certain states is trying to transform ordinary commercial operations like the sale of grain into a means of pressure, an implement of political force.

The deterioration of conditions for exporting agricultural products of developing countries on the markets of industrially developed capitalist countries adds to the difficulties of these countries that are importers of foodstuffs. During the 1970's the capitalist countries have appreciably increased customs and other protectionist barriers on the path of exports from developing states of vegetable oils, coffee, cocoa beans and many other traditional kinds of products of tropical and subtropical farming.

The contradictions in international trade in foodstuffs between developing and industrially developed capitalist countries in their antagonistic fervor are almost as bad as the present "trade wars" which break out from time to time in economic relations among imperialist countries. We are speaking about conflicts which periodically disrupt trade in grain between the United States and the EEC, "fish wars" between the United States and Canada and Mexico, the "chicken war" between the countries of the Common Market and the conflicts in the EEC regarding questions of trade in fruits, vegetables, meat and other agricultural commodities.

It is no wonder that under these conditions international trade in foodstuffs, instead of contributing to easing the world food problem, in the modern stage has become one of the serious factors in aggravating it. Taking this into account, the concept developed at the U.N. World Food Conference (Rome, 1974) which orients developing countries toward the need to resolve their difficulties with food through increasing their own production, under these conditions was augmented by appeals from the FAO and the U.N. World Food Council to these countries to supply all of their own food, either nationally or regionally.

But these recommendations, which were accepted enthusiastically by many developing countries, evoked in the West a counterflow of "initiatives" which pursue openly mercenary goals. The Western propaganda machine has begun to demand that developing countries reject the policy of industrialization of the economy. It was precisely with this in mind that they developed the sensational campaign with appeals to developing countries to develop national food strategies which were to become the main direction for the economic policy of each of them. These attempts turned out to be in vain. Thus in the concluding documents of the U.N. World Conference on Agrarian Reforms and Agricultural Development (Rome, 1979) it was unequivocally emphasized that the national food strategy should be an organic part of the overall long-term programs and plans for the social and economic development of developing countries. Subsequently this point was raised to the rank of a principle by the decisions of a U.N. conference regarding the least developed countries which was held in the autumn of 1981 in Paris.

One should note especially that the majority of these strategies focus the attention on questions not only of increasing food production, but also creating conditions for elimination of above-normative losses of it. It has been calculated that the volume of expenditures on providing for the storage of 1 ton of grain are half as much as the expenditures that would be necessary to increase the production by the same amount. It is recognized that the course for preserving agricultural products, primarily after harvesting, produces a great number of advantages since it contributes simultaneously to solving the problem of efficient and economical utilization of energy, resources and fresh water and, which is very important, reduces to a minimum the moral harm caused to the immediate producer in whose eyes the product of his hard work is frequently lost.

National strategies in the area of food have been developed and are being implemented by such developing countries as India, Mexico, Tanzania, the Philippines, Bangladesh, a number of countries of tropical Africa and several others. An analysis of these programs makes it possible to gain a more profound understanding of the specific nature of the food crisis in the developing countries. In this connection special importance is attached to the positive results of radical agrarian reforms and transformations in rural areas and the development of the cooperative movement in Algeria, Afghanistan, Angola and a number of other developing countries of socialist and progressive orientation.

In many developing countries the conviction is becoming stronger that the main factor in eliminating hunger and malnutrition should be planned, comprehensive development of their productive forces. Their actions in this direction are increasingly based on profound socio-economic structural transformations, the elimination of backward forms of land ownership and land utilization, and the implementation of progressive agrarian reforms. There is no doubt that the implementation of tasks regarding questions of the food situation in developing countries depends primarily on their success in the matter of mobilizing their own resources in order to develop an independent national economy, particularly through strengthening their sovereignty over their own natural resources in all spheres of economic activity, the introduction of

planning and the expansion of state and cooperative sectors of the national economy. All these issues are also of great significance because agrarian transformations in developing countries are carried out against a background of a rapidly developing restructuring of the agricultural of industrially developed capitalist countries where the leading tendency is acceleration of agro-industrial integration. This results in merciless crowding out from agriculture of owners of small and medium-sized farms with a strengthening of the role of large capitalist firms.

The opinion of the majority of specialists regarding the international food problem amounts to the fact that there are no particularly prepared formulas for solving it on the global scale. Every state, on the basis of comprehensive accounting for local conditions, must determine the specific directions for increasing its production potential on the basis of the mobilization and distribution of financial and economic resources. Methodologically and in issues pertaining to principles which are based on the development of food "strategies" and programs both on the national level and on the regional scale, science and the practice of planning and administration of the economy in developing countries will have to carry out many difficult and important tasks. The experience of each country in this area is being attentively studied. Everything valuable is being adopted.

In this sense the USSR Food Program is also playing an appreciable role. The first responses in the foreign press and in speeches in international forums show the growing interest that is being manifested toward this document on the part of representatives of official, scientific and business circles of many foreign countries. The first thing that attracts the attention of foreign specialists is the utilization of a comprehensive approach to the development of agriculture and other branches that constitute the agro-industrial sector of the national economy and the organic combination and extensive range of goals and means of achieving them in the area of the state's economic and social policy with respect to the food problem.

The striving of the USSR Food Program toward maximum utilization of scientific and technical potential in order to improve the country's food situation has evoked a good deal of interest abroad. Many developing countries are faced with a crucial problem of developing regional cooperation in issues related to the food situation. In this connection they are attentively studying the section of the Program that is devoted to cooperation between the USSR and other countries of the socialist community in the area of food.

The USSR Food Program is encountering predictable interest and understanding on the part of the majority of foreign states. It is described as another important contribution of the Soviet Union to the solution of the food problem in the world.

The attention of foreign researchers is attracted by the Program's reasoning and the profoundly scientific substantiation of the main directions and indicators of production and consumption of food in the USSR during the period up to 1990. In this connection a great deal of significance is attached to

the volumes earmarked by the Soviet Union for the harvesting of grain crops, whose role in the food problem is legitimately regarded as the key role in all countries of the world.

It should be emphasized that the Soviet Union correctly regards the international food problem as one of the most important among the other global economic problems with which mankind has had to deal in the second half of this century.

The USSR is deeply sympathetic with the efforts of developing countries in their struggle to eliminate hunger and malnutrition and to achieve social and economic progress. Our country is rendering multifaceted and effective technical and economic assistance in this area to many developing countries. It is worthwhile to note the organic unity and connectedness of this sphere with other important areas and directions of economic and technical cooperation. The comprehensive nature of the assistance presupposes its high effectiveness in both its economic and its social aspects.

The main direction for cooperation with developing countries regarding food issues is assimilation of water and land resources; organization and construction of state agricultural, most often seed growing, farms and also machine-tractor and repair stations; the construction of enterprises for producing agricultural machinery and implements, capacities for producing mineral fertilizers and initial processing and storage of food raw materials, and enterprises of the food industry; the organization of veterinary laboratories and treatment centers, and scientific research agricultural experimental stations and institutions; expeditions for fighting against diseases of plants and pests; the development of fishing and acquiring other products from the sea, and a number of others. It goes without saying that these directions of economic and technical assistance to developing countries have not been thrust upon them by the Soviet Union. They are organically interwoven into national programs and plans for the economic and social development of these countries.

The USSR takes an understanding attitude toward issues of technical assistance to developing countries in training national specialists in the area of the agro-industrial complex. One cannot but see the immense significance for the food situation of developing countries that is attached to assistance from the USSR in organizing in these countries specialized education, occupational training in the specialties in which there is the greatest shortage, and the transmission and dissemination of advanced experience in agriculture. With all forms of training and with the help of Soviet organizations we have trained many tens of thousands of agronomists, agricultural machine operators, irrigation engineers, and laboratory workers for many developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Assistance from the USSR in solving the food problem is rated highly by the public of the developing countries as well as by their governments.

The majority of developing countries have repeatedly been convinced that assistance from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is arranged on a fair basis which is completely different from that used by capitalist

countries. In this respect the example of the so-called "privileged" deliveries of food from the United States to developing countries is indicative. It would seem that by its very essence food assistance can be dictated only by humanitarian goals. Yet in reality it is speculation in the most critical needs of the population of developing countries. As the co-directors of the Institute of Food and the Policy of Development (San Francisco) F. M. Lappe and J. Collins emphasize, the major goal of food assistance rendered by the United States has "never been to feed the hungry."

This assistance has been used primarily to establish and expand American influence in various regions of the developing world, to provide an economic, political and military-strategic advantage for the United States, and to create policies that are suitable to Washington in the recipient countries.

The Soviet Union is unwaiveringly in favor of further development of mutually advantageous economic and commercial cooperation, particularly in the area of food, with many foreign states, and primarily socialist ones.

As for developing countries, from year to year Soviet imports of products from tropical and subtropical farming increase. The mutual interest and the striving for normal development of trade constitute a factor which is undoubtedly dominant in this issue.

Our country emphasizes that without good will on the part of all countries with respect to their observance of the aforementioned principles it will be difficult to count on great effectiveness of the programs and recommendations advanced by the U. N. with regard to questions of the international food situation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Ekonomika", "Khozyaystvo i pravo", 1983

11772

CSO: 1807/193

END