



JPRS Report

Soviet Union

International Affairs

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980610 027

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 6

47
126
A07

SPECIAL NOTICE

Effective 1 June 1987 JPRS reports will have a new cover design and color, and some reports will have a different title and format. Some of the color changes may be implemented earlier if existing supplies of stock are depleted.

The new cover colors will be as follows:

CHINA.....	aqua
EAST EUROPE.....	gold
SOVIET UNION.....	salmon
EAST ASIA.....	yellow
NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA...	blue
LATIN AMERICA.....	pink
WEST EUROPE.....	ivory
AFRICA (SUB-SAHARA).....	tan
SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY.....	gray
WORLDWIDES.....	pewter

The changes that are of interest to readers of this report are as follows:

USSR reports will become SOVIET UNION reports.

The USSR REPORT: NATIONAL ECONOMY will be titled SOVIET UNION/ECONOMIC AFFAIRS (UEA).

The USSR REPORT: POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS will be titled SOVIET UNION/POLITICAL AFFAIRS (UPA).

The following Soviet journals will be added to those which are already issued in separate series:

- EKO: ECONOMICS & ORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION (UEO)
- THE WORKING CLASS & THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD (UWC)
- PEOPLES OF ASIA & AFRICA (UAA)
- MILITARY HISTORY JOURNAL (UMJ)
- FOREIGN MILITARY REVIEW (UFM)
- AVIATION & COSMONAUTICS (UAC)
- SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES (USS)

If any subscription changes are desired, U.S. Government subscribers should notify their distribution contact point. Nongovernment subscribers should contact the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

3 JUNE 1987

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.

SOVIET UNION
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

- Book on UN as Instrument of Peace
(Leonid Kutakov; INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 3,
Mar 87)..... 1

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

- Western Businessmen on East-West Trade Prospects
(M. Ilinskiy; IZVESTIYA, 22 Apr 87)..... 4

SOCIALIST COMMUNITY, CEMA

- Principles of Socialist International Relations
(B. V. Gorbachev; VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS, No 1, Jan 87)..... 7
- 66th Session of IBEC Council in Moscow
(EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA, No 17, Apr 87)..... 24
- Bloc Symposium on World Socialist System
(D. Feldman; OBSHCHESTVENNYYE NAUKI, No 1, Jan 87)..... 25
- Briefs
Marjai, Antonov's Economic Talks 29

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

- NEWSWEEK Article on USSR Third World Policy Assailed
(A. Lobashkov; ZA RUBEZHOM, No 15, 10-16 Apr 87)..... 30

GENERAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

- USSR Economics Official Interviewed on Joint Ventures
(Igor Faminsky Interview; NEW TIMES, No 17, 4 May 87)..... 32

- Problems in Recouping Cost of Imported Equipment
(M. Aleksandrov, A. Chupakhin; SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 19 Mar 87). 36

- Czech Newspaperman on USSR Reforms
(Zdenek Horeni; NEW TIMES, No 17, 4 May 87)..... 39

UNITED STATES, CANADA

- Commentary on U.S. Presidential Candidates
(Yu. Kuznetsov; PRAVDA, 22 Mar 87)..... 42

- Threat of U.S. Militarism Reviewed
(S. Bakanidze; KOMMUNIST GRUZII, No 12, Dec 86)..... 45

- U.S. Micronesian Policy Denounced
(Oleg Kurochkin; INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 2, Feb 87)..... 49

WEST EUROPE

- Finnish Paper Views Changes in Foreign Trade Structure
(Kustaa Hulkko; HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 31 Mar 87)..... 55

- Commentary on FRG Foreign Policy
(Yuriy Korzhin; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 22 Jan 87)..... 64

- EEC Economic, Political Problems, Prospects Examined
(V. Malyshev; POD ZNAMENEM LENINIZMA, No 6, Mar 87)..... 66

EAST EUROPE

- Moscow TV Highlights Hungarian, CSSR Initiatives
(Yuriy Ulyanov; Moscow Television Service, 7 Apr 87)..... 67

LATIN AMERICA

- U.S. 'Gunboat Diplomacy' in Dominican Republic Recalled
(K. Khachaturov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 28 Apr 87)..... 68

- LATINSKAYA AMERIKA No 1, 1987: Table of Contents
(LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 1, Jan 87)..... 71

Three Areas of Increased U.S.-Latin America Controversy Noted (A. A. Matlina; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 1, Jan 87).....	73
Liberal, Conservative Trends in 'Liberation Theology' Viewed (A. S. Popov, A. A. Radugin; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 1, Jan 87).....	84
Articles on Theme of 'Leftist Revolutionaries' Sought (I. Tverskoy; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 1, Jan 87).....	91
Books on Latin America From 'Progress' Publishers Surveyed (N. P. Kalmykov; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 1, Jan 87).....	95
Book on Latin American S&T Development Problems Reviewed (Ye. V. Kovalev; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 1, Jan 87).....	103
Background, 1978 Events in Jonestown Recalled, CIA Implicated (B. Borisov; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 25 Mar 87).....	106

CHINA, EAST ASIA

Chinese Agricultural Reforms, Arising Problems Assessed (G. Arslanov; SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 2 Apr 87).....	116
---	-----

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

TASS Reviews Soviet-Ethiopian Cooperation on Anniversary (TASS, 5 May 87).....	119
---	-----

/12223

BOOK ON UN AS INSTRUMENT OF PEACE

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 3, Mar 87 pp 131-132

[Book review by Leonid Kutakov]

[Text] The book under review covers the basic directions taken by the United Nations aimed at averting war, maintaining international peace and security and ensuring political cooperation of states with different social systems. The authors thoroughly examine the UN activities in the 1970s and early 1980s which are notable for ups and downs in international relations. These years in particular brought into focus the peculiarities in the UN mechanism functioning both during the periods of an easier and deteriorating international situations.

The monograph brings to light two diametrically opposite approaches to the United Nations. One is the stand of the United States which strives to sway world opinion to believe that the UN is unable to help resolve vital problems, that it is gripped by crisis and is allegedly doomed to ruin. In its tough course, the US administration employs a broad array of methods, including financial pressure, to impede the normal functioning of the UN and its specialised agencies.

In contrast, the USSR is a consistent proponent of bolstering the UN prestige, heightening its role in world politics and making maximum use of its potential in maintaining international peace and security. The authors draw a sound conclusion that the sharply deteriorated international situation in the 1980s makes the UN today even more responsible for maintaining peace (p. 4). They stress that the potential of this world organisation in the maintenance of international peace under its Charter, is far from being exhausted.

The idea of the need to undertake concerted actions by all countries for the sake of saving the present and future generations from nuclear annihilation and boosting its contribution to arms limitation and the promotion of disarmament, is enjoying broad support. Therefore, the monograph dwells at length on the problems of averting nuclear war and achieving disarmament, and on specific features in the activities of the basic elements of the international mechanism for examining and settling these issues.

The authors stress the importance of the debates in the General Assembly which discussed Soviet initiatives aimed at developing international

cooperation in the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes. The book draws attention to the proposals of the Soviet Union which it voiced from the UN rostrum in the 1980s. These proposals are aimed at elaborating international agreements averting the arms race in outer space (pp. 45-53). These moves by the Soviet Union proved its readiness to do everything possible to block the US course towards the militarisation of outer space.

Citing concrete facts, the authors show how, due to the radical changes in the balance of forces in the world and a considerable expansion of the UN membership, first of all because of the growing share of the developing countries, the activities of this pivotal international organisation in the present day system of international relations is acquiring an increasingly anti-imperialist, anti-war and anti-colonial thrust.

In analysing the correlation of the main political forces in the UN, they note the growing role of the non-aligned countries in resolving political problems and the support rendered by them to the initiatives of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist community, identity or closeness of the views held by the non-aligned movement and the socialist states on the key present day problems. This allows the authors to draw the conclusion that nowadays there exists a quite stable majority at the UN which adheres to progressive positions on such problems as reducing the threat of nuclear war, checking the arms race and preventing its spillage into new fields, achieving disarmament, eliminating the vestiges of colonialism and racism, and promoting social and economic progress. It is expedient, however, to point out that on some urgent problems as Kampuchea and the situation around Afghanistan some of the newly free countries yield to the pressure of the imperialist forces and sometimes vote for the resolutions which are at variance with the provisions of the UN Charter and so complicate political settlement of the problems involved.

In the light of the policy of neoglobalism proclaimed by the US administration and its practical implementation, it is becoming particularly important to use the UN as an instrument for preventing the escalation of international disputes into conflicts and military clashes and for barring new international crises. In this connection one should take note of the author's observation that not all possibilities and potential contained in Chapters VI and VII of the UN Charter have been used (p. 11).

It is quite appropriate that the book contains a special section dealing with the UN activities geared to eliminating the vestiges of colonialism. The impetuous raging of racism in South Africa and its illegal occupation of Namibia, the US completion of the colonisation of Micronesia in violation of the relevant decisions of the Security Council, the outrages committed by colonialists in other regions, all stress the political urgency of the elimination of colonialism. The Soviet Union speaks at the UN in favour of adopting effective measures aimed at eliminating all forms of colonial oppression, of granting the sovereign rights to each and every nation to choose its own destiny.

The monograph covers the UN role in developing international cooperation on such global present-day problems as the use of the World Ocean resources,

including the issue of establishing an international organisation on the questions of the sea-bed, environment protection and peaceful exploration of outer space. The consideration of the above-mentioned problems in the book dealing with the political aspects of the UN activities is very much to the point since these problems concern all states and are most closely connected with the task of creating a comprehensive international security system.

Particularly interesting is the section revealing the importance of the UN Charter as a foundation of international law and order, and as a solid base for raising the role and efficiency of this international organisation. The authors show the unsubstantiality of numerous proposals made by Western scholars and politicians aimed allegedly at improving the functioning of the UN mechanism while actually undermining it.

The book precisely analyses the trends within the entire UN system under modern conditions and covers the impact on its activities produced by progressive international non-governmental organisations against the background of the escalation of the anti-war movement. It is noted that this impact goes beyond the framework of purely consultative ties.

It is only natural that in such a vast subject as the problem of the UN activities, not all issues covered in the book have been illuminated in equal detail. For instance, it is correctly noted in the introduction that the political aspects of UN activities, which are directly connected with the problem of averting the threat of nuclear war and safeguarding international security, have priority over the UN contribution in other fields (p. 12). However, in our view, the authors should have covered more extensively what influence could exert progress in averting nuclear war and eliminating nuclear and other mass-destruction weapons on the UN activities in the socio-economic, scientific and technological fields.

Unfortunately, there are some regrettable inaccuracies in the book. For example, the authors assert that the "UN operation of the Congo" was sanctioned by the General Assembly (p. 74). Actually, the troops under the UN command were sent to the Congo in accordance with the decision of the UN Security Council. However, the USA and its allies managed to isolate the Council from supervising the operations and used these troops against the national liberation movement of the Congolese peoples.

All in all, the book under review is a useful contribution in elaborating the Soviet concept of the role of the UN and its place in the present-day international relations.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye," 1987
English Translation Copyright: Progress Publishers 1987
Signed for printing on February 25, 1987

/13046
CSO: 1812/187

WESTERN BUSINESSMEN ON EAST-WEST TRADE PROSPECTS

PM291311 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Apr 87 Morning Edition p 5

[M. Ilinskiy dispatch: "After the Discussion at San Giorgio"]

[Text] Venice--"What is your attitude toward the international conference held recently on the Venetian island of San Giorgio? Did the course taken by the debates live up to the title of the forum, namely, 'International Cooperation Between Countries With Market and Planned Economies in Europe'? What specific benefit could this international/conference--the first of its kind--bring to peoples and states belonging to different socioeconomic systems?"

These were the questions I asked R. Ossola, president of the Italian-Soviet Chamber of Commerce, and Emilio Rocchi, its secretary general.

"I totally agree," R. Ossola said, "with the organizers of this important international forum, who believe that 'important signals are coming' from the Soviet Union and that business circles in the West have no right to miss this chance and not display good will in our age, which is so complex in politically, economically, and ideologically."

"There are considerable complexities, of course," my second interlocutor said. "But an important trend emerged during the debates at the conference: A specific, constructive discussion is under way in which representatives of business circles, banks, and joint-stock companies, as well as scientists and political figures, are actively joining. We have considerable differences of opinion--for example, in our methods of approach to resolving many issues, such as setting up joint enterprises. But this certainly does not mean that these enterprises have no future. On the contrary. The foundations have been laid: 10 Italian firms are ready and are beginning cooperation with their Soviet colleagues. This process must gather momentum and the experience will undoubtedly bear fruit."

At the conference the Soviet representatives gave a broad picture of the present international economic situation and the development of ties and cooperation between countries.

"The absence of official relations between the two largest economic groupings in the world--CEMA and the EEC--is anachronistic," CEMA Secretary V.V. Sychev stressed. "It is all the more unnatural in view of the fact that the countries of both groupings have long-standing traditions and a wealth of experience of reciprocal trade and cultural ties and are also resolving a whole series of all-European problems. As is well known, the Integrated Program for Scientific and Technical Progress in the CEMA Countries Through the Year 2000 has been drawn up and adopted. The West European states are at present resolving scientific and technical tasks largely similar to ours. Coordinating this work and utilizing the advantages of the international division of labor would not only allow both sides to save time and resources but would also benefit the whole continent."

Another area of development could be the implementation of all-European projects--primarily programs to protect the environment and develop the power industry, the transport network, and a number of other spheres. This was the subject of a conversation between your correspondent and the Belgian W. de Clerc, member of the EC Commission responsible for questions of the "Common Market" countries' foreign ties and trade policy.

"Broad prospects for all-European cooperation are opened up by joint entrepreneurship and the formation of joint enterprises. Differences in the nature of our economic systems cannot be an obstacle to this. The forum participants listened with great interest to reports on how CEMA countries have recently taken measures to restructure their foreign economic activity. If Western countries were to lift the restrictions they have imposed in the sphere of the exchange of civilian output, this would play an important, decisive role in expanding East-West production and trade ties. Removing barriers, seeking common interest, and bringing our views closer together regarding the most important economic issues--that is the way to increase stability and strengthen international trust not only in Europe but throughout the world."

"I can only agree with that," Gaetano di Rosa, president of the Fata European Group (Italy), remarked. "I am often asked why and how we set about forming the first joint industrial enterprise with Soviet partners. I am happy to answer this question because I hope that our experience can be of interest to those who would like to follow this path and use this form of cooperation. A long and deep knowledge of the Soviet market led us to a very positive assessment of the new potential opening up a real way to create means making it possible to balance exchange with consideration of the vast Soviet market forces. I will not go into the technicalities of our project connected with the production of food storage equipment, refrigerators, freezers, coolers, and so forth. I will not conceal the fact that we came up against many complex problems after we signed the preliminary agreement between our firm and the Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances. But there have been no insurmountable problems. Today I can report with satisfaction that in a mere 10 weeks since the signing of the preliminary agreement we have already prepared all the basic documents."

"What kind of assistance can Italian financial organs give to joint enterprises?" I asked economist Donato de Gaetano, an expert from the Banco di Roma.

"Verbosity is particularly harmful in cooperation. Real action and an accurate assessment of facts and events are what is needed. The conditions have now been prepared for setting up a working group which will include specialists from the USSR Foreign Trade Bank and three Italian banks. This group will provide information on the real potential of partners who are ready to begin to set up joint enterprises with Soviet colleagues. Hence the potential for precise financing."

The analysis of the international market situation given by Soviet Academician O.T. Bogomolov aroused great interest in journalistic and business circles at the conference.

The impression of participants in the forum who came to Venice from outside the European Continent are interesting.

"As a businessman involved in a number of technological processes," A. Posnik, president and administrator of the "Ferro Corporation" in Cleveland (the United States), noted, "I am inspired by the new changes of direction in East-West economic life. I can see what considerable mutual benefit can be gained by states with different socioeconomic systems from the development of mutual trust and economic ties. My firm already has positive experience of contacts with partners from socialist countries. So is every reserve exhausted? Certainly not. We are talking about business, this is our profession, but its further deepening is hampered by many well known restrictions. Mutual good will is needed for the 'iron stream' of technology to become a mighty torrent, which will be in the interests of people throughout the world."

The conference was over. I turned once more to R. Ossola, president of the Italian-Soviet Chamber of Commerce, and asked him what his feelings would be as he returned to Milan to continue his work.

"You know I am both a realist and a utopian. A great deal of what has been discussed at San Giorgio will be called utopian today. But this utopia will become reality in the future. The things we did not even attempt to discuss 2 to 3 years ago or regarded as utopian have today become reality. I believe in East-West cooperation."

/12858
CSO: 1825/177

PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Moscow VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS in Russian No 1, Jan 87 pp 19-33

[Article by B. V. Gorbachev: "On the Development of International Relations of the Socialist Type"]

[Text] The 27th CPSU Congress introduced many new and creative ideas into all spheres of socialist construction and international relations. The fresh, innovative ideas relate also to the problems of development of the world socialist system and the relations between the countries of the socialist alliance. Their theoretical interpretation undoubtedly has great practical value for the general cause of world socialism.

"Socialism," says the new edition of the CPSU Program, "has brought to life a new and previously unseen type of international relations developing between the socialist states. Their solid foundation is the uniformity of their socio-economic and political order, their Marxist-Leninist ideology, their class solidarity, their friendship, cooperation and mutual aid in solving the problems of building and defending the new society, their struggle for peace, international security and social progress, and their equality and respect for the independence and sovereignty of each state."¹ These positions directly echo Leninist thought on the fact that socialism creates "entirely different international relations which make it possible for all oppressed peoples to rid themselves of imperialist oppression."²

It is a regular occurrence that these "entirely different international relations" develop primarily within the world socialist system itself, at the same time having a great revolutionizing effect on all aspects of world ties. In the words of K. Marx, the communists are striving to see that "the simple laws of morality and fairness which individuals must follow in their mutual relations become the highest laws also in the relations between peoples."³ There are many monographs and articles concerning the development of the world socialist system and the relations which have become established between the socialist countries. However, we would like to illuminate in greater detail the current practical and theoretical state of the given problem with consideration for the decisions and ideas of the 27th CPSU Congress and the latest congresses of the other fraternal parties.

The author shares with the readers certain notions on the question of the formulation and development of international relations of the new, socialist type.

* * *

As the connecting thread in this sphere, Marxist-Leninist theory uses the position that every socio-economic formation has its own inherent and unique type of international relations determined by the fundamental peculiarities of the state's internal structure.

The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia laid the beginnings of the world socialist system.

The peculiarity and distinguishing feature of this beginning was the fact that socialism developed within the framework of "a single, separate" country, a single multinational state consisting of the union republics. A single system of socialist ownership and planning was established in the USSR, a single defense, foreign policy and foreign trade. Due to the huge multiplicity of the national and historical conditions and the different customs and levels of development of the republics and other autonomous parts of the country, the Soviet Union served as a practical testing ground for literally all the general regularities of the socialist revolution and the problems of the transitional period and of socialist construction. The development of principally new relations between the nations and peoples had particular historical significance. These relations were based on the elimination of all great power sentiments, on full equality and agreement, on the truly fraternal and unselfish aid on the part of the socio-economically developed nations to backward peoples, and on mutual cultural enrichment. After the victory of the people's revolution in Mongolia, Soviet-Mongolian relations began to develop successfully on a principally new and internationalist basis. In essence, the lessons of the Soviet Union were the first experience, the prototype--obviously with many historical corrections and clarifications--for future relations between the peoples who later embarked on the socialist path.

After October there were already two principally different social systems in existence and operation in the world. Nevertheless, the emergence of the world system of socialism as a totality of sovereign socialist states and as a world system of economic management and new international relations relates to the period directly after World War II, when a second wave of people's-democratic and socialist revolutions arose in Europe and Asia in the course of liberation from German fascism and Japanese militarism. The result of this revolutionary upheaval, which had been prepared for by the multi-year process of class anti-imperialist and anti-fascist struggle of the workers, was the entry of over 10 European and Asian countries, significantly different in their socio-economic level, onto the socialist path of development within a historically short period.

Unlike the preceding formations, socialism as the first phase of communist formation set tasks of principally new historical scope and importance. For the first time in history we may speak of the elimination of all forms of exploitation, first within individual countries, and then also in international relations; of a truly world-wide establishment of fair and equal ties, and of an "international cooperative of workers". The formulation of the world socialist system as a future integral organism means the comprehensive development of the process of equalizing the socio-economic level of its members as a necessary condition for new forms of cooperation and international relations of the socialist type. At the same time, this meant the elimination of the huge inhibiting legacy of all the preceding epochs in politics and ideology, in law and morals,

and in the sphere of national and inter-state relations. Everything anti-humanistic, unjust, and irrational which has been engendered in this plan by the bourgeois and pre-bourgeois epochs must be overcome and corrected on a socialist basis.

It is a regular fact that with the emergence of socialism, forces became active in a number of countries which unified them into a single international system. Proletarian internationalism in its new manifestation, undoubtedly, has an extensive and deep-seated basis--a social, class, economic and ideological base. With the development of the new order, there emerges the objective possibility (and possibility in history often coincides with necessity) for political cohesion and cooperation based on the principle common character of the social system and the long-term determining goals of social development.

There was also a direct external motivation for unity--the imperialist threat, the need to protect socialist conquests. How could the popular-democratic and socialist states answer the imperialist course of "repelling communism", the economic blockade, the creation of anti-communist military blocks, the bitter psychological war, and finally the atomic blackmail? In the face of the imperialist military threat, the socialist countries showed a great capacity for cohesion and unity. They concluded class military-political alliances of a defensive character on a bilateral basis. They created in Europe a multilateral defensive alliance--the Warsaw Pact Organization which, particularly in the course of its further development, also became the center for coordination of the foreign policy activity of its participants. Forced to concern themselves with security and defense and to actively protect international positions and interests of individual socialist countries as well as of the system as a whole, they at the same time counteracted imperialist policy of military blocks and the arms race with a general course toward peaceful coexistence of states having different social order.

Broad horizons for cooperation and interaction were also opened in the economic sphere. At first these were, obviously, the simplest, most traditional forms, as for example trade associations on a bilateral basis. But here too significantly new elements were introduced: long-term nature and planning of agreements, stability of prices free from the business-associated fluctuations of the capitalist market, and favorable conditions for loans and credits. Already in 1949 the Council on Mutual Economic Assistance was formed, which pronounced such initial principles as full equality of its members, their independence and sovereignty, the right to choose specific forms of cooperation, comradely mutual assistance, and aid in the industrialization of countries with a less developed economy. CEMA activity from the very start paved the road for higher forms of cooperation. The year 1955 marked the first experience in coordination of national economic plans and the first steps in the specialization and cooperation of production. Thus, the vital elements of a principally new socialist international division of labor and the future socialist economic integration were being formulated.

The spiritual sphere is no less important in this process. The formation of a new historical community of peoples and states which had begun included the previously unseen expansion in the exchange of spiritual values and mutual cultural enrichment, although there was no question here of the emergence of any

unified or national culture. The broad acquaintance with works of literature and art, with history and the progressive traditions of nations, and the multifaceted work of friendship societies served as a strong stimulus for a deeper cognition and understanding of one another, and for overcoming the national prejudices which were a consequence of the many centuries of dissociative activity of the exploiting classes. Proletarian and socialist internationalism gradually overcame the legacy of national egoism, mistrust, and isolation.

However, these processes also regularly had another very important side.

Despite the generality of the basic regularities of transition to socialism, each of these countries passed through a specific and peculiar history of social development and class struggle. Ultimately this specific national history determined the original course of the socialist revolution and transformations, their rates and stages, the forms and methods of socialist construction, and many other specific-historical peculiarities. Each of the countries was going toward a new formation by its own path, confirming Marx's prediction on the "endless variations and gradations" of the same basis in its specific manifestations.⁴

Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, for example, in the past belonged to the number of highly developed industrial countries of the capitalist world. In Hungary, Poland, and Romania the level of development of capitalism was moderate, or even below average, and considerable feudal vestiges remained in agriculture. Bulgaria and Yugoslavia were among the typically agrarian countries with a rather low level of industry, while Albania represented one of the most backward countries in Europe. Cuba, where the people's revolution was victorious in 1959, had a semi-colonial, monocultural economy closely tied to the world capitalist market.

In the East, in Asia the contracts of social order were even more significant. Mongolia had passed through a long path of non-capitalistic development. In the past it had been a feudal country of nomadic livestock raising. In Korea, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia there were the strongest vestiges of feudal relations. A deep imprint on their social order had been left by the epoch of colonial supremacy and prolonged wars for national liberation. Particularly specific and complex was the socio-economic and class structure of China--an ancient state, the largest peasant country in the world with a rather small working class, deep vestiges of eastern Middle Ages in its entire order of public, social and state life, and at the same time having a huge revolutionary potential.

Of the noted national peculiarities there was also that difference, that multiplicity of socio-economic, political and cultural-educational problems which had to be solved by each country building a socialist society. Of course the character and volume of the national-liberation, antifeudal and all-democratic problems of the revolution were by far not identical, particularly at the initial stages. The former ruling, privileged, and exploiting classes and strata showed themselves differently in their methods and degree of resistance to the new order. Strongly differing possibilities existed concerning the constructive application of historically formed democratic and state institutions by means of their being filled with new socio-economic content.

Obviously, we cannot help but see that the process of formulation and development of new socialist international relations takes place under conditions of continually overcoming certain difficulties and later features which emerge from the legacy of past epochs and from various approaches of the socialist states to certain problems of current times. The very newness of this matter requires particular attention to each other's interests and positions, as well as the mutual respect and understanding of the common goals of socialism. The CPSU firmly adheres to this line.

In recent years there has been a noticeable improvement in sino-soviet relations, and the economic and cultural ties of the two countries have been expanded. As M. S. Gorbachev noted in his speech in Vladivostok, "the Soviet people perceive with understanding and respect the goal presented by the Chinese Communist Party--to modernize the country and to build in the future a socialist society worthy of this great people. As far as we can tell, we have similar priorities with China--the acceleration of socio-economic development. And why not support each other, why not cooperate in the implementation of our plans wherever this is clearly of benefit to both? The better the relations, the more we will be able to have a mutual exchange of experience."⁵

In the course of his visit to the Soviet Union in October of 1986, Kim Il-song once again confirmed the mutual desire to develop Soviet-Korean cooperation in every way possible, to exchange experience in socialist construction, and to act together in the struggle for improving the situation in Asia and in the Pacific Ocean basin and the struggle for preventing the nuclear catastrophe toward which the aggressive and dangerous policy of imperialism is pushing mankind. It was noted that in recent years the contacts between the CPSU and the Korean Labor Party have undergone favorable development, and ties have been strengthened in economics and culture. Soviet-Korean cooperation has ascended to a new level in all spheres of life.⁶

Soviet-Yugoslavian relations are successfully developing in the interests of the peoples of both countries and for the cause of peace and socialism. A significant contribution in strengthening mutual understanding and overall cooperation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia is made by the direct mutual contacts of their republics, krajs and cities. The high-level meetings such as the one between the CPSU delegation headed by M. S. Gorbachev and the delegation of the LCY [League of Communists of Yugoslavia] headed by M. Renovitsa, held in the USSR from 9 through 12 December, 1986 facilitate the rapprochement of the peoples.

From the very start of its formulation, the world socialist system thus represented a certain community of countries united by coinciding interests, goals and ideals. But at the same time, a cardinal fact was that this developing community consisted and currently consists of independent, sovereign states separated from one another by state boundaries. And this sovereignty, simply speaking, is the objective political reality on which the relations of the socialist countries with each other and with the capitalist world is based. It is determined by significant factors and reasons.

There can be no doubt that the socialist revolution and the process of building a new society are implemented in the given historical conditions only within the framework of national statehood or union, or federation of several national

state formations (republics and other autonomous units) united by common historical fates. Closely tied with the development of specific statehood is that uplift in national consciousness, economics, culture, art, literature, and social life. This is a sort of national rebirth which regularly occurs under socialism, particularly in the nations which were previously oppressed and dependent. The importance of the national factor is hard to overestimate here. The construction of a socialist society requires a socialistic (specifically in a socialistic) national statehood which gives form to the foreign ties and relations as well as to the realization of all the progressive potentials and traditions of the nation--spiritual, cultural and social.

Here we must consider one other significant aspect. Every socialist state has its own national wealth, its own existing and operating independent system of people's ownership--of land, of its mineral wealth, and of the tools and means of production. This sovereign ownership entails such economic consequences as the need for foreign trade on the basis of the law of cost, and on the basis of equivalency, i.e., the transfer from one country to another of equal amounts of commodity goods (by international cost) or reified labor. Evidently, this circumstance certainly does not exclude various types of aid and mutual aid, privileges and benefits. However, the equivalency of trade and commodity-monetary relations still remains the law and the rule. The on-going internationalization of economic life, in spite of all its huge significance, cannot in a short historical period overcome the significant differences in the levels of production and labor productivity. Nor can it go beyond the national framework of reproduction, i.e., eliminate the certain isolation of national economies. As a result of this, the world socialist economy for a period of a prolonged historical period cannot function in any other way than as a totality of mutually related but sovereign independent national economies. This is also an objective political and economic reality.

Such historical realities also determine the presence of each socialist state's own national interests and the need for selecting appropriate forms of cooperation which answer its foreign and domestic conditions. The existence of common international interests by the socialist countries certainly does not contradict these peculiar national interests which, as practical experience has shown, may be realized so much more fully and deeply the more closely connected they are with the common goals and interests.

The Secretary General of the Hungarian Socialist Worker's Party Yanosh Kadar notes that: "...We cannot forget that socialist cooperation comprises independent national states. They are tied together by the similarity of their basic goals and basic interests. This gives force to proletarian and socialist internationalism. The strength and effectiveness of the order in a socialist country are ensured only then--and this is one of the main conclusions of Hungarian communists--when the leading force in society, the Marxist-Leninist party in its decisions simultaneously and in equal measure considers the common, primary regularities of socialism, the peculiarities of the country and the national traditions. All this is a condition for the fact that the masses support our goal and for the advantages of the socialist social order to be truly utilized, so that we may be dependable partners to our socialist allies and to all those who fight for peace."⁸

In order to obtain a complete picture of the formulation of the world socialist system, we must evidently also remember the following. It is fully explicable why many countries with people's democracies, embarking on the construction of a new society, leaned primarily on the experience of the Soviet Union as the only real example of socialism at that time. This experience of world-historical significance gave the named countries the most significant orientation and support in many decisive problems on radical social transformations, organization of new power and statehood, industrialization, cooperation of the peasantry, and cultural revolution. But at the same time here and there at times there were also definite negative moments manifested in the application of Soviet experience. Such errors, specifically were the stereotyped, dogmatic understanding, its simple "copying", and the transfer [of this experience] to one's own national soil without its well-reasoned, creative transformation. In his time, V. I. Lenin warned against this most persistently.

* * *

In the 7 decades of socialist and communist construction in the USSR and the already 40 years of development of a number of other socialist countries, results of a world-historical scope and significance have been achieved. Socialism has become the determining revolutionary force of current times. Its deep political, economic and spiritual effect on the life and work of mankind is clearly evident.

"World socialism," said CPSU Central Committee Secretary General M. S. Gorbachev in his Political Address of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress, "is a strong international formation. It rests on a highly developed economy, a sound scientific basis, and a reliable military-political potential. It is over a third of humanity, tens of countries and peoples proceeding along the path of comprehensive discovery of the intellectual and moral riches of man and society. A new way of life has arisen, based on the principles of socialist fairness. It has neither oppressors nor oppressed, neither exploiters, nor exploited. Here the power belongs to the people. Its distinguishing features are collectivism and comradely mutual aid, a celebration of the ideas of freedom, a close unity of the rights and responsibilities of every member of society, personal dignity and true humanism."¹⁰

Thanks to the experience which has already been accumulated in socialist revolutions, it has been established with scientific reliability that they promote an unusual increase in the creative activity of the popular masses and their political avant-garde, as well as the role of scientific theory. Lenin's position that without revolutionary theory there cannot be revolutionary practice has become standard. It is specifically this process which most clearly manifests the increase of the leadership role of the communist party, Marxist-Leninist forethought, and subjective factors of social progress in society.

What we have said has direct relation to the formulation and development of new socialist international relations and socialist cooperation. While the international relations of former epochs occurred elementally and represented an uncontrolled process, the supremacy of some countries and the subordination of others, the formulation of the world socialist system and its foreign and domestic ties is to a significant, if not to a decisive, degree the fruit of

conscious and well thought out creativity. Undoubtedly, in this sphere there are still elements of spontaneity and indeterminacy (as the result of the policy of imperialism, the effect of nationalist forces, and miscalculations in policy). However, the determining moment in the development of a world system of socialism is ever more becoming the goal-oriented class policy of the ruling communist parties, an entire complex of well thought out measures, and the scientifically substantiated organization of socialist forms of foreign ties.

We have already spoken of the initial stages of formulation of the socialist system and of how the foundations for these relations were laid. The 27th CPSU Congress and the congresses of other fraternal parties held in recent times have ascertained that with the growth in maturity of socialism there is a higher stage in the development of socialist cooperation and relations between the socialist countries, and an increase in the variability and depth of the presented problems.

What are the new traits and regularities currently coming to the forefront?

A significant peculiarity of the current situation is that most socialist states are acutely faced with problems of seeking out specific means, methods and forms of changing over to the intensive stage of development, and of accelerating their general socio-economic growth on this basis. In those countries where this question is not of primary importance due to the level of development of the productive forces, resources and capacities for accelerating social progress in the future are just as persistently sought out. There are joint explorations and experiments being conducted in this direction. Naturally, this general requirement of the moment placed a deep imprint on the entire system of foreign relations between the socialist countries--political, economic and ideological.

"Today the fates of the world and of social progress," stresses the Political Address of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th CPSU Congress, "are tied in closer than ever before with the dynamism of the economic and political development of the world socialist system. The need for such dynamism is dictated by the concern for the well-being of the peoples. But it is also necessary to the socialist world from the standpoint of counteracting the military danger. Finally, in this is a demonstration of the possibilities of the socialist way of life. Both friends and enemies are watching us. The huge and many-faced world of the developing countries is watching us. It is seeking its choice, its path, and this choice depends largely on the achievements of socialism, on how convincingly it answers the call of the times."¹¹

The documents of the 27th CPSU Congress and the subsequent plenums of the party Central Committee present practical ideas on how we must take largely new approaches in relations between the countries of the socialist system. The primary task now is to fill the historically formulated principles of socialist internationalism with new specific content which meets the basic, most current interests of socialism, the internal dynamics of socialist construction, and the current international conditions. Although we are speaking primarily of the dynamism of internal processes, this regularly concerns also the direct foreign ties of the fraternal countries. In the current period it is becoming

vitaly important to have ever more active interaction, which gives the effect not simply of the addition, but rather the multiplication of the potentials of the socialist states.

The political cooperation of the countries of the socialist alliance has now taken on the most varied forms which are adequate to the specific needs. This includes cooperation and coordination of the general course in the international arena, in the struggle for peace and constructive cooperation of states, and against the imperialist arms race policy and policy of suppression of all progressive processes in world affairs. This is the broad and deep exchange of socio-economic experience and its creative application in its specific conditions. This is political-ideological cooperation which encompasses the theory and practice of socialist development and the active struggle against revisionist and bourgeois ideology. [The socialist alliance countries] actively cooperate in the United Nations Organization for purposes of strengthening its authority and effectiveness, especially in connection with the outlined tendency on the part of U.S. imperialism aimed at subverting the UN. At the last conference of the Political Consultative Committee of states participating in the Warsaw Pact, held in Budapest in June of 1986, important new initiatives were presented for remedying the situation on the European continent and strengthening peace and security by means of radically reducing the number of Warsaw Pact and NATO troops on European territory.¹²

The heart of political cooperation, as indicated at the 27th CPSU Congress, remains the interaction of the ruling communist parties. A new, maybe a key sector is being formed--the institution of multilateral working meetings by leaders of the fraternal countries, which make it possible to effectively seek advice in a comradely manner on the entire set of problems of socialist construction and its foreign and domestic aspects.¹³

The ever closer and more varied cooperation of the ruling communist parties and their mutual communication on domestic and foreign policy are becoming exceptionally important factors in the progress of the fraternal countries. The growth of mutual understanding and cohesion is closely tied with the development of relations between the socialist countries on the basis of principles of proletarian socialist internationalism, equal rights and mutual responsibility, mutual benefit and mutual aid in the economic sphere, the combination of the initiative of each one with the coordinated line in international affairs, and the mutual expansion of exchange of experience in socialist construction with its accompanying generalization. The fraternal parties are united in that at the current stage of socialist development, the innovative, creative spirit in politics takes on particular significance, the new political thinking in domestic and international affairs, and the principally new approach to world problems.

"Pre-nuclear thinking," noted M. S. Gorbachev, "in essence has lost its significance as of 6 August 1945. Today we cannot ensure our own security without considering the security of other states and peoples. There can be no true security if it is not uniform or all-encompassing. To think otherwise means to live in a world of illusion, in a world of self deception."

"The new thinking which the current world needs is incompatible with the concept of it as someone's private domain, with the efforts of "honoring" others with one's patronage and teachings on how to act and what path to select--the socialist, capitalist or some other one.

"The Soviet Union believes that every people and every country has the right to determine its own fate, to command its own resources, to determine its own social development in a sovereign manner, and to defend its own security and participate in the organization of an all-encompassing system of international security."¹⁴

The higher level of relations of the socialist countries at the same time presupposes also the greater independence and creative initiative of the ruling communist parties. This, undoubtedly, does not exclude but rather strengthens their class international solidarity, their deeper mutual understanding and cooperation. On this new ascending twist in the spiral of mutual relations, the cohesion and mutual ties of the fraternal parties and countries are regularly strengthened. This is becoming a vital and determining principle in politics. Thus, a new quality of relations arises which more deeply reflects the regularities of socialism.

As Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee Secretary General Gustav Gusak noted in his speech presented at the 17th Czechoslovak Party Congress in March of 1986, "the need for accelerated and comprehensive application of the advantages of socialism comes to the forefront in individual countries as well as in the framework of the entire alliance. This requires the search for new and more effective forms of cooperation in all spheres--in the political, economic, scientific-technical and ideological. This also means the improvement of the mechanism and methods of activity of the Warsaw Pact Organization and Council on Mutual Economic Assistance in the interests of ensuring defense and coordinating foreign policy and the comprehensive development of socialist economic integration."¹⁵

The development of political cooperation of socialist countries is also strongly affected by such a factor as the current international situation: the increased threat of nuclear war, which if unleashed would bring the end of human civilization itself; the irrational imperialist policy of the arms race; the efforts of capitalism to take historical revenge over socialism. Under such conditions, the importance of unity and cohesion of the socialist states and all progressive and peace-loving forces in the struggle against the nuclear danger becomes many times more important. This problem is placed at the leading edge of the entire system of international relations. Socialism unconditionally rejects war as a means of resolving inter-state political and economic contradictions and ideological disagreements, and continually stands up for the principles of peaceful coexistence. This activity of the socialist countries has become the main direction in their coordinated foreign policy.

Deep, large-scale processes are taking place in the sphere of economic cooperation of the fraternal countries and in their economic integration. Although socialism has everything needed to assimilate the most current science and technology, it would be incorrect to assume that the scientific-technical revolution does not present serious problems to socialist society. Experience shows that its development is closely tied with the development of the economic management mechanism, with social relations, with a reorganization of thinking, with the development of a new psychology, and with the confirmation of dynamism as a way of life and a standard of everyday existence. The scientific-technical revolution persistently demands the constant re-examination and renewal of the

formulated schemes of economic management and control. In other words, it not only opens up prospects, but also increases the requirements for the entire organization of the domestic and international life of the socialist countries.

As a preparation for deeper forms of integration, the Integrated Program for Continued Intensification and Improvement in the Cooperation and Development of the Socialist Economic Integration of the CEMA Member States, adopted in 1971 in Bucharest, was of landmark importance in the historical plane. It summarized over 20 years of activity by the Council on Mutual Economic Assistance in all spheres of economic ties and defined the course to be followed for the next 20 years. The measures and proposals presented in the Program essentially went far beyond the framework of the specific economic sphere and encompassed a broad circle of political, ideological, legal and organizational problems. For the next step in integration, not only did bilateral ties become characteristic, but also integrated, long-term collective measures encompassing production, consumption and foreign trade. Such types of cooperation as the coordination of national-economic plans, specialization and cooperation of production, exchanges in the field of science and technology, joint construction of large facilities of collective function, and a number of other basic forms were reinforced.

At the same time, the integrated program took into account also such an aspect of the matter as the different levels of preparedness of the socialist countries for rapprochement of their economies, the existence of independent economies in sovereign socialist states, and independent systems of public ownership. In this regard, it did not go ahead of itself, but thoroughly considered the existing realities. Socialist economic integration took place on a totally voluntary basis and was not accompanied by the creation of supranational organs, nor did it touch upon questions of internal planning, financial and cost accounting activity of organizations. It stemmed from the harmonic and rational combination of national and international interests of the socialist states. At the same time, it oriented the fraternal countries toward the gradual improvement and change in forms of cooperation in accordance with the specific results in socialist development which they had achieved.

Therefore, with each year the level of economic cooperation of the CEMA member states must increase, and the form and content of this cooperation must be enriched. The high-level conference of the CEMA member states held in Moscow in June of 1984 adopted important decisions on the basic directions for development and intensification of economic and scientific-technical cooperation for the long-range future. The conference, which confirmed the course toward further integration of the economies, placed in the forefront the accelerated change-over of the economy to the intensive means of development, as well as a decisive increase in its effectiveness. It made an important new step in the matter of the CEMA member states coordinating their economic strategy. The discussion stemmed around the coordination of structural policy for purposes of joint determination of the means of direct interaction in the sphere of science, technology, material production, and capital construction, and around increasing the degree of coordination of the national-economic plans and expanding the direct ties of the ministries, associations and enterprises.¹⁶

The adoption of the Integrated Program for Scientific-Technical Progress of the CEMA Member States to the Year 2000 in Moscow in December of 1985 was a creative continuation and specification of the decisions of this high-level conference. It signified the unification of efforts, resources, and scientific-technical potential of the fraternal countries at the decisive sectors of socio-economic progress. "The sense of this," stated the Political Address of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress, "is the transition of the CEMA states to a coordinated scientific-technical policy."¹⁷ The basis adopted for the Integrated Program was comprised of five priority directions on co-operation which encompassed fundamental research as well as the introduction of principally new engineering, technology and materials.

The topic of discussion here is primarily that of electronization of the national economy, which provides for the development of mass means of computer technology, super-computers, a unified system of digital information transfer, a new generation of satellite systems, and a wide range of various types of instruments based on leading achievements in microelectronics. Secondly, it was decided to place the emphasis on integrated automation directed at the manufacture of rapidly readjustable production systems, industrial robots, principally new technologies and many other systems and automatic machines. Thirdly, the accelerated development of atomic energy and the creation of prerequisites for a practically inexhaustible source of energy based on controlled thermonuclear reactions is moved to the forefront. Fourth, serious attention is given to the development of new technologies and materials having increased durability, heat resistance and many other useful qualities. Fifth, the accelerated development of biotechnology is envisioned. Its goal is the effective treatment of serious illnesses, the increase in food resources, the continued development of waste-free types of production, and the reduction of harmful effects on the environment.¹⁸

"The supreme task of the current stage of economic cooperation," noted M. S. Gorbachev, "has been defined by the leadership of the fraternal parties and states. This is scientific-technical progress and production cooperation, particularly in machine building. The Integrated Program for Scientific-Technical Progress of the CEMA Member States to the Year 2000 is a quality document aimed at achieving the highest limits according to world standards, but its realization will require great effort."¹⁹

The Soviet Union, as well as the other CEMA states, is conducting an in-depth search for the most optimal variants of foreign economic activity and continued improvement in the forms of communications between the socialist states. In light of this, the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on measures for developing the management of economic and scientific-technical cooperation with the socialist countries takes on vital importance. This resolution is part of the deep-seated reorganization of the economic management mechanism conducted in accordance with the decisions of the party congress. Along with a set of organizational and administrative measures, many Soviet ministries and departments, as well as a number of major associations and enterprises have been given the right, effective as of 1 January 1987, to directly implement export-import operations (including markets of capitalist and developing countries). Their make-up will include cost-accounting firms.

As the appropriate prerequisites are created, this right will be given to other ministries, organizations and enterprises. All this is directed toward a single goal--to eliminate all obstacles in the path of direct interaction of associations, combines, enterprises and labor collectives in the fraternal countries.²⁰

One of the main reasons for the reform being implemented in the Soviet Union is the desire to create such a mechanism for managing foreign economic activity which would meet the needs of the current stage in the development of the Soviet Union and the concord countries, as well as the requirements of the strategy of accelerating socialist integration. This has been expressed in that favorable conditions are being created for direct ties and production and scientific-technical cooperation. Without such transformations it would be difficult to utilize in full measure the advantages of the international socialist division of labor or to increase the effectiveness of cooperation to such a degree that it would become for all the CEMA states an effective instrument for implementing the line toward acceleration of scientific-technical progress.

The working meeting of leaders of the fraternal parties of the CEMA member states held in Moscow on 10-11 November 1986 was of primary importance in strengthening socialist cooperation. This meeting discussed the "cardinal problems in developing and improving cooperation between the socialist countries and the possibilities of the most complete exposure of the building potential of socialism. Particular attention was given to further enhancing relations in the economic sphere, to utilizing new and most progressive forms of economic and scientific-technical interaction in the interests of accelerating the socio-economic development of the fraternal countries, and to improving the well-being of their peoples."²¹

There was also an exchange of opinions on a broad range of current questions dealing with the current international situation. The meeting participants supported the principal position of the USSR in Reykjavik and stressed the need for "increasing joint efforts in the interests of the struggle for elimination of nuclear and reduction of conventional weapons, and for strengthening peace and international security."²²

Thus, a process of deep-seated, ever more comprehensive rapprochement and mutual augmentation of the economies is developing. This process takes into the account the national peculiarities and interests and rests on the fundamental principles of international socialist division of labor. In a practical plane, the fraternal countries are already working out agreements and other documents dealing with direct ties between associations, combines and enterprises, with the creation of joint societies and enterprises, and with the work of joint collectives of specialists. This activity rests on the broad and flexible capacities of socialist cost accounting relations which exclude exploitation and reward initiative and creative endeavors in all types of industrial and agrarian production.

At the same time, there is continued rapprochement of the peoples of socialist countries in the spiritual, ideological and cultural sphere. With every passing year, the fraternal peoples understand each other better. Their contacts become

broader and more varied, while their self-reliance and peculiarities of their spiritual and cultural values and traditions remain intact. They are constantly enriching their cultures, assimilating all that is best, progressive and democratic that has been accumulated by their comrades in the common communist cause.

Naturally, the interaction and contact of socialist cultures leads to their true flourishing and mutual enrichment. And here there is no place for any unification. The cultural world of the socialist countries and peoples is just as varied as are their national character and traditions, their inimitable thousand-year long histories. The interrelation and mutual influence of national cultures are the basic and necessary conditions for forming a unified all-people's communist culture. The international general and the national specific--these are two factors which augment each other. Obviously, at present we are not faced with the question of creating an international culture of socialism, but the bricks to this building are already being laid today.

An effective factor in ideological communications was the conclusion of special agreements on cultural and scientific cooperation between most of the socialist countries. The Soviet Union, for example, has such agreements with Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. In these agreements the parties, as a rule, promise to further the continued development of cooperation and exchange in the sphere of science, education, enlightenment, literature, art, cinema, the press, radio, television, cultural enlightenment work, physical culture and sports. We must note the creation of a number of intergovernmental commissions on bilateral cultural cooperation as a beneficial phenomenon. Thus, for over 10 years now the Soviet-Hungarian commission has been working fruitfully. Analogous commissions have been created by the USSR in conjunction with Bulgaria, Poland, Romania and other countries. Periodic meetings of Central Committee secretaries on questions of ideology and propaganda, culture, and science have become a common practice, as well as meetings of ministers of culture, and managers of state institutions knowledgeable in questions of radio and television broadcasting, cinema and education. An important sector in cultural construction has become the expansion and intensification of ties along the line of creative unions of writers, actors, artists, musicians and other artistic figures.

The deeply humanistic culture of the socialist order comprises a strong foundation for formulating socialist consciousness, patriotism and internationalism. This is particularly important under the conditions of sharp exacerbation of the ideological struggle against imperialism at the current stage. Speaking out from unified positions and reacting in a timely and acute manner to the "psychological war" and the ideological campaigns of the class enemy, the fraternal parties are thereby making a significant contribution to strengthening the positions of world socialism and to the spiritual rapprochement of the peoples of the socialist alliance.

* * *

This is how the formulation and development of international relations of the new socialist type is proceeding. These relations have been embodied most fully between the countries of the socialist alliance. "History has not yet known

such a community of countries," states the new edition of the CPSU Program, "where no one has or can have special rights and privileges, where international relations have really become relations between peoples, where fruitful associations have been formed and are developing at different levels--from the highest party and state leadership to the labor collectives. Cooperation multiplies the forces of the fraternal states in socialist construction and helps to ensure their reliable security."²³

The relations between the countries of the socialist alliance represent a new historical phenomenon stemming from the socio-economic nature of the socialist order. The basis for these relations are such factors as the elimination of all types of exploitation, oppression and inequality, the supremacy of public ownership on means of production, the planned economy, socialist internationalism and other fundamental traits of socialist society. Undoubtedly, this does not exclude the complexities and problems in establishing and securing new international relations, be they questions of economic cooperation, its true mutual benefit and fairness and coordination of the activity of internal economic management mechanisms, or be they questions of national specifics and interests. At the same time, we may speak of the entire series of traits of the new type of international relations as the real achievements of socialism.

Among them is the fact that this is not only the presentation of the slogan of freedom, independence, equal rights of nations, and their right to self government and their own statehood, but also the practical realization of such a slogan--the provision of truly free development of nations and states according to the path which they have selected.

One such trait is the establishment of relations of fraternal friendship, mutual understanding and mutual aid between nations within the framework of the socialist federation or union, as well as between peoples forming independent states.

There is a successive continuation in overcoming the socio-economic, and cultural-educational inequality which arose due to the nonuniform development of nations and the specific conditions of their history, and which remained as a legacy of the old order. There is also a continuation of the multifaceted and unselfish aid to backward nations and states on the part of the developed and leading countries, as well as a continuation of the course toward equalizing the socio-economic levels.

Cooperation and various ties in the sphere of economics, science, technology, culture, art, and social life are broadly developing, and there is a mutual enrichment with cultural values, a moral and spiritual rapprochement of nations and states.

Among the characteristic traits of international relations of the new socialist type are the growing dynamism in their establishment and securement, the ever more complete and comprehensive coverage of the society's vital activity by such relations, and the ever more rational coordination of internal processes of socialist construction with the external ties of the fraternal countries.

The solidarity of the socialist countries is getting stronger, as is their support of each other in protecting socialist conquests, the common cause of

socialism and its international positions. Also gaining in strength is the coordinated line in the anti-imperialist struggle, in major world problems, and in the struggle for disarmament and against the atomic threat.

We have every right to speak of the combination of international and national interests of the socialist states in placing the common interests and goals of the socialist system in the forefront.

Finally, we must emphasize the cohesion of the socialist states and peoples into a new historical community--into the socialist alliance, which elevates the entire totality of their political, economic and cultural ties to new heights corresponding to a mature socialist society.

The extensive experience accumulated by the socialist countries indicates that historical progress is invincible. It is not "zig-zags" which determine history. Mankind does not go in a circle, but lives through actual history of progressive ascent from lower levels to ever higher ones. Because of this, the continued growth and expansion of the world socialist system is a regular and inevitable fact, as is its ever more all-encompassing and determinate mission in the history of mankind and, finally, its transformation into a single world system, into communist social formation.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Programma Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza." [Program of the CPSU] New edition. Adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress. M., 1986, p 12.
2. Lenin V. I. "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" [Collected Works] Vol 42, p 107.
3. Marks K. and Engels F. "Sochineniya" [Works] Vol 16, p 11.
4. Ibid, Vol 25, pt II, p 354.
5. Gorbachev M. S. "Reorganization is Immediate, It Concerns Everyone and Everything". Collected Materials on M. S. Gorbachev's Trip to the Far East, 25-31 July 1986, M., 1986, p 25.
6. Cf. PRAVDA, 25 October 1986.
7. It is important to note in this connection that V. I. Lenin associated the problem of "dying off" of the state with the process of rapprochement and merging of nations. It is a well known fact that he placed an increased emphasis on the need for "eliminating the current national barriers," referring, naturally, to the bourgeois order, and to the establishment of "new, higher forms of human society" in international relations after the conquest of the socialist revolution (cf., for example, Lenin V. I., "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy", Vol 26, p 39-40). However, V. I. Lenin placed no less emphasis also on the other side of the question. In the work entitled "Itogi diskusii o samoopredelenii" [Summaries of a Discussion on Self Determination], he wrote: "Having rebuilt capitalism into socialism, the proletariat creates the possibility of fully eliminating national oppression. This possibility turns into reality 'only'--'only!'--with full implementation of democracy in all spheres, up to the determination of a

boundaries in accordance with the 'sympathies' of the population, and up to complete freedom of separation. On this basis, in turn, the practically absolute elimination of the slightest national frictions will develop, the elimination of the slightest national mistrust, and there will be rapid rapprochement and merging of nations, which will culminate in the dying away of the state" (Lenin, B. I., "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy", Vol 30, p 22).

8. NOVOYE VREMYA, 1986, No 41, p 5.
9. Cf. Lenin V. I. "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" Vol 38, p 217; Vol 43, p 200.
10. "Materialy XXVII s'yezda Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza" [Materials of the 27th CPSU Congress], M., 1986, p 7.
11. Ibid., p 70-71.
12. Cf. Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact Participant States. Budapest, 10-11 June 1986. M., 1986.
13. Cf. Materialy XXVII s'yezda Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza, p 71.
14. Announcement by CPSU Central Committee Secretary General M. S. Gorbachev over Soviet television, 18 August 1986. M., 1986, p 5.
15. "XVII s'yezd Kommunisticheskoy partii Chekhoslovakii" [17th Congress of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party] Prague, 24-28 March 1986. Prague, 1986, p 55.
16. Cf. High-Level Economic Conference of the CEMA Member States, 12-14 June 1984. M., 1984.
17. "Materialy XXVII s'yezda Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza, p 71.
18. Cf. "Kompleksnaya programma nauchno-tekhnicheskogo progressa stran-chlenov SEV do 2000 goda. Osnovnyye polozeniya." [Integrated Program for Scientific-Technical Progress of the CEMA Member States to the Year 2000. Basic Directives.] M., 1986.
19. "XI s'yezd Sotsialisticheskoy yedinoy partii Germanii." [11th Congress of the German Unified Socialist Party.] Address by Comrade M. S. Gorbachev. PRAVDA, 19 April 1986.
20. Cf. PRAVDA, 24 September 1986.
21. PRAVDA, 12 November 1986.
22. Ibid.
23. CPSU Program. p 12.
COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Voprosy istorii KPSS", 1987.

12322

CSO: 1807/235

66TH SESSION OF IBEC COUNCIL IN MOSCOW

Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 17, Apr 87 p 21

[TASS article: "Session of IBEC Council"]

[Text] The 66th Session of the Council of the International Bank for Economic Cooperation was held in Moscow.

Delegations from the following countries, which are Bank Council members, participated in the Council's work: the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Hungarian People's Republic, Socialist Republic of Vietnam, GDR, Republic of Cuba, Mongolian People's Republic, Polish People's Republic, Socialist Republic of Romania, USSR, and Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, as well as representatives of the CEMA Secretariat and the International Investment Bank.

Also present at the session were representatives of the People's Bank of Yugoslavia, who participated in the Council session on establishing an agreement on cooperation between IBEC and the People's Bank of Yugoslavia; representatives of the Bank of Afghanistan, Bank of Yemen (Aden), Bank of Mozambique, Bank of Finland, National Bank of Ethiopia, and Bank of International Settlements attended as observers at the invitation of the IBEC Council.

The Council discussed comprehensive measures to perfect and improve the effectiveness of the settlement-credit mechanism of the bank in convertible rubles at the new stage of socialist economic integration, strengthening its role in intensifying economic interaction among CEMA member countries, including activation of IBEC settlement-credit activity to promote the accelerated development of new priority forms of cooperation.

CSO: 18 25/191-P

BLOC SYMPOSIUM ON WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM

Moscow OBSHCHESTVENNIYE NAUKI in Russian No 1, Jan 87 pp 190-193

[Article by D. Feldman, candidate of philosophical sciences at the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics of the World Socialist System Institute: "National-State Interests Within the System of New-Style Relations"]

[Text] A symposium on this topic was held in June 1986 in Moscow by the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics of the World Socialist System Institute (IEMSS) within the framework of multilateral cooperation between the academies of sciences of the fraternal countries on the compound topic of "The World Socialist System." Participating in the symposium were 30 scientists from the PRB, HPR, GDR, PPR, USSR and CSSR.

The springboard for discussion was a collective report presented by the symposium organizers. In this report it was emphasized that the strategy of acceleration of socioeconomic development adopted by the fraternal countries will require mobilization of all internal resources. At the same time, accomplishment of the key tasks involved in acceleration will also necessitate a pooling of national resources, especially in the realm of economics. In order to understand the interaction among fraternal countries on a new level which will ensure the most efficient utilization of their total physical and intellectual potential, it is essential that the forms and methods of their cooperation be optimized. These matters should be the subject of comprehensive scientific investigation on a collective, international basis. One of the methods of approaching these questions is analysis of the conditions, principles and mechanism for realization of national-state interests within the system of socialist international relations.

Yu. Novopashin (USSR), O. Shentov (PRB), E. Borshi (HPR), [Z. Kvilich] (GDR) and V. Kiselev (CSSR) underscored that the building of socialism is a complex, multifaceted process, in the course of which the mutual influence of internal and external factors in social development intensifies. Thus, the delays and errors which occur in any one country cannot help but have an effect on cooperation between socialist countries and on their common interests. By the same token, utilization of all that is best in the experience of each country and creative application of well-proven practical methods and approaches to finding solutions to current problems are not only completely conformal to the

national-state interests of each country, but also increase the might of world socialism and aid in the realization of our states' international interests.

At the symposium the effect of various aspects of social functions on the formation, nature and realization of national-state interests of socialist countries was analyzed (analysis by N. Ananyev, PRB; E. Borshi; Ye. Ambartsumov, A. Savchenko and A. Yazkova, USSR). This analysis revealed the integral connection between the democratic nature of the political systems in those countries and the democratic nature of new-style international relations. In this connection it was emphasized that a democratic orientation in public affairs is not achieved once and for all merely by the act of a socialist revolution. It is an historical process which is defined and reinforced by the successes of socialism's socioeconomic, political and intellectual development. Attention was drawn to the mutual influence of specific forms of solutions to the nationalities question, to the actual status of nations, ethnic groups and national minorities in individual countries and to the realization of these countries' national-state interests in the international arena.

Conference participants devoted considerable attention to summarization of the historical experience of cooperation between socialist countries. G. (Chakher) (GDR), Ye. Ambartsumov, A. Bakhrameyev and F. Konstantinov (USSR), and others noted the ambiguous nature of many facts and phenomena in the history of the development of mutual relations among the fraternal countries and the need for comprehensive scientific analysis of those facts and phenomena. In particular, D. Polinski (PPR) stated that those who are attempting to exaggerate the negative aspects which were part of the application of the Soviet Union's experience by young socialist countries should not forget that in the first postwar years this model was the sole model available, and it was very difficult to determine which parts of it were unique and specific and which were universal in nature. Time and international experience with the building of a new society were required in order to realize that the same general conformances to law not only can, but actually should be realized in forms which take into account the specific features of a given country and the distinctiveness of its national-state interests.

The process of internationalization of public production was examined from the standpoint of the symposium theme. It was pointed out that the development of this process at all levels of interaction between national economic systems, and not just within the framework of those systems, should be taken into consideration. Realization of a course toward coordination of the national economic policies of CEMA countries will require the creation of an extensive network of direct organizational, scientific-technical, technological and other ties between the economic organizations of various countries. Thanks to the development of direct ties, new preconditions for increasing commonality of fraternal countries' national-state and international interests are being formed.

As some speakers (S. Stefanov and O. Shentov, PRB; A. Doronchenkov and M. Lebedev, USSR) emphasized, realization of the summit-level Economic Conference of CEMA Member Countries and of the "Comprehensive Program for the Scientific

and Technical Progress of CEMA Member Countries Until the Year 2000" will require substantial restructuring in the consciousness of those who take part in international cooperation, from workers to heads of ministries, as well as an increase in political culture, vocational skills and international tempering on the part of all levels of working people. Thus, in his presentation A. Doronchenkov noted that an incompetent, inert functionary can, as the practical embodiment of cooperation between countries, be an obstacle on the road to harmonization of national-state and international interests, disturbing the favorable political climate which is typical of the development of the new, socialist type of international relations. Incompetence in the organizing of cooperation hinders not only the implementation of internationalist principles, but also prevents the full advantages of socialism from being demonstrated.

Theoretical issues pertaining to the concept of "interest," its nature, content and role and the characteristic traits by which it is manifested in international relations were a source of lively discussion at the symposium. A. Butenko (USSR), basing his conclusions on the concept of interest as an objective category, described the factors which define the content of the national-state and international interests of socialist countries, the theoretical possibility of correlating them, and the specificity of their reflection and realization in the foreign policy concept and foreign policy course of various countries. V. Kulish (USSR), inclining toward an interpretation of interest as an objective-subjective category closely connected with those requirements of the vital activities of socialist society which comprise its social groups, devoted particular attention to the role of various interests in the development of new-style international relations. He underscored the need to approach both interests and their correlation as a motive force in the interaction and cooperation between the peoples of the socialist world.

In their arguments on behalf of and comparisons between various viewpoints, participants in the discussion attempted to discover the practical significance of theoretical concepts and avoid an abstract scholastic, non-historical approach to the issues being discussed. It was precisely from these positions, i.e. in light of the practical tasks of correlating socialist countries' interests, that contradictions within the system of socialist international relations were examined.

G. Chakher, V. Zastavny (PPR), D. Feldman (USSR) and others stated that the tendency to deny or cover up contradictions in new-style international relations, a tendency which was widespread in the past, was unfounded both in theoretical and practical terms, and has been subjected to convincing criticism both by Marxist social science and on a high political level. But today it is no longer enough to merely acknowledge the existence of these contradictions. Real life requires a creative search for ways and forms of solving them which are inherent in socialism, as well as conscious formation of such conditions as will fully encourage utilization of contradictions as a source and a motive force in the development of the new society, thus preventing them from worsening, much less growing into crises and conflicts.

One of the most timely problems for those sciences which study international relations between socialist countries is the creation of a theoretical model of the mechanism for the realization and harmonization of their national-state and international interests at the stage of economic intensification. Therefore one can understand the attention aroused by a report devoted to this problem, presented by A. Yazkova, B. Shmelev and A. Vakhrameyev (USSR). The authors of this report feel that in any consideration of the mechanism for realization of socialist countries' interests in the realm of economic cooperation today it would be incorrect to limit oneself exclusively to that sphere. It is no coincidence that in CEMA documents adopted in recent years the economic and scientific-technical aspects of cooperation have been analyzed in close connection with foreign policy issues and international security issues. As the level of economic interdependence in socialist countries' development increases, so does the significance of coordination of their foreign policy. On the whole, the process of coordination of the activities of fraternal parties and states is encompassing an ever wider range of issues and is becoming ever more detailed and efficient, encouraging ever more complete realization of their vital strategic interests, an increase in the influence of real socialism and strengthening of the cause of peace on Earth.

The socialist world is diverse and multifaceted. The peoples and states which comprise it differ one from another in terms of their levels of economic and political development, their historical and cultural traditions, and the geographical conditions under which they live. But regardless of the characteristics of any individual country, regardless of the specificity of its interests, unity among socialist countries conforms to the vital national-state interests of each of them and to their common international interests. Unity and solidarity: this is the optimal form for the functioning and development of the socialist community and the entire world socialist system. Those things which unify and close the ranks of socialist countries are primary; they are immeasurably greater in number than those things which might divide socialist countries. Therefore, the conviction that socialist countries, fully observing the principles of equality and taking mutual interests into account, will proceed along a path of ever greater mutual understanding and convergence was common to all those who addressed this symposium on "National-State Interests Within the System of New-Style International Relations."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Obshchestvennyye nauki", 1987

12825

CSO: 1807/200

BRIEFS

MARJAI, ANTONOV'S ECONOMIC TALKS--Moscow, 10 Apr (MTI)--Deputy Prime Ministers Jozsef Marjai of Hungary and Aleksey Antonov of the Soviet Union, the co-chairmen of the Hungarian-Soviet inter-governmental commission for economic and technical-scientific cooperation and permanent representatives of the two countries of the CEMA, held talks Friday in Moscow. The deputy prime ministers discussed economic and technical-scientific relations between the two countries, and timely issues of further developing socialist economic integration and the transformation of the CEMA. They evaluated the state of implementation of the inter-governmental agreement signed on December 30, 1985 on Hungarian-Soviet cooperation in the construction of projects related to the operation of the Yamburg gas field, and the gas pipe-line to be built between Yamburg and the western border of the Soviet Union, and at the petroleum and gas fields plains near the Caspian Sea, as well as the activity of the participating Hungarian and Soviet companies. The sides also defined the related further tasks. [Text] [Budapest MTI in English 1203 GMT 10 Apr 87 LD] /12624

CSO: 1825/175

NEWSWEEK ARTICLE ON USSR THIRD WORLD POLICY ASSAILED

PM281519 Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 15, 10-16 Apr 87 (Signed to Press 9 Apr 87) p 5

[A. Lobashkov article: "NEWSWEEK's Dirty Game"]

[Text] The U.S. magazine NEWSWEEK carried in a recent issue a half-page article about "Moscow's Third World" policy. Its authors are experienced journalists, including NEWSWEEK's Moscow correspondent Debbie Seward. They begin by reporting E.A. Shevardnadze's March tour of Australia, Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam and B.N. Yeltsin's visit to Nicaragua at the beginning of the same month. There is no doubt that these events were highly important in world politics. And the journalists could not have ignored them, bearing in mind that the Soviet leaders' trips evoked a broad response in the world, a response and assessments that were mainly serious and favorable. But there were also different types of response. They include NEWSWEEK's article.

Having described the visits, spicing the reports with "rumor has it" and conjectures of the "should this happen, then" type expressed by U.S. officials unwilling to give their names, NEWSWEEK draws a surprise conclusion: "Talk of economic reform and arms reduction has obscured tangible changes in Moscow's policy toward the Third World," in other words the developing states in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The description of the "essence of the changes" is done by the authors as if by divine inspiration, and they deem it beneath their dignity to cite facts or proof. The initiated will understand, and let others believe the word. The authors know from experience that this method of disseminating poisonous insinuations works. "It appears" to them (this is perfectly convincing proof for NEWSWEEK) that the Soviet Union is "shying away from its proteges in the world's poorest areas." "But on the other hand, in Latin America, Southeast Asia, and the Near East," the journal claims, "the Soviets are beckoning to wealthy developing countries that the Kremlin once scorned as hopelessly bourgeois. The Soviets are looking for countries where they can exploit anti-Americanism..."

At whom is this "it appears" aimed? Is it at people ignorant of international politics, at those who are familiar with it through sources like NEWSWEEK's article?

It is universally known that the USSR is always one of the first to defend the interests of young liberated states, regardless of the path of economic and social development they have chosen, and that it shows a readiness for mutually advantageous cooperation with them. It is sufficient to mention the hydroelectric power complexes on the Nile and the Euphrates and the metallurgical combines in Helwan and Bhilai. And now the Soviet Union is giving selfless assistance to many liberated countries on all continents.

Resorting to all sorts of fact-juggling, and at times even to downright lies, the authors strive to sow among developing countries mistrust of the Soviet Union, its peace-loving foreign policy, and its business cooperation with them. For example, the journal tries to implant in Latin American countries, and in Nicaragua in particular, the idea that "the Soviets have no intention to increase their aid." Indeed, and why should they do so? "They are in a win-win situation come what may. If the Sandinistas win, it is a triumph for the Soviets. If they lose, the Soviets could blame U.S. imperialism." A "logic" worthy of a cynical trader. The authors have evidently forgotten that for 70 years now this logic has no longer been universal in international relations.

NEWSWEEK has a different trump card to play with the Arab countries, a card that is also marked: Moscow is "actively probing for opportunities to establish relations with pro-Western countries in the Third World. Regardless of its ties to Libya and Syria, the Kremlin is flirting with the idea of restoring diplomatic relations with Israel. After all, this would give it an opportunity to compete with the United States for the role of honest broker in countries like Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia."

As far as the restoration of diplomatic relations with Israel is concerned, the USSR's stance is well known: First of all, the consequences of Israeli aggression must be eliminated. And we venture to claim that the Soviet Union is jealous least of all of the dubious laurels of the organizers of Camp David. The role of broker, even an "honest" one, is not for us. Especially since the authors of NEWSWEEK's article have a curious view of honesty, almost equivalent to baseness. And it is evidently held not only by them but also by those who prompted them to write the article entitled "Moscow's Third World Game."

Politics is not a gaming table for Moscow. It is seen like this by political cardsharps in some completely different capitals.

/12858

CSO: 1807/303

USSR ECONOMICS OFFICIAL INTERVIEWED ON JOINT VENTURES

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 17, 4 May 87 pp 18-19

[Interview with Professor Igor Faminsky, director of the National Research Institute for Foreign Economic Relations under the Foreign Economic Relations Commission of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, by NEW TIMES reporter Victor Firsov]

[Text] Firsov: Discussing joint ventures as a relatively new form of foreign economic activity for the Soviet Union, some people often mention the New Economic Policy of the 1920s, relating that period, as if were, to the 1980s. Are such associations justified?

Faminsky: Having announced the New Economic Policy, our Party set out to rehabilitate the war-ravaged economy and advance Russia to the level achieved at the time by developed capitalist countries. The joint ventures that are being launched today are called upon to play a different role, namely, to boost our participation in international specialization and coproduction. So the two periods of economic development are fundamentally different in terms of the tasks facing the country.

Firsov: Yet the experience of the New Economic Policy should not be disregarded, it seems. That policy brought out the latent reserves in our system and also helped us understand to what extent the involvement of foreign capital could be permitted without infringing on the basic principles of socialism, for instance, the state monopoly of foreign trade.

Faminsky: The monopoly of foreign trade was introduced on Lenin's initiative in 1918. The overall idea was that foreign trade should be the prerogative of the state, which was to decide what volume of foreign trade operations should be entrusted to what agencies. However, organizational structures in that field can be modified depending on the tasks facing the state at one time or another.

Incidentally, Lenin had to argue with opponents of the state monopoly of foreign trade even within the party, seeking to prove that not only a special agency (the People's Commissariat for Foreign Trade) but also other

state bodies, including those engaged exclusively in domestic trade, should contribute to foreign trade operations. Most importantly, he believed that joint-stock enterprises, mixed companies in which foreign capital would be represented as well as that of Soviet organizations, could operate on foreign markets. The decree of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee "On Foreign Trade," approved on March 13, 1922, stipulated that foreign capital could be attracted to produce export-oriented goods in the country, to market them abroad, and also to import the goods needed to rehabilitate the national economy and for the home market.

Firsov: Companies with the participation of foreign capital did not take root in our country at the time. However, foreign trade, which was very modest from the point of view of today, made it possible to involve very different enterprises and make use of many forms of cooperation.

Faminsky: Nevertheless, the view that the state monopoly of foreign trade is equivalent to a monopoly by the Ministry of Foreign Trade was current for a long time. That system of organization emerged in the 1930s, when major foreign trade associations secured the monopoly of trade in specific goods. It was a necessary measure at the time because it made it possible to concentrate trade, mostly in raw materials, under one body. But now that we are seeking not only to expand our export of manufactures, machinery and equipment but also to organize coproduction in that field, these patterns cannot satisfy us. That is why we are on the lookout for new forms. Joint ventures are one of them.

Naturally, our business contacts should not be limited to them. Direct ties between enterprises, for instance, offer equal promise. Specialization and coproduction ventures can be expanded at the level of enterprises of socialist, capitalist and developing countries. These are a new departure for us, and many problems are arising.

Firsov: The problem is, apparently, that our interests and those of our potential partners far from always coincide.

Faminsky: Western partners often think that joint ventures will enable them to make inroads into our market and thus boost their profits. But such a one-sided orientation of joint ventures would merely increase our hard currency spending, which could result in balance-of-payment deficits vis-a-vis other countries unless exports grow accordingly. That is why joint ventures should export a part of their output to buy raw materials and equipment both on the domestic market and abroad and transfer funds outside the country as profit, wages for foreign personnel, etc.

The state cannot and must not interfere in the operations of joint ventures just as it has no obligation to meet their hard currency expenses. That is why the main principle is self-sufficiency in hard currency. The task is not only to meet the demand of the domestic market with the help of such ventures but also to upgrade production standards and produce more competitive goods to boost exports.

Firsov: But sometimes it is expedient to set up joint ventures which do not fully meet their currency expenses. Instead, they will make it possible substantially to curtail imports and thus help save hard currency reserves.

Faminsky: It stands to reason that, if a joint venture produces goods on a mass scale that are not manufactured by Soviet industry but imported by the U.S.S.R. in large quantities, this will help cut back hard currency expenses.

Firsov: What then is your view of the profitability of joint ventures and the incentives to them?

Faminsky: The tax rate for joint ventures is 30 per cent of the gross profit plus a 20 per cent tax if the foreign partner wishes to transfer his profit abroad. Is it a lot or little?

Joint ventures should be established in our territory if their profits at least average the overall profitability rate in our country which is 14-15 per cent. At this rate, the net profit transferred by the foreign partner abroad will be 7-8 per cent. If the foreign partner chooses to reinvest it in the U.S.S.R., it will be higher, roughly 10 per cent, because the 20 per cent transfer tax will not be levied. If the actual profit proves higher than the average, which is very possible as joint ventures will use efficient technology and processes, foreign partners will earn even bigger profits. Meanwhile, a net profit of 7-8 and even 5 percent is considered quite satisfactory in the West.

Firsov: But if we want to attract foreign investors, we should offer them better terms than those offered by other countries.

Faminsky: We think our terms are quite favourable. Moreover, there is a two-year exemption from all taxes. It is not much, of course, in view of our construction schedules. But, first this should stimulate speedier construction and the early organization of production. Second, when it comes to capital- and science-intensive types of production, which call for greater investment in the early years, joint ventures can claim additional tax privileges.

Firsov: But in Hungary, for instance, joint ventures in some industries are exempt from taxes for five years and pay a 20 per cent tax beginning with the sixth year.

Faminsky: We should remember that our market has some advantages over the markets of other countries: it is immense and has huge raw material resources. This explains interest in our proposals: we have already more than 200 applications for joint ventures from different companies.

I think initially a limited number of joint ventures will be established. Their practice has to be assessed and their operation analyzed in the context of our economy.

It cannot be ruled out that new problems, which we have not yet mentioned, will arise, such as contractual prices and their relationship to the fluctuation of world prices.

Firsov: But what about the ebb and flow of politics? Cooperation with the West in such high-tech fields as electronics, robotics, and laser technology is blocked by the restrictions of COCOM, NATO's Coordinating Committee for Control of Strategic Exports to Communist Countries. It appears that only companies manufacturing consumer goods and farm products and engaged in the public services can be considered dependable partners.

Faminsky: No, they do not exhaust the list. Proposals are now under discussion to establish joint ventures in the chemical, engineering and timber industries. Of course, Western restrictions on the transfer of advanced technology and processes are holding back potential partners, and many Western companies are questioning their politicians about the rationality of such restrictions. Indeed, those companies are not only losing profits but have no access to Soviet scientific and technological achievements.

Firsov: True, it is admitted in the West that Soviet science is sufficiently developed and even leads the world in some areas of fundamental research. However, we sometimes lack the experience needed for introducing technical novelties in mass production as quickly as possible and for marketing them. Foreign companies have plenty of experience in this respect and the marriage of our scientific achievements and foreign experience of mass production and marketing is one of the most promising areas of joint business activity. Are there any proposals from Western companies for the establishment of joint ventures on this basis?

Faminsky: I think the initiative in this respect should come from us. We ourselves should offer technological novelties and attract foreign partners to organize their production and marketing. In my view, industries and organizations that are concerned with scientific and technological research should pay more attention to this aspect of foreign economic activity. The State Committee for Science and Technology, for instance, could work harder in that field. Naturally, we should borrow foreign experience too.

In the past few years, for instance, there have emerged in the West several development, engineering, marketing and consultation firms, some of them quite small, which could well be attracted to promoting our scientific and technological novelties on the world market.

This area of cooperation also seems promising for both sides. Generally speaking, there are many other fields of business cooperation in which a fresh approach could lead to mutually advantageous projects. We are ready for such cooperation. It is a long-range policy.

/8309

CSO: 1812/178

PROBLEMS IN RECOUPING COST OF IMPORTED EQUIPMENT

Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 19 Mar 87 p 2

[Article by M. Aleksandrov, sector chief of the KNK SSSR (USSR State Committee of People's Control), and A. Chupakhin, special correspondent of SELSKAYA ZHIZN: "Millions Thrown Off Course, or a Sad Story of How Imported Equipment, which was Acquired with a Considerable Sum of Money, is Turned into Scrap Metal"]

[Text] Modern land improvement and construction equipment costs a lot. This is readily understood: high-capacity highly productive machines and mechanisms are difficult to make. Those that are purchased abroad cost even more. Of course, we get the very best, on the expectation of quick recovery through intensive operation. For example, several concrete placing complexes were acquired for cash--these are real mobile plants for building main canals. Moving along the side of a ditch, they leave a level concrete roadbed behind them. Such productivity and quality cannot be achieved by any other known methods as yet.

However, the cost of such machine-plants is expressed in figures with many zeros. A complex of the American Rayco firm, which is now on the balance of the Glavsredvolgovodstroy, cost the state, that is you and us, R3.9 million in foreign currency! Organizations of the same main administration, bearing in mind the importance of land improvement in the central Volga region, were supplied two more similar complexes--of American and West German production.

So the money was paid and the equipment was delivered to place of work. What is next? "Next we will be standing still," the builders of the canal, who operate the Rayco firm's complex, said with indignation. Why? There is no concrete.

When the concrete was finally delivered, it turned out that there was no crushed rock. Next day fellow workers did not prepare the "field of operations." Then operating problems in mechanisms cropped up.

It turns out that there are three times as many downtime days than work days in a year, when the most powerful machine, figuratively speaking, sleeps on the side of the canal.

By no means are other complexes utilized any better. Another one (of American production) was unable to move even 3 km along the canal in 2 years with the

means to move 9 km a year. Unskilled maintenance has reduced it, as they say, to a hopeless condition. A complex of the West German Alkons firm is also in fact inoperative. One cannot seriously call the monthly warm-ups a year as operation of the machine, and more so with a productivity that is one-half below the norm.

Other imported equipment is also used inefficiently, if not miserably, in subdivisions of the main administration. For example, high-capacity loaders, which were purchased in Poland and Czechoslovakia, or excavators-levellers, which were imported from the GDR. Careless storage in winter also brings these machines to rapid wear. At PMK-36 a universal loader valued at R27,000 was stored without the mud stuck on its wheels being cleaned and without their pneumatic tires painted with a light shielding compound. The engine part was also not prepared in a proper manner. There were no seats in the cab and instruments of the control panel were broken. At PMK-46 a similarly sad sight was revealed by an excavator-leveller, which cost the state R50,000.

The treatment of expensive imported equipment in the Glavsredvolgovoostroy cannot be called any other way than irresponsible. At the Engelsk Assembly Products Plant alone automated pumping stations valued at more than R5 million are lying in the open and become unfit for use!

And here is what happens, when following, if one could call it that, safekeeping they are finally installed. Automation devices do not work on 34 of the 69 stationary pumping stations produced by the Sigma concern (CSSR) which were assembled and put into operation in sovkhoses and kolkhozes during the past 10 years. The expenditure of R500,000 to acquire them turned out to be in vain.

In order to somehow relieve itself of responsibility, the main administration turned over a part of mobile electrified pumping stations to farms, which do not even have plans for developing and improving land and supplying electric power to irrigated sectors. Seven such stations in the imeni Radishchev sovkhos and four more in the imeni Komintern and imeni Shchors kolkhozes in Krasnokutskiy Rayon have been lying in a heap of scrap metal for more than 2 years.

One of the important directions in land improvement today is closed drainage. Its extensive introduction depends on mass use of plastic pipes. Imported equipment was purchased to produce them. It would seem that it should have been put to use as quickly as possible. But, no! Irresponsible-indifferent attitude of the Glavsredvolgovoostroy, which is headed by I. P. Kuznetsov, has led to disruption in commissioning of a specialized shop under construction in Novouzensk for the preparation of granules from polyvinylchloride and production of corrugated pipes from it. This means that the equipment which arrived from Poland and for which more than R5 million was paid will remain inoperative for a long time.

It is sad, but everything said about Volga area land reclamation workers also applies to those who are conducting work in the nonchernozem zone. The value of imported equipment at the Glavnechernozemvostroy reaches R17 million. It

includes that which has already been assembled and that which has been waiting its turn for more than its first year. For example, 37 lines of corrugated drainage pipes from polymeric materials have been assembled, but instead of a steady flow of production reports are arriving from enterprises about breakdowns, unforeseen delays in delivery of raw materials, and so forth. But even when the lines are operating they are turning out products of very poor quality.

In 1985-86, three lines in a Pechora testing ground shop of the Smolenskmelioratsiya Association stood idle almost half of the working time. Preparatory work has not been mechanized there and production premises are cluttered up. One need not be surprised that out of a dozen of models of corrugated pipes not even one corresponds to technical conditions. In fact the same is true in the Shilovskoye Stroyindustriya Association, the Pskovvodstroykonstruktsiya Association, and at the Yaroslavskiy Reinforced Concrete Products and Pressure Pipes Plant.

In conclusion we would like to say that a great share of the blame for all of the aforementioned shortcomings lies with the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources. Lack of control has led to the fact that the 4-year old order of the minister with regard to developing capacities for the production of corrugated pipes from polyvinylchloride, which was issued, by the way, on the basis of a government resolution, has not been fulfilled up to now. Quite often production equipment which was purchased is distributed without knowledge of the situation locally. Thus, two production lines were shipped to the Glavsredvolgovodstroy in 1984, which were turned over to the Minvodkhoz of Belorussia a year later owing to lack of need. The ministry has not established output norms and service periods for basic earth-moving and construction machines which purchased through import.

For implementing the broad program of land reclamation the state spares no funds for construction organizations of the USSR Minvodkhoz. Not only equipment produced domestically but large volumes of foreign equipment is purchased for them. More than R315 million were spent for this purpose during the 11th 5-Year Plan alone. However, the return from currency investments, as shown by inspection, cannot even be called satisfactory.

9817

CSO: 1825/149

CZECH NEWSPAPERMAN ON USSR REFORMS

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 17, 4 May 87 pp 16-17

[Article by Zdenek Horeni, editor-in-chief of Czechoslovak newspaper RUDE PRAVO]

[Text] Along with Comrade Grajneder's letter, the editors of NEW TIMES forwarded to me a letter from Elsa Jors of the F.R.G. who, recalling the "Prague spring" of 1968, longs for "socialism with a human face" and asserts that now, in launching the restructuring drive, the Soviet Union is having second thoughts about what happened in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and Poland in 1980. The spirit of these two letters is poles apart. But let us try to sort things out.

To begin with, a few words about what socialism with "a human face" really is.

It has become increasingly clear with the passage of time that the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and Poland in 1956 and 1980 were nothing short of counterrevolution. Their purpose was not to improve socialism, but to eliminate it. It is true that in those years counterrevolutionaries donned socialist garb because they preferred not to show their true colours.

Drawing upon the experience of the international communist and working-class movement, Lenin exposed those reactionaries who, while fighting socialism from within, pretended to support it. Anti-communism resort to this tactic whenever it cannot act against socialism in the open. In such cases the reactionaries use a wide range of methods of [words indistinct] warfare, and all to the same end--to revitalize revisionism. This was true of Hungary and Poland in the mid-fifties, Czechoslovakia in the late sixties and Poland again in 1980.

It is important to note that anti-socialist forces in socialist garb often try to discredit Marxist-Leninist parties by using the same trick--exploiting the mistakes and shortcomings admitted to and denounced by these parties themselves!

This was the case in Hungary, as confirmed by documents. In March 1955 the Central Committee of the Hungarian Working People's Party condemned erroneous industrialization and farm collectivization practices in the country and adopted the correct resolution on the need to fight leftist dogmatists and breakers of socialist laws. Unfortunately, Hungarian Communists were prevented from carrying this resolution out at the time.

This was also the case in Poland, when anti-socialist forces took advantage of the working people's discontent and provoked disturbances in the country in October 1956. There, too, they capitalized on the conclusions drawn by the Polish United Workers' Party on the need to remedy the mistakes identified at the Central Committee's plenary meeting in March.

Czechoslovakia went through the same experience in the sixties. In our country progress towards socialism has not been plain sailing either. Problems arose, solutions were found, but mistakes and tragic delusions were rectified unacceptably slowly. A discussion in the run-up to the 13th Congress of the CPCZ in 1966 revealed many of our miscalculations in the building of socialism. However, the decisions of the congress were never fully implemented. The right availed themselves of our tardiness and launched a campaign to revise the general line of the Party, undermine the principles on which it was organized and destroy the political and economic structure of socialism. The hypocritical slogan "socialism with a human face" mentioned by Frau Jors was used by right-wing demagogues merely as a mask. The baiting of honest Communists and other supporters of socialism was graphic evidence of this, as it was subsequently in Poland. In 1956 Hungarian counterrevolutionaries went so far as to shoot Communists openly in the streets.

Comrade Grajneder and others of my compatriots go to the other extreme: they are afraid lest the new trends in the U.S.S.R. cause it to stray from socialist principles. Are there any grounds for such apprehensions?

The purpose of the reform now under way in the U.S.S.R. is to stir all the links in the political system to greater activity and to draw the population in running the affairs of society on a wider scale, to improve Soviet democracy and implement in ever fuller measure socialist self-government of the people through getting them and their work collectives and organizations actively to participate in state and public life. Is this incompatible with socialism?

You fear the consequences of self-government. But doesn't the practice of self-government (of which the Communist Party is the organizing force) underlie the functioning of the entire political system, particularly that of the Soviets of People's Deputies? Soviet Communists admit that the activity of the Soviets has recently failed to keep pace with the imperatives of the time, that their prestige as government bodies has begun to dwindle and that their economic and legal authority has diminished. Now, in the course of restructuring, these shortcomings are being resolutely removed through the democratization of the Soviets. This is being done on the party's own initiative and by its own purposeful effort. Any destruction of socialism is therefore out of the question.

Restructuring has extended the rights of work collectives in the U.S.S.R. and stepped up their productive and political activity. The principles of democratic centralism in economic management are being persistently put into practice, and socialist enterprise is being encouraged in every way. Industrial plants are being granted ever broad rights, including that of electing their own managers.

Do you regard this as detrimental to socialism. On the contrary, this practice strengthens socialism, helps eradicate laxity and irresponsibility, and brings greater order to production. Promoting the economic independence of work collectives is essential in improving the entire system of production management and planning. This is also being done in the U.S.S.R. today.

The Soviet Union is improving other forms of democracy as well: more heed is being paid to public opinion than was previously the case; features that adversely affect the work of the state machinery, work collectives and public organizations are being removed. Does all this run counter to the principles of socialism?

It is the Party, I repeat, rather than any other force, that is directing the process of restructuring, strengthening and developing socialism as a political system, consolidating the legal standards and improving the state machinery and economic mechanism. It is the Party that is encouraging by its own example openness in public and state affairs....

Indeed, this is a real revolution in the whole system of public relations, as well as in the minds of the people, their mentality and their understanding of the problems posed by tempestuous scientific and technological progress. So how can anyone draw a parallel between it and the activities of counter-revolutionary forces that professed a desire to improve socialism in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary while being, in fact, determined to destroy it!

And one last thing--private property. Neither the U.S.S.R. nor we in Czechoslovakia are going to revoke the collective management of production and the distribution of national wealth. What we are trying to do is to run the economy more efficiently. We want to improve the socialist principles on which the progress of our society is based. But those who adhere to the cause of socialism need have no fear of the consequences of these reforms. On the contrary, it is our adversaries who will have to do the worrying.

/8309

CSO: 1812/179

COMMENTARY ON U.S. PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 87 p 5

[Article by Yu. Kuznetsov: "Puffing Out One's Chest"]

[Text] From across the ocean we get reports about the preparations which have begun there for election of the next chief resident of the White House. There are already a lot of candidates. The republicans are especially active.

The representatives of their administration, as we know, have severely damaged their reputation in Washington. And now, when the question is being decided as to whether any of them should be pretenders to the office which allows one to move into the White House, certain Republicans have decided for some reason that they must show themselves off by staging anti-communist and anti-soviet hysteria.

One of the most ardent stagers is the Reverend Pat Robertson, a well-known (in the USA) television preacher. What is he known for? Primarily for his bold political contentions. Having entered the race for the presidency, he has proclaimed, no more and no less, that his goal is "to eliminate communism once and for all in all regions of the world, including the Soviet Union."

What? What kind of reverend is this?! So he wants to devour all communism. Only, as they say, who will let him? But this is another eparchy.

Aside from the above-named cult server, other non-reverend Republicans have also entered the race for the administrative throne. As the newspaper PHILADELPHIA ENQUIRER noted, they "are making active efforts to outdo each other in their anti-communist rhetoric and expression of mistrust of the Soviet leadership."

Former Secretary of State A. Haig decided to strike us in the very heart. "What kind of reforms are these in the USSR?", he grimaced. "Why, these are simply 'atmospheric disturbances'!"

It seems, though, that Haig really is worried by something. Could it be that he is worried about the disturbances to his personal career? In any case, he puffed out his chest and warned with all his state wisdom how dangerous it is to "make concessions to the Soviets."

Evidently, in U.S. right-wing circles they now even classify leading Republicans by how loudly they are willing to proclaim their pretensions. The criterion is who will yell in the most heart-rending manner, and most importantly, in the most unusual manner, condemning the pernicious Marxist ideology in general and its fiend--the Soviets, in particular.

So Representative Jack Kemp, member of the house of representatives ("so as not to let himself be surpassed," maliciously remarks the above-named newspaper), proclaims: "You know, the Soviets approach arms control very much like Andy Warhol approaches art. After all, it was he who said that art is a sphere of activity where you can go unpunished."

About art--that was very clever of Kemp. I even recalled one incident which happened in a madhouse. It is generally well known, but is very appropriate here. Well, it seems that the patients there were also very much involved in art. They were discussing the last book they had read. Some spoke with a knowledge of the matter. Some said that although it wasn't bad, it had almost no lyrics. Some complained that there weren't enough war scenes. And one kept worrying that there were too many characters. Finally, the nurse came and said: "Alright, impaired ones, give back the phone book!"

So you see how the jolly company sits: the valiant and reverend P. Robertson together with the valiant (although a congressman) J. Kemp and others. They sit and worry: oh, there are too many names on the list of Republican candidates. Oh, it would be good to add some war scenes to world politics. And so on and so forth.

Everyone puffs out his chest as much as he can, everyone works on the public: here, they say, is who you need.

The publisher of the newspaper MANCHESTER UNION LEADER, N. Loyb described the kind of candidate that the Republicans need. "We need a man who will take a decisive anti-communist position, since force is the only thing the communists respect". And he added: "Sweet words and arms control agreements are only a means of wrapping our country around their little finger."

Generally speaking, in practice--how can we say this most tactfully?--there are rather strong traditions in the United States of garbling their own and other people's views and intentions. This reminds me of the story which some Swedish friends told me.

Once a Stockholm bishop went to the USA on business.

"Be careful with the American journalists," they warned the priest. There they will write anything for the sake of sensationalism.

Therefore, when an impudent reporter from a local newspaper asked the bishop the leading question: "Aren't you going to visit some night spots for entertainment?", the latter cautiously asked, "Why, are there such places here?"

The next day the newspaper printed an interview on the front page bearing the bold headline: "First question of the Swedish bishop: Are there night spots for entertainment in New York?"

Need we say more?

In this case, probably, yes. But now let's imagine that the visiting priest and the unpardonable pen-pusher who was pursuing only his own monetary gain, suddenly exchanged places. What would we have? Why, we would have a reverend who, pursuing his own gain, like P. Robertson, is capable of saying anything, even something that is a scandalous provocation, and not only in the personal-moral sphere, but also in the sphere of general politics.

And so we would like to shout: "Hey, where are you, impudent reporter? How can you compare with P. Robertson and his company!"

12322

CSO: 1807/231

THREAT OF U.S. MILITARISM REVIEWED

Tbilisi KOMMUNIST GRUZII in Russian No 12, Dec 86 pp 86-89

[Article by S. Bakanidze under the rubric "International Life": "The USA--Imperialism's Locomotive"]

[Text] Militarism is a system of political, economic and ideological means used by the exploitative classes to increase their military might, to prepare for wars of aggression and to suppress the resistance of the oppressed masses within the country. "Modern militarism," V.I. Lenin wrote, "is... 'a vital manifestation' of capitalism: both a military force used by capitalist states in their external conflicts... and a weapon in the hands of the dominant classes for suppressing any kind of movement (economic or political) of the proletariat...." ("PSS" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 17, p 187)

In the political report to the 27th CPSU Congress, Comrade M.S. stated: "Militarism is expanding the arms race to an incredible degree, attempting, step by step, to take over also the political reins of power. It is becoming the most hideous and dangerous monster of the 20th Century. Through its efforts, the most advanced scientific and technological thinking is being fused into a weapon of mass destruction."

The distinguishing features of contemporary militarism are most graphically illustrated in the example of the United States of America, which, the 27th party congress pointed out, continues to be the locomotive of imperialism. It is American imperialism which is presently the main agent of the misanthropic militaristic ideology, the immediate source of the danger of war and the initiator of armed intervention and international terrorism.

According to an official publication, "Istoriya amerikanskoy armii" [A History of the American Army], the United States carried out around 50 military actions and armed attacks on other peoples from the beginning of this century to World War II. Studies by the Brookings Institute in Washington have shown that in the pursuit of its political goals, the USA has used armed forces 215 times and been prepared to use nuclear weapons 33 times, including four times directly against the Soviet Union. From 1975 to the present the White House has resorted to aggressive acts and shows of force 50 times for "backing up" its foreign policy. Billions of dollars robbed from many peoples of the world, including its own, have been spent on all of this.

How right V.I. Lenin was when he wrote in a letter to the American workers on 20 August 1918 that there are traces of blood on every dollar!

Taking advantage of the difficult situation which the capitalist nations found themselves in following World War II, U.S. monopolistic capital set out on a path of extensive economic expansion. By means of the Marshall Plan and the policy of "economic cooperation," it assumed the dominant position in the economies of a large number of nations. The center of militarism shifted to the United States, which became the world policeman and the main enemy of the liberation movement of peoples. American imperialism became a bulwark of international reaction, and the danger of war comes precisely from it, the new edition of the CPSU Program states.

The sorry new aspirants to world supremacy know very well that the Soviet Union is the main obstacle on the path to their accomplishment of their imperial ambitions. And it was certainly no accident that during the final phase of World War II plans were already being hatched up in certain influential circles of the West for using prostrated Germany against the USSR and the growing forces of socialism and democracy, and attempts were made to reverse the progressive course of history. This is why the imperialists thwarted the Potsdam Agreement. Led by the United States, they set out on a path of dangerous adventures, a struggle against the socialist system, and the formation of military blocs.

...An American document ratified on 3 November 1945, LS-329, called for the dropping of atomic bombs on 20 cities of the Soviet Union by B-29 "Flying Fortresses" of the 383 Air Group. American militarism continued planning for nuclear strikes in the decades which followed, as it is still doing today.

As the staging area for implementing these barbarous plans American strategists selected more than 1,500 military bases and installations located on the territories of 32 states, where more than 500,000 American servicemen are permanently stationed. They created the so-called "Rapid Deployment Force" for interfering in the affairs of other states, primarily nations of the Near and Middle East. The United States has a military base with nuclear weapons at its disposal on the island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. In addition, it has held on to the naval base at Guantanamo, which belongs to Cuba. American militarists use around 25 military installations on the African continent (in the Republic of South Africa, Liberia and Morocco) and on adjacent islands. The USA is linked with Oman, Somalia and Kenya by agreement on the use of and the modernization of military bases, and the construction of new ones on the territories of those nations. The Americans have long been the bosses at bases and airfields of Saudi Arabia, Egypt and a number of other nations. It has acquired also the unlimited right to use Israel's military bases under a "strategic cooperation" agreement.

Most of the U.S. military bases are located near the borders of the Soviet Union and other socialist commonwealth nations, mainly in Western Europe, to which particular importance is attached as a result of its strategic location and economic strength, and of close economic and political ties.

We can see that the strategic plans of the American militarists are directed toward creating a so-called nuclear belt around our nation to protect them against

a retaliatory strike. With respect to the future of those peoples on whose territories the American military bases are located, it is appropriate to recall W. Churchill's words back in 1951, when he unambiguously warned the leaders of a number of capitalist nations: "We must not forget that by building an American base... we are turning ourselves into a target, perhaps the center of a target." ("Militarizm: tsifry i fakty" [Militarism: Facts and Figures], Moscow, 1985, p 16)

The building or enlargement of military bases on the territories of foreign states is a component of the expansionist, militaristic course of the White House, which is directed toward the achievement of world domination. "America is nation No. 1... the American military forces must be unsurpassed," proclaims the political platform of the Republican Party now in power in the USA. The entire foreign and domestic policy of this administration demonstrates that militarism has become firmly established in the minds of ruling circles of the United States. As early as 1918 V.I. Lenin stated in his work, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautskiy," that imperialism "is distinguished by the least love of peace and freedom, by the greatest and most universal development of the military." ("PSS," Vol 37, p 248)

The business of war and the frenzied arms race is subordinated to capitalism's basic economic law, manifested in a striving for maximum profits. Capitalist military production is the foundation of militarism. V.I. Lenin had precisely the monopolists in the business of military industry in mind when he said that "the shower of gold pours directly into the pockets of the bourgeois politicians, who form a close-knit international gang spurring peoples toward competition in the weapons business...." ("PSS," Vol 19, p 83)

The military corporations are even now being enriched by unprecedented amounts by taking the arms race into space. The newspaper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR describes the plan for militarizing space as "the Pentagon's last gold vein in the 20th Century." It is enough just to cite the following figures. The experts calculate that it will cost from 100 to 500 billion dollars (not counting the research costs) to create (sozdaniye) the laser stations consisting of 18-50 space platforms for the Strategic Defense Initiative system. And the total cost of the program for creating (sozdaniye) a single-layer ABM system, in the opinion of the experts, will exceed 500 billion dollars.

Military production therefore constitutes enormous business for the American capitalists. When President Eisenhower, in a letter of 17 January 1961, called the combining of the monopolistic nucleus of military business with the state militaristic apparatus of the USA the "military-industrial complex," the Pentagon's budget was only 43 billion dollars. Military outlays have grown 7-fold since then. Military outlays presently approved by the Congress amount to almost 300 billion dollars. These outlays are far greater, of course, when other items for militaristic purposes in the budget are added. We know, for example, that billions of dollars are allocated to the Department of Energy for the production of nuclear weapons. In addition, Congress has provided for the creation of a special fund to be used by the President if he finds a way to supplement the Treasury from additional sources. The Pentagon also has sizeable carry-overs from past budgets, whose expenditure extends beyond the framework of a fiscal year. According to press figures, these "remnants" presently amount to 142 billion dollars. And so, the Defense Department alone will have 430-440 billion dollars at its disposal in the new fiscal year.

The population of the United States of America comprises 5 percent of the people on Earth, while their outlays for military purposes account for more than one third of these outlays for all the world's states. G. Kennan made the witty comment that military business has become "a sort of national economic addiction."

The U.S. military economy is the largest in the capitalist world. It accounts for a considerably greater portion of military production than America's portion of the capitalist world's industrial output. The United States accounts for more than three quarters of the total production of aircraft and missiles, almost half of the artillery weapons production, and more than two thirds of the ship-building of the NATO nations. Militarization has embraced all of America. More than 70 percent of all the funds allocated for research and development today goes for military orders. Total outlays for military research have increased 62 percent since 1981, while allocations for civilian research have been reduced by 10 percent. A total of 44 billion dollars will be spent on research and development for military purposes in fiscal year 1987. The USA is also the world's largest supplier of weapons.

The constantly growing profits from the production of implements of death are making it possible for the U.S. military-industrial complex to advance its henchmen and impose its will upon them in various nations. Six of the 10 leading U.S. military corporations--Rockwell, Lockheed, Northrop Aircraft, McDonnell Douglas, Lyton and Hughes--operate in California. They are the ones who put Reagan into the White House. One only has to consider the fact that the Pentagon has eclipsed all of the other departments of the Washington administration, including the State Department, with respect to importance and influence.

The military-industrial complex is not only establishing a cult of the cudgel in the nation, but is also doing everything possible to make military force the dominant element in U.S. foreign policy. Should we be surprised, then, by the bandit-like attack on Grenada, the interference in Lebanon's internal affairs, acts of provocation against revolutionary Nicaragua and Cuba, and other hostile acts by the United States against sovereign states? By the extensive propagandizing of militaristic ideology for purposes of instilling unbridled anticommunism, great-power chauvinism and undisguised racism in the minds of the American people? By the stubborn disinclination to halt nuclear weapons testing, despite the Soviet program for their phased elimination by the end of our century, and other peace initiatives?

And so, can militarism's spree, which is pushing mankind toward nuclear catastrophe, be halted or not? Intelligence will undoubtedly prevail over the dark forces of reaction. As Comrade M.S. Gorbachev has stated, social progress and civilization must go on. The danger hanging over mankind because of imperialism's reactionary, militaristic, aggressive course has never been as menacing as it is today. "But there have also never before been such realistic possibilities for preserving and strengthening peace. By uniting their efforts, peoples can and must parry the danger of nuclear destruction," states the new edition of the CPSU Program.

11499

CSO: 1807/215

U.S. MICRONESIAN POLICY DENOUNCED

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS In English No 2, Feb 87 pp 105-109, 118

[Article by Oleg Kurochkin]

[Text]

The United States administration has defied the international community yet again. The White House has issued a special presidential proclamation giving a new status to three of the four parts of the UN Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands known as Micronesia: the Northern Mariana Islands are to enter into a "commonwealth with the United States" and the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia into "free association" with the USA. It is claimed that the USA has thereby fulfilled its trusteeship obligations.

Shortly before this demarche of the White House, the US permanent representative at the UN had "informed" the Secretary-General about an agreement between Washington, on the one hand, and the three Micronesian formations, on the other, regarding a timetable for bringing fully into effect the agreements on the new status imposed by the USA on these parts of the Trust Territory. Simultaneously, the US representative informed the UN Secretary-General about the intention to notify him when Washington after suppressing the resistance of the fourth part of Micronesia --the Palau Islands-- forced it to agree to "free association" and set a date for the Compact to come into force.

These actions by the White House and the US permanent representative at the UN are the final act of Washington's scenario for annexing the Trust Territory by imposing a semi-colonial status on the Micronesians and presenting the UN, which is responsible for this territory, with a fait accompli. This act aimed at imposing a neo-colonialist regime on Micronesia and thereby denying it the possibility to gain genuine independence was rightly qualified in a TASS Statement as unilateral, arbitrary and illegal.

The United States operated behind the back of the Security Council, which, under Article 83 of the UN Charter, exercises "all functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and their alteration or amendment," and is the only body that has the right to revoke trusteeship.

Following the Second World War, an international trusteeship system was established to govern the former League of Nations mandated territories so as to prepare them for self-government or independence, and Micronesia, which used to be a Japanese possession, came under UN trusteeship.

In 1947 the UN Security Council granted the United States the mandate to govern this strategic territory temporarily. Since it became the "administering authority" in the UN Trust Territory (almost 40 years ago), the USA has not fulfilled either the requirements of the UN Charter regarding trust territories or its obligations under the trusteeship agreement between the Security Council, on behalf of the UN, and the US government. Instead of carrying out its commitments to help the population to attain independent political and economic status, Washington immediately set out to perpetuate its control over Micronesia by making it, in the words of prominent American politicians Gary Hart a "military colony of the United States".

Micronesia is situated north of the equator in the western Pacific and includes three archipelagos—Mariana, Marshall and Caroline Islands—with a population of 136,000. The 2,000 islands and atolls of Micronesia have a total land area of just 1,854 sq km, but its marine area is an enormous 7.8 million sq km. Even before it received the UN mandate, the Americans regarded Micronesia primarily as a convenient location for testing nuclear and other weapons and as a Pentagon bridgehead in the Pacific. In all, between 1946 and 1958 the USA conducted 66 nuclear explosions on the Bikini and Eniwetok atolls in the Marshall Islands. The "governors" from Washington were not the least concerned about what happened to the indigenous Micronesians: they were driven from their native atolls so that atomic explosions could be freely conducted. When the Pentagon decided to make the lagoon of Kwajalein Atoll a target for intercontinental ballistic missile launches, it forced the islanders to move to other, less habitable atolls, condemning them to a pitiful half-starved and miserable existence.

But the Pentagon got what it wanted. Tests were carried out there of hundreds of ICBMs launched from the US Vandenberg air force base in California, ballistic missiles launched from submarines, and MX, Minuteman and Trident strategic systems. The Americans have also cast Micronesia an important role in the Star Wars programme. *Washington Post* military observer Walter Pincus wrote in August 1986 that the Pentagon planned constructing a new military space complex on Kwajalein Atoll in early 1987.

While transforming Micronesia into a testing site and military bridgehead, the USA ignored the fact that under Article 84 of the UN Charter its duty as the administering authority in the Trust Territory is to "ensure that the Trust Territory shall play its part in the maintenance of international peace and security".

Feeling threatened with the loss of Micronesia through decolonisation, Washington elaborated the annexation scenario. In talks with representatives of the Micronesians begun in the late 1960s, the USA offered them the semi-colonial status of a "commonwealth" on termination of the UN trusteeship. The Micronesians quite justifiably rejected this proposal, saying that they desired independence. On October 8, 1972 *The New York Times* wrote: "Increasing demands for independence in Micronesia... have stalled negotiations between United States officials and Micronesian leaders on the future political status of the scenic islands and atolls".

However, Washington did not even want to hear about the Trust Territory's independence and set out to divide it and absorb it bit by bit. First, the USA split off the Northern Marianas, imposing on them in 1975 a Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States under which all defence matters (including the right to use the islands for military purposes for 50 years) and foreign relations of the Northern Marianas were

handed over to Washington, with the islands gaining "local self-government". In 1976 the US Congress approved the deal. In a February 28, 1976 editorial eloquently entitled "American Marianas", *The New York Times* wrote: "Congress acquiesced this week in the first outright territorial annexation by the United States in a half century".

Actively encouraged by the USA, the remaining Territory split into three component parts. The islanders were ruthlessly pressured, and when the promised economic "benefits" did not help, the American "rulers" used open intimidation. As a result, the Compact of Free Association, an agreement common to the three formations and envisaging to grant them the status of "free association" with the USA on termination of the UN trusteeship was initialled by the US President's personal representative, on the one hand, and representatives of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), the Marshall Islands and the Palau Islands, on the other, in 1980 and signed in 1982. The agreement promised Micronesians "internal self-government" while it gave the US government "all the powers and responsibility for their security and defense". The status of "Free Association" makes the Micronesians fully dependent on the United States. Counselor of the Department of State and Chairman of the Interagency Group on Micronesia, Edward Derwinski was forced to admit at hearings of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives: "By virtue of the plenary US authority for defence and security matters [the Freely Associated States] would not possess attributes of statehood sufficient for admission to the UN".

Highly indicative from the viewpoint of Washington's objectives in annexing Micronesia is Section 314 of the Compact of Free Association, which, under the terms of the additional agreement, allows the USA in Micronesia to test by explosion or destroy any nuclear weapons; to test, destroy or discharge any poisonous chemical or biological weapon; and to test, destroy or discharge any radioactive, poisonous chemical or biological materials. The Pentagon may also—under the additional agreement—store US chemical weapons and radioactive materials on the islands. Just how ephemeral is the provision for "the additional agreement" is made clear by the above statement by Edward Derwinski about unqualified US powers on defence and security matters: there is no doubt that no one is even going to ask the islanders.

But even this was not enough for the Pentagon, which got the government to conclude a series of "additional agreements" with the Micronesians setting out specifically on which atolls, islands, bays and lagoons the Washington military intended to build new military bases, airfields, depots and other military installations, and where they intended to expand ones already in existence.

The Americans used many and varied devices to get the general agreement for all three formations and the additional agreements approved in the referendums which they organised on the FSM and the Marshall Islands. The Palau islanders rejected the agreement: the section giving the USA the right to test and store nuclear, chemical or biological weapons and radioactive and poisonous chemical and biological substances in Micronesia, and also to bury such materials there is contrary to the Palau Constitution. The US demanded that the Constitution be changed but the islanders did not give in under pressure. Eventually, even though it had to modify the "Compact of Free Association" and promise the Palau representatives not to use, test, store or dispose of nuclear materials on Palau, Washington managed to achieve its aim—to conclude the "Compact of Free Association". However, it is doubtful that it will keep its promise: having become a territory "freely associated" with the USA, the UN Trust Territory will be fully at the mercy of the United

States. It is noteworthy that Washington scheduled a new referendum on the Palau Islands for December 2, 1986, but the US Senate had already approved the agreement in early October, which gave the USA complete jurisdiction on matters concerning Palau's security and defence.

By carrying out its plans to turn Micronesia into its military strategic bridgehead endangering not only Micronesians but also the entire Asian and Pacific region, the USA ignored a basic objective of the UN trusteeship system, under which, as the "administering authority", it is obliged to "further international peace and security" (Article 76(a) of the UN Charter).

The "administering authority" showed equal disregard for other obligations towards the population of the Trust Territory, for example that it should "promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence", Article 76(b). Even the US President's Personal Representative at the talks with the Micronesians on the future of the territory, Fred Zeder, was forced to admit before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the US House of Representatives in September 1984 that "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands suffers from the classic problems of an underdeveloped area" and that "almost 90 per cent of the domestic economy [of Micronesia] is directly or indirectly dependent on US assistance."

Describing the situation in Micronesia after decades of American rule, the *Wall Street Journal* wrote in July 1985 that "where once the islanders were self-sufficient, skimming lagoons teeming with fish and picking fruits and vegetables that grow in natural abundance, an entire generation has grown up without the skills or incentives to survive in the islands". Having deprived the Micronesians of the means of existence, Washington naturally found it easier to force them to sign colonial agreements. The UN, too, is aware of the territory's hardships. In 1986 the subcommittee on smaller territories of the UN Decolonisation Committee noted in its conclusions and recommendations that the Trust Territory remains largely dependent economically and financially on the administering authority and that, to all appearances, the structural disproportions in its economy have not decreased. How can one speak of the Micronesians' "free will" when Washington has made them completely dependent on the USA even in food supplies?

Going ahead with its operation to complete the annexation of Micronesia, Washington was particularly vexed by the upsurge in the anti-nuclear movement there, for example by the 1985 "Avarua treaty" creating a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. Ten member countries of the South Pacific forum have already signed this treaty and four of them have ratified it. While the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China voiced support for the nuclear-free zone, the USA (and Britain and France as well) raised numerous objections to it. New Zealand's refusal to allow American nuclear-capable vessels to call at its ports also caused a stir in Washington. To judge by its reaction, Washington also sees as a threat to its imperial plans and preparations the programme of action along five lines announced by Mikhail Gorbachev in Vladivostok to improve the situation in the Asian and Pacific region and jointly build new, just relations there.

Meanwhile, the goals of the Soviet programme for peace, security, cooperation and interaction in the Asian-Pacific region are being increasingly recognised and supported. This is confirmed in particular by the consistent policy of India, which is reflected in the joint Soviet-In-

dian statement on the visit by Mikhail Gorbachev to that country in November 1986. This is the policy aimed at mitigating tensions, developing goodneighbourly relations with all the countries of the region and establishing cooperation at the regional level.

As far back as 1984 the US government submitted to Congress a "Compact of Free Association" with the three Micronesian formations, brushing aside the fact that it had been rejected in the Palau referendum. Failing to win approval, the President sent it once again (this time, it is true, regarding only the Marshall Islands and the FSM) to the next convocation of Congress. In an effort to sway the Congressmen, the President stated in an accompanying message that the "defense and land provisions of the Compact extend indefinitely the right of the United States to foreclose access to the area to third countries for military purposes. These provisions are of great importance to our strategic position in the Pacific and enable us to continue preserving regional security and peace." Translated from the White House's "imperial" language, this means that by annexing the UN trust territory and transforming it into its colonial patrimony, the USA will be able freely to involve it in the global arms race, including in nuclear and space weapons, in its drive for military superiority.

It is regrettable that the UN Trusteeship Council has been going along with the Washington administration. At its last (53rd) session, which ended on June 4, 1986, despite strong Soviet resistance, the USA, Britain and France, which have a majority on the Council, passed a resolution that says, contrary to the facts that "the peoples of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia and Palau have freely exercised their right to self-determination" in plebiscites.

Then the authors of the resolution requested on behalf of the Trusteeship Council the government of the United States, in consultation with the governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, Palau and the Northern Mariana Islands to agree on a date not later than 30 September 1986 for the coming into effect of the Compact of Free Association and the covenant on the commonwealth, and to notify the Secretary General of the United Nations of this date.

Drawn up on an American initiative, the Trusteeship Council resolution is further evidence of the US intention to complete the annexation and present the UN with a fait accompli, merely "notifying" the Secretary General of the annexation date.

The UN Special Committee on Decolonisation (Committee of 24), with which the US has flagrantly refused to cooperate even by providing necessary current information on the situation in the UN trust territory, has repeatedly stated that, taking into consideration the principles laid down in the UN Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the fact that the Declaration's principles fully apply to Micronesia, the administering authority (i. e. the USA) is obliged to create in the Trust Territory conditions that would enable its people, having been fully advised of the alternatives and without any interference whatsoever, freely to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and independence. Washington has never had any intention to grant the Micronesians that right, and its references to the "freely exercised right to self-determination" manifested in the "compacts" on a new status concluded under US pressure behind the back of the UN Security Council, is far removed from reality.

In its 1986 conclusions and recommendations, the subcommittee on small territories of the Committee of 24 reminded the United States that it is bound by the obligation to hand over all power to the population of the Trust Territory in line with the UN Charter and the Declaration on Decolonisation.

As it has been during all the period of "administering" the Trust Territory, the USA remains deaf to the demands of the international community. In his message to the participants of the Special Jubilee Session of the General Assembly on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Mikhail Gorbachev pointed to the United States' acts towards the annexation of Micronesia as yet another example of how the imperialists powers, in a bid to preserve the domination over the dependent territories, are foisting various neo-colonialist statuses on those territories and are turning them into their military-strategic strongpoint and bridgeheads for aggression.

The Soviet Union has on more than one occasion, including at the UN and in special statements on the situation in Micronesia, drawn the attention of the world community to the need to prevent the US government's illegal actions aimed at turning the UN trusteeship territory into a colonial possession and military bridgehead endangering regional security.

In connection with the US intention to present the UN with a fait accompli in the form of annexation of Micronesia, a TASS statement stressed that under the UN Charter, the Security Council of the United Nations alone, which directs the international trusteeship system, has the right to decide to terminate UN trusteeship and that the United Nations continues to be responsible for that territory until the Micronesian people gain true independence.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1987

English Translation COPYRIGHT: Progress Publishers 1987

/9317

CSO: 1812/191

FINNISH PAPER VIEWS CHANGES IN FOREIGN TRADE STRUCTURE

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 31 Mar 87 p 25

[Article by Kustaa Hulkko: "New Administration for Soviet Foreign Trade Comes into Being"; first paragraph is HELSINGIN SANOMAT introduction]

[Text] Responsibility for exports transferred to industry. Authority both centralized and decentralized. Importing and exporting of product categories brought under the same roof.

Early this year the Soviet Union initiated major reforms in the administration of its foreign trade.

In terms of their objectives, these reforms are startlingly radical. Since as early as the 1920's, the Ministry of Foreign Trade (MFT) has administered the state monopoly in the country's foreign trade through the approximately 70 foreign trade associations it controls. Now the MFT will have to give up its position and the country's industry will have to assume partial responsibility for its own exports.

Deputy Premier Vladimir Kamentsev says that foreign trade will have increased considerably by the year 2000. Cooperation that speeds up Soviet scientific-technical and sociopolitical development will in particular be developed.

According to the plans, the Soviet Union is to transfer a fourth of the country's imports and about 15 percent of its exports to be administered by the industry ministers. Machine and equipment exports would account for two-thirds of the exports.

The arguments for the redistribution of functions and authority are known; we have been able to read them in many Soviet newspapers these past few weeks. The Soviet Union's share of world trade does not correspond to the country's economic level or its development needs. The export potential of the machine industry in particular has been badly handled. Contacts with international markets do not function effectively.

The objectives are so hard to attain that doubters have now raised their voices. Will this reform of the trade organizations suffice to resolve the problems stemming from production and product development? Where else will

industry get the people to administer foreign trade than precisely from the foreign trade associations that have been criticized?

It has also been pointed out that Soviet traders have been incapable of achieving the reputation abroad of being especially high-pressure salesmen. It may take a long time too for foreign trade career men experienced primarily in buying to be trained to be sellers.

Up, Down and Sideways

The ideas of both centralization and decentralization are included in the administrative reforms of exports and imports. The MFT's functions will now be transferred upwards to the government level, horizontally to other ministries and downwards to the production companies.

A state committee for foreign trade has been created in connection with the government that will superintend and dovetail trade engaged in by all the ministries and agencies with other countries. Kamentsev is himself the chairman of this committee--this organ has also been referred to as a "commission" in certain contexts.

Even before, a coordinating committee functioned in the Soviet Government which, at least in principle, consolidated the different branches of foreign trade. Now-retired Deputy Premier Ivan Vasilyevich Arkhipov, the foreign trade minister and the chairmen of the State Planning Committee (Gosplan) and State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations (GKES) were members of it.

Apparently, that loose model did not work; instead, a clearer centralization of the decision-making process was needed. In addition to ordinary trade, the new committee also supervises the funding of foreign trade, that is, the Vneshtorgbank [Foreign Trade Bank]. Its functions also include the adaptation of new forms of international economic relations, such as scientific-technical collaboration in the different sectors.

A total of 22 trade ministries and government departments will have the authority to import and export products pertaining to their fields of operations. The ministries will themselves manage their own foreign trade associations. The foreign trade associations are corporate bodies.

Like the earlier associations under the MFT, the new foreign trade associations will enter into contracts with foreign suppliers and buyers. Companies will also have a similar authority to contract for deliveries or orders in the name of their associations.

The Soviet Government will also require the new associations to actively provide information on and advertise their products, organize expositions and participate in fairs.

Associations must also apply themselves in product development: study technical developments in foreign countries, patents and licenses and examine standards and operational experiences with products.

MFT Keeps the Oil Trade

Aside from the ministries, every Soviet republic government has the right to establish its own foreign trade association that will export and import for the republic's companies and ministries.

In practice the new foreign trade associations will be set up in such a way that some of the products and trade personnel of the MFT and the GKES are transferred to the ministries. Above all, machine construction industry salesmen and products will change places.

The MFT will retain control over the exporting and importing of fuels and raw materials, foodstuffs and products important from the standpoint of the state. The MFT will also continue to be the ministry that is the expert on foreign trade, the one that organizes and plans exports, imports and trade policy. It will provide the companies and associations with guidelines in practical matters concerning imports and exports.

The MFT will, for example, continue to conclude trade agreements with Finland. As before, it will head trade delegations stationed abroad. Those foreign trade associations that remain under the MFT will follow the same principles of "economic responsibility and the ability to support and finance themselves" which the economic reform of the country has in general imposed as the guiding star for the companies.

At the same time the MFT's own administration is being reformed. If we are talking about the units that do business with Finland, there are now only four new "main administrations" instead of the former eight. The following have their own: 1) raw materials, 2) consumer goods and finished products, 3) industrial capital goods, and 4) imports and exports of machines, equipment and vehicles.

GKES Starts to Administer Rakvere

The organizational structure and functions of the GKES have also been subjected to reform. As an additional function it has acquired the administration of construction jobs that foreign firms perform in the Soviet Union. With these jobs imports and exports are combined in the duties of the same department. Before, this state committee was specifically responsible for construction exports, for example, for big projects in Finland like all deliveries to Rautaruukki and the construction work on the natural gas pipeline abroad.

First and foremost, the GKES has acquired responsibility for overseeing the construction and restoration of nonproduction projects. Included in this category are obviously, for example, the Perusyhtymä [Basic Combine] projects for the construction of the Metropoli and Astoria Hotels. Before, the MFT foreign trade association, Soyuzvneshtroyimport, ordered them.

Responsibility for the projects lost by the Finns, the Rakvere meat-processing complex and the Arda cellulose plant, has also been transferred from the industrial import associations, Tekhnoproimport and Prommashimport, under the MFT, to the GKES.

The associations managed by the GKES before will continue to function, as will also its delegations abroad. As far as is known, the GKES has its only Western delegation in Helsinki.

The State Committee for Material and Technical Supply (Gossnab) has for a long time administered the distribution of many products and the distribution planning. It has participated in foreign trade as a sort of bookkeeping agency, but now it replaces over 30 associations that engage in trade and is beginning to export iron metallurgy products, among others.

V.S. Murakovskiy, the chairman of the State Committee for the Agriculture Industry (Gosagroprom), is a long-term work colleague of First Secretary Gorbachev. Many foodstuffs, for example, have become the responsibility of the Gosagroprom. This will probably have an effect on, for example, arrangements for the exporting of Finnish meat and dairy products since contracts used to be concluded with the Prodintorg, under the MFT.

The State Committee for Science and Technology (GKNT), the deputy chairman of which, A.K. Romanov, was in charge of cooperation with Finland, assumes responsibility for license sales as its field of operations.

The Ministry of the Navy assumes some of the duties of the ship importing association, Sudoimport; the Ministry of the Automotive Industry the functions of Avtoeksport, among others; the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Construction in turn Traktoreksport exports and imports, equipment construction, automatic devices, etc., and the exporting and importing of computers is transferred from Elektronorgtekhnika to the ministry.

Soyuzkhimeksport relinquishes control over chemical products to the Ministry of the Chemical Industry.

Example: The Medical Industry

We do not yet know how many foreign trade associations will ultimately be terminated. We only know to which organizations they are relinquishing their duties.

It is very easy for an outsider to understand the basic objective of these reforms, to make foreign trade more efficient. Up to now, the jungle of organizations and products involved in exporting and importing has been a terrible one. The distribution of labor among the foreign trade associations has often been inconsistent. Import associations have not had proper contact with the end user of the product. Export associations have lacked the sufficient knowledge and drive needed to get into international markets.

Let the medical industry serve as an example of the confusion existing under the old system. Before the reforms, eight foreign trade associations, most of which were under the MFT, participated in the exporting and importing of medicines and medical industry raw materials. In addition to Medeksport, the medical export association, seven other organizations took part in this. Among others, Stroymaterialintorg, specializing in construction materials sales, Tekhmashimport, specializing in the importing of technical machinery, and Eksporthkhab, which got its name from exporting bread, participated in it.

Now foreign trade in medicines is centralized in the Ministry for the Medical and Microbiology Industry.

The key principle is that the ministries that have acquired new authorities must cover their import expenses with the foreign exchange revenue obtained from their exports. It is also possible that the Foreign Trade Bank, Vneshtorgbank, may extend them credit for their import purchases.

Many companies will also get a chance to do business in international markets.

Firms established in them will in practice take care of imports and exports for over 70 production associations. The firm is not the juristic person, to which rather the company or organization whose subsidiary it is corresponds.

Aside from serving as a trading agency, under the new rules the firm is also specified as a filter for international market information. The firm must study economic situations and compare products and quality requirements in its own field.

Generations Have Changed

Two years ago we published in HELSINGIN SANOMAT the same sort of list of personalities influential in foreign trade as the one below. Most of the names have been replaced by new ones.

Men are also replaced at close to the same time when administrative structures are radically reformed. Before the Gorbachev era it was unusual in the Soviet Union for high officials to go into retirement. They only retired from office when they died. Now a change has taken place.

The natural reason for having to go into retirement is conservatism, opposition to the reforms initiated by the Soviet leadership. It would, however, be an exaggeration to regard the change in generations as a purely political liquidation, a purge. The old guard must go chiefly because increasing efficiency requires new blood.

The names published constitute more a list of technocrats than a list of political VIP's. Missing from the list are the specialists in each sector from the CPSU Politburo, who hold higher authority than the others in foreign trade matters too.

Other influential persons have also been omitted from the list. For example, current Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov has personally discussed economic cooperation with Finland. Likewise, the Soviet ambassador to Finland's role includes participation in economic negotiations with Finland. The current ambassador is V.M. Sobolev.

Nor is the list a compendium of foreign trade contacts either. If one is looking for that, one ought to turn to the Finnish-Soviet Chamber of Commerce and its Moscow and Leningrad representatives. Finnish bank groups can also be of help in such matters.

Commission Participates in Government Business

The Soviet Union's basic problem in handling trade with the West appears to be an administrative one: how to find a suitable organization form.

Finland does not need to consider a change of administrative structure. After the elections, however, Finland's basic problem in the administration of the Soviet trade will be a political one: Which party is to occupy the chairmanship of the Economic Commission?

According to the rules now in effect, the president of the republic appoints the Commission's Finnish chairman and the vice chairmen must be members of the government.

Before, there was no such contingency. Ahti Karjalainen served as Economic Commission chairman from the time Finland and the Soviet Union created the organization in 1967. At the time Karjalainen was foreign minister in the Rafael Paasio administration.

President Mauno Koivisto removed Karjalainen from the Economic Commission in May 1983 and Foreign Trade Minister Jermu Laine was appointed temporary chairman. At the same time they had to consider how they could see to it that the Soviet Union would be as highly represented on the commission as possible. The fact is, it was apparent that its durable Foreign Trade Minister N.S. Patolichev would no longer be able to continue in his post for very many years.

The first step in carrying out the strategy that was chosen was a new decree that would permit the choice of a suitable minister. The second step was Koivisto's appointment of Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa [to the post].

Finland's hope materialized and the Soviet Union appointed Deputy Premier Arkhipov as its own chairman. The chairmen of both countries were on the same status level. When Arkhipov retired, the Soviet Union chose Deputy Premier Kamentsev as its new chairman.

We do not have the title of deputy premier [or deputy prime minister] in Finland. It would thus be natural to again choose a prime minister as the commission's next Finnish chairman. This will be a dilemma for President Koivisto if Paavo Vayrynen becomes prime minister.

Next week Finland and the Soviet Union will discuss the growth of trade agreed-on for this year.

The problems of the import deficit will under no circumstances be removed from the agenda yet. An additional interest-bearing loan of 300 million and the arrangements for paying it off were agreed on previously. Now a deficit of what already amounts to 329 million rubles is placing a strain on the Bank of Finland's customary clearing account. In principle the credit limit for this account is 300 million rubles, but that limit is flexible.

The "low bracket" of the trade agreement, that is, the minimum trade option agreed on is based on an arithmetical prediction of a crude oil price of \$14 a barrel.

According to this pessimistic scenario, Finland's exports to the Soviet Union in 1987 would come to slightly under 1.9 billion rubles. Imports would come to the same figure.

If the current price level holds, both exports and imports could come to over 2 billion rubles.

How trading oil sales develop will also make things different, in addition to the price. So far, only one deal for 250,000 tons has been concluded. It is unlikely that the contracts for 5 million tons of trading oil agreed on for this year will be completely effected.

Trade will, however, fortunately also be balanced at the low-bracket level if the price of oil is \$17 and we manage to buy even 3 million tons of trading oil.

Soviet Foreign Trade Decision-Makers

The Government, The Council of Ministers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Vladimir Kamentsev: deputy premier and chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Trade of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Yu.A. Pekshev: deputy chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Trade.

L.M. Kondratyev: first secretary of the Finnish-Soviet Economic Commission.

A.T. Bobyrev: head of the Deputy Premier Secretariat.

S.L. Shebeko: referendary of the State Committee for Foreign Trade of the Council of Minister.

Ministry of Foreign Trade

Boris Ivanovich Aristov: minister of foreign trade.

V.I. Vorontsov, Pl Pavlov and N.G. Osipov: deputy foreign trade ministers.

Yu.P. Ledentsov: head of the Main Administration for Commercial and Economic Cooperation to Be Entered into with the Industrialized Capitalist Countries.

V.V. Grigoryev: head of the Finnish Department of the Main Administration.

P.D. Filin: department head.

T.V. Shimanskaya: senior referendary.

E.B. Berzets: deputy chief [of the Main Administration] for Capital Goods Exports and Imports.

A.I. Gnevko and Yu.N. Minayev: deputy chiefs of the Main Administration for Raw Materials Imports and Exports.

R.N. Minayev: deputy chief of the Main Administration for Consumer Goods.

P.V. Mikheyev: chief of the Main Administration for Machine and Equipment Imports and Exports.

A.D. Novikov: department head.

Gosplan (State Planning Committee)

Nikolay Talyzin: chairman and deputy premier.

D.B. Inkin: chief of Foreign Trade Department.

GKES (State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations)

Konstantin Katushev: chairman.

Ye.I. Osadchuk: deputy chairman.

V.V. Tsubar: chief expert.

GKNT (State Committee for Science and Technology)

Boris Leontyevich Tolstykh: chairman.

A.K. Romanov: deputy chairman.

Gosagroprom (State Committee for the Agriculture Industry)

Vsevolod Serafimovich Murakhovskiy: chairman.

Gossnab (State Committee for Material and Technical Supply)

Lev Alekseyevich Voronin: chairman.

V.S. Nikolayenko: administration chief.

Production Subministries

Ministries that have the authority to participate in foreign trade.

Yuriy Mikhailovich Kolmer: Navy minister.

Nikolay Andreyevich Pugin: minister of the automotive industry.

Sergey Aleksandrovich Afanasyev: minister of heavy transport and machine construction.

Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Yezhevskiy: minister of the tractor and agricultural machine industry.

Nikolay Aleksandrovich Panichev: minister of the machine tool and tool industry.

Yuriy Aleksandrovich Bessalov: minister of the chemical industry.

Valeriy Alekseyevich Bykov: minister of the medical and microbiology industry.

Vladimir Makarovich Velichko: minister of energy economy machine construction.

Nikolay Pavlovich Kudryachev: minister of the fishing industry.

Yevgeny Aleksandrovich Kozlovskiy: minister of geology.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Shkabardniya: minister of instrument making, automatic equipment and control systems.

Oleg Georgiyevich Anfimov: minister of the electrical industry.

Sergey Fedorovich Voyenushkin: minister of the construction materials industry.

Other Ministries

Vladimir Grigoryevich Klyuyev: minister of light industry.

Mikhail Ivanovich Busygin: minister of the forest industry.

G.L. Medvedev: first deputy minister.

N.G. Nikolskiy: deputy minister.

Lev Borisovich Vasilyev: minister of the machine construction industry for the light and food industries.

Oleg Dimitriyevich Baklanov: minister of general machine construction.

Igor Sergeyeich Belousov: minister of the shipbuilding industry.
Serafim Vasilyevich Kolpakov: minister of ferrous metallurgy.
Vladimir Aleksandrovich Durasov: minister of nonferrous metallurgy.
Viktor Stepanovich Chernomyrdin: minister of the gas industry.
Vasiliy Aleksandrovich Dinkov: minister of the oil industry Nikolay
Vasilyevich Lemayev: minister of the oil refining and petrochemical industry.
P.M. Avdeyenko: deputy minister.

Soviet Trade Delegation in Helsinki

V.D. Pugin: trade representative.
Y.F. Bochkarev: head of Economic Department.
B.V. Sergeev: head of the Department for the Exporting and Importing of Raw
Materials and Forest and Light Industry Products.
A.N. Zolotarev: head of the Department of Electrical and Electronic
Imports.
I.S. Gudzenko: head of the Department of Ship Imports.
A. Lapada: head of the Department for the Importing of Mining Industry and
Metallurgy Machines and Equipment.

Soviet Embassy in Finland

V.Ye. Ivashov: trade advisor.

11,466

CSO: 3617/69

COMMENTARY ON FRG FOREIGN POLICY

Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 22 Jan 87 p 3

[Article by Yuriy Korzhin, journalist: "FRG: Selection of a Political Course"; the first two paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA introduction]

[Excerpts] Recently some political figures and commentators in the Federal Republic of Germany express incomprehension and resentment apropos the fact that the Soviet public gives frank and sharp assessments to the constantly increasing discharge of anti-Soviet and revanchist attitudes. They reproach Moscow on the grounds that, by criticizing the foreign policy platform of the CDU/CSU bloc, it, they say, is intervening in the internal affairs of this country.

The invited remarks of the journalist Yuriy Korzhin are devoted to the examination of the question concerning the motives by which Moscow is guided in its criticism.

At the same time, the present government of the FRG, together with the United States, persistently refuses, from the positions of "Atlantic solidarity", the compromise proposals of the socialist countries. Standing on the platform of ideological hostility, it avoids the joint search for ways of strengthening security for all. It refuses to accept the only reasonable conception, according to which, in the missile and nuclear age, security can only be joint, all the more so in our common European house. Such a position of the government of the FRG, of course, cannot but leave a negative imprint on bilateral relations.

Hence the constant attempts of Bonn to act in violation of the letter and spirit of the agreements with the other socialist countries and to advance revanchist and nationalist claims towards them are not conducive to the creation of a friendly atmosphere in USSR-FRG relations.

The USSR and the FRG, unfortunately, are far from political, economic, and other cooperation in that volume which in principle is possible on the basis of the agreements and understandings that have been reached. Bonn is hindered by looking frequently to Washington, as well as by its own ideological blinders. In addition, the artificial difficulties create at times pretensions of the representation of the interests of West Berlin beyond the limits that are set by the Four Powers Agreement.

It must be stated that, the good and correct appeals notwithstanding, official

Bonn essentially does not do anything to strengthen positive ideas about the Soviet Union in its own people. On the contrary, a great deal is undertaken with a view to depicting the USSR as the opponent of the interests of the West Germans. With the knowledge, approval, and even the participation of the FRG leadership, the history of the Second World War is falsified. In the representation of West German propaganda, the USSR appears as the enslaver and oppressor of the countries of Eastern Europe, which, as it were, crave to give themselves up to the embrace of the capitalist West and NATO.

Under the present political leadership, the malicious and absurd Reaganite thesis about the USSR as the "focus of evil" is rehashed in its own way in the FRG. Nevertheless, in his time, even outstripping Reagan, Mr. F. J. Strauss declared that he hoped the year 2017 would not be the 100th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. And the federal chancellor H. Kohl, in his anti-Soviet rhetoric, not long ago sank to the drawing of vile parallels between the Soviet leadership and the Nazi regime.

What does Moscow want from Bonn? Properly speaking, no more, it would seem, than the correctly understood state interests of the FRG itself would suggest. And this means: To assist the restraint of the arms race and disarmament; to create cooperation, and not confrontation, to strengthen, and not to undermine trust; to treat the position and initiatives of the other side with attention, and not to ignore and reject them for ideological motives; to be filled with new political thinking, and not to stay in the political trenches of the "Cold War".

As far as the reproaches are concerned that Moscow supposedly interferes in the internal affairs of the FRG, they are completely unfounded. Soviet people understand very well that the free selection of a political course is the inalienable prerogative of every genuinely sovereign state. It is in the interests of the FRG to follow a policy that will be based on the aspiration to universal peace, security, cooperation and prosperity.

8970

CSO: 1807/245

EEC ECONOMIC, POLITICAL PROBLEMS, PROSPECTS EXAMINED

[Editorial report] Kiev PÖD ZNAMENEM LENINIZMA in Russian No 6, Mar 87 pp 83-86 carries an article on the economic situation of the EEC and its future outlook. The article entitled "The EEC: In a Closed Circle of Problems" by V. Malyshev quotes Western sources on the approximately 2 percent rise in the GNP of Western Europe and cites "the marked decline in growthrate in industrial production as being of greatest concern to Western business circles." Malyshev touches upon S&T developments, the increase in financial instability, and rivalry between leading capitalist countries and then addresses specific EEC problems: the creation of a European common market by 1992, free of petty trade barriers and free to give European companies a basis to challenge the technological might of the U.S. and Japan.

Malyshev points out "The main reason for the continuous squabbling in the EEC is the deep contradictory nature in the development of the capitalist states, their chronic inability to overcome disagreements, to sacrifice their own narrow egotistical interests for the sake of the common cause of European integration."

In addition to the problems of the 1987 budget, the agrarian policy, and the Unified Europe Act the author examines the problem of chronic unemployment, "one of EEC'S most acute problems." "The well-tried method of increasing economic activity and reducing the army of 'surplus people'," he says, "is forcing exports and expanding markets through demand in other countries. But under conditions of integration this method to a considerable degree loses its purport inasmuch as all countries in the group go through a crisis simultaneously as a result of increasing interdependence. Thus, an attempt by EEC partners to increase exports and conversely to limit imports is a constant source for new trade wars. A hidden erosion of the very foundation of integration is taking place."

Problems arising from the entry of Spain and Portugal into the EEC are also addressed.

The author notes that in addition to internal contradictions, the EEC faces increasing competition from its foreign economic partners, especially the U.S. Addressing briefly the divergent political views of EEC members on problems ranging from disarmament to the Middle East, the author concludes by saying: "Attempts to force the process of West European integration will indisputably be undertaken again and again, since this is fully in the interests of large capital in West European countries."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Radyanska Ukraina". "Pöd znamenem leninizma", 1987

MOSCOW TV HIGHLIGHTS HUNGARIAN, CSSR INITIATIVES

OW100815 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 7 Apr 87

[From the VREMYA newscast; Yuriy Ulyanov commentary]

[Text] Now, news from fraternal socialist countries.

[Ulyanov] Recently, the Hungarian newspaper, MAGYAR Nemzet, reported that, by the beginning of this year, Hungary had established nearly 70 joint ventures, together its partners. Currently writes the newspaper, possibilities for developing cooperation with the Soviet Union in this area are growing.

The creation of joint enterprises is not simple, but it is a very necessary task and Hungary is particularly conscious of this today. Weather conditions, and other reasons have led to a situation where the productivity of the country -- take January as an example -- has fallen by 2 and 1/2 percent in comparison with last year. Retail trade turnover has decreased. Hungarian foreign debt to the West is much too large.

The integration of the efforts of the fraternal countries is one way to overcome these difficulties. An example of this is the cooperation of the textile workers of BUDAPRINT with two Estonian enterprises -- [word indistinct] and the Baltic enterprise. [Video cuts to fashion parade held a BUDAPRINT showroom to which Soviet and other journalists were invited; shows models displaying fashions made at BUDAPRINT from materials manufactured at the two Estonian enterprises; shots of BUDAPRINT general director speaking about the advantages of such joint cooperation].

Our next report is from Czechoslovakia about self-servicing private cars. Admittedly, the readers of IZVESTIYA may be prompted to remember the recent court case concerning the management of the Moscow Suburban Council of the Russian Voluntary Society of Motorists, who were engaged in extortion and who were extracting bribes from those who made use of their motor servicing facilities. But, as they say, all good things are open to abuse, or it could be done like this. [Video shows Andreyev report from Czechoslovakia where the local motor club has made available to its members a fully-equipped workshop where, for a small fee, motorists can do their own work. Video shows workshop, equipment, facilities].

/12624

CSO: 1825/176

U.S. 'GUNBOAT DIPLOMACY' IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC RECALLED

PM300845 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Apr 87 First Edition p 3

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences K. Khachaturov, deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee of Solidarity with Latin American Peoples: "According to Imperial Canons is How the United States is Building Its Policy With Regard to the Latin American Countries"]

[Text] On 28 April 1965 the United States began its armed intervention against the Dominican Republic--a small island state in the Caribbean. Not long before President John Kennedy had sworn that henceforth no American soldier or marine would lay a finger on any Latin American state: After all, in the time it has existed the United States has resorted to "gunboat diplomacy" against its southern neighbors on over 200 occasions. Some 14 armed actions have been undertaken against Mexico (it is not for nothing that in its hymn the Marine Corps boasts that it began its bloody path "from the halls of Montezuma..."), while 13 have been undertaken against Cuba, 11 against Panama, 10 against Nicaragua, 9 against the Dominican Republic, and 7 against Colombia, and a total of 17 Latin American countries have been victims of aggression.

The organizers of the acts of intervention set themselves the most diverse tasks. Thus the United States has "swallowed up" Puerto Rico. It has broken other countries up. For instance, Mexico has been deprived of over half its territory, including Texas and California with their very rich natural resources. The virtually indefinite occupation of alien territory has also been the result of aggression. This has happened in Panama, where the United States seized that part of its territory along which the route of the canal between the oceans lay. The many years' occupation of, for instance, Cuba and Nicaragua was the result of intervention.

Every armed onslaught has been camouflaged by phony pretexts--"defending the property and lives of U.S. citizens," "defending North American interests," and so forth. At the beginning of this century the United States proclaimed a "preventive policy" in an attempt to justify its "right" to interfere in the internal affairs of the Latin American republics by the "anarchy" allegedly prevailing there and by the "undesirable political transformations" and since 1917 by the phony argument of the "threat of communism.

Stories of "chaos" in the country, the "threat to the lives" of U.S. citizens, and of "communist infiltration" served as the pretext for armed intervention against the Dominican Republic. The fate of that country's people is tragic. For many years they suffered from colonial oppression and the tyranny of foreign occupiers. The U.S. vice regent Rafael Trujillo ruled the Dominican Republic for over three decades.

The Dominican dictator tried to justify his barbaric terror with far-fetched anticommunist fabrications. On the pretext of the struggle against communism he perpetrated murder, acts of violence, arson, torture, and robbery. The bloody dictator deservedly earned the nickname the "Caribbean jackal." The word "Trujillism" has become the embodiment of this ferocity on the part of pro-U.S. regimes.

The Dominican people waged an active struggle against the dictator and launched a mass movement for democracy. Juan Bosch, a representative of the liberal bourgeoisie, was elected president at the first free elections in the country's history. This caused dissatisfaction among the local oligarchy and in the United States. Lies, slander, and misinformation were put into play against the lawful president. The provocateurs spread rumors that "priests will be killed in front of the altar and children will be kidnapped and sent to Russia, whence they will return as enemies of God." The reaction came up with the catch phrase: "Anyone who's not a conspirator is a Communist." Subsequently these methods were used to overthrow other legitimate governments and in particular the government of popular unity in Chile. The Dominican Republic was a kind of testing ground for rehearsing means of replacing constitutional governments with pro-U.S. regimes not only in Latin America but also beyond.

After the overthrow of Juan Bosch the U.S. special services began to rock the "Dominican boat." But the reaction's plot was thwarted. In April 1965 a popular uprising flared up under the leadership of officers loyal to the constitution headed by Colonel Fransisko Kaamanyo [name as transliterated]. His legendary figure became the symbol of "the other army." After all the armed forces of the Latin American countries had won notoriety as the butchers of their own peoples. In the Dominican Republic for the first time in the history of Latin America the patriotically inclined section of the army merged with the revolutionary people.

The White House and the Pentagon were frightened by the fact that the military regime, which had invariably been the people's executioner, had become their defender, the guarantor of the country's independence. The U.S. President sanctioned direct armed aggression. The Dominican Republic was occupied by 40,000 U.S. marines. A handful of soldiers from several Latin American countries was in the rearguard and Washington depicted its aggression as a "collective action" by the men in the blue "pan-American" helmets. Its organizers were thus seeking to "legitimize" U.S. armed intervention against any inconvenient Latin American state and the creation of a "pan-American" gendarme corps with a view to the "preventive suppression" of the mythical "communist threat."

The long-term aim of this policy was to eliminate the socialist system in the Dominican Republic's neighbor Cuba and to stifle the anti-imperialist movement in the region. History has proved that imperialism has been defeated in implementing its strategic task.

But that does not mean that the United States has failed to achieve its aim in reinforcing its tactical success. If, of course, you can call establishing a political protectorate over a country a tactical success. To this day the Dominican Republic is experiencing the consequences of American occupation. The Mexican newspaper EXCELSIOR describes this country's daily life as follows: "The rural inhabitants drag out a miserable existence, suffering from malnutrition, unemployment, illiteracy, and the lack of elementary sanitation and other misfortunes. The majority of the urban population lives under the same conditions and to these must be added the shortage of drinking water, electricity, housing, and transport. Nearly 2 million unemployed and 0.5 million with only seasonal employment in a country with a population of scarcely over 6 million present a grave danger. The tangle of problems in which this underprivileged mass has been caught could become a powder keg." To this must be added the repressive actions of the government dependent on Washington.

The United States has frequently made use of elements of its "Dominican policy" but repeated it in its "pure" form only two decades later, when it occupied Grenada. Washington tried to use the need to "restore order and democracy" and "curb anarchy" to justify its armed intervention against this tiny Caribbean country whose population is 100 times less than that of New York alone.

The bandit action against Grenada was also motivated by concern for the security of U.S. citizens, not a hair on whose heads was harmed, incidentally. Finally, the shameful intervention was undertaken under the flag of the phony "Organization of East Caribbean States." Washington sanctioned the intervention not after receiving a "request" from a number of Caribbean countries but before the drafting of this document unprecedented in the practice of international law. The intervention against the Dominican Republic and against Grenada flouts the UN and OAS charters. But all that is nothing to the U.S. "defenders of human rights!"

Today the "Dominican policy" is manifested in Washington's undeclared war against the lawful government of Nicaragua. Statements about "the threat to U.S. national security," "the hand of Moscow and Havana," and the "communist threat" to the continent are in circulation again. But the truth is that Washington is dreaming of returning its southern neighbors to the time of the policy of the "big stick" and "gunboat diplomacy." But times have changed irrevocably and the peoples will not accept the American Marines' evil morals or armed interventions on the "Dominican" model.

/12858
CSO: 1807/304

LATINSKAYA AMERIKA NO 1, 1987: TABLE OF CONTENTS

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 1, Jan 87 pp 3-4

[Text] Table of Contents

Matlina, A. A. Latin America and the United States: The Latest Stage in the Exacerbation of Contradictions.....	5
Zea, Leopoldo (Mexico). Neoglobalism and the "Vietnam Syndrome".....	17
[not translated]	
Popov, A. S., and Radugin, A. A. The Struggle Between Tendencies Within the Catholic Church.....	20

THEORY AND CONCEPTS

Goncharova, T. V. In Search of a Tomorrow.....	31
[not translated]	

CONTACTS AND INTERVIEWS

Without Peace Development Cannot Be Assured (Norberto Gonzalez, Executive Secretary of the ECLA, answers questions from our editorial staff) [not translated].....	40
--	----

DISCUSSIONS AND DEBATES

Foreign Debt and Developmental Problems [not translated].....	46
---	----

PAGES FROM HISTORY

Ivanov, G. I. (Ivanovo). Mexico's Colonial Period As Viewed In Modern Mexican Historiography [not translated].....	75
--	----

LITERARY ARTICLE

The Odyssey of Miguel Littin, or a Secret Return to His Homeland; Report by Gabriel Garcia Marquez (continuation) [not translated].....	86
---	----

ART AND LITERATURE

DEDICATED TO JOSE MARIA ARGUEDAS

Orzhitskiy, I. A. All the Blood of Peru [not translated].....102
Ruiz, Ignacio Diaz (Mexico). A Contribution to Folk Culture.....109
[not translated]
Posadas, Moises Arroyo (Peru). Arguedas' Bequests Have Still Not Been
Carried Out [not translated].....110
Mosquera, Gerardo (Cuba). Recent Cuban Painting: Primitivism and
Modernism [not translated].....113

SPRINGBOARD FOR DISCUSSION

Concerning An Article in This Journal.....118

SEARCHES AND DISCOVERIES

Yershova, G. G. The Victory Texts of the Maya [not translated].....121

BOOKSHELF

Kalmykov, N. P. Books on Latin America by Progress Publishers (a
summary)..... 132
Sukhostat, A. A. "Fidel Castro: Selected Works, 1952-1986"..... 137
[not translated]
Kovalev, Ye. V. "Problems of Scientific and Technical Development in
Latin American Countries"..... 140
Ivanyan, I. E. N. G. Chicherina, "International Firms: Social Policy
and Propaganda" [not translated]..... 142
Nemira, I. V. Lisandro Otero, "Cuba: For the Revolution and Against
It" [not translated]..... 143

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

12825

CSO: 1807/186

THREE AREAS OF INCREASED U.S.- LATIN AMERICA CONTROVERSY NOTED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 1, Jan 87 pp 5-16

[Article by A. A. Matlina: "Latin America and the United States: The Latest Stage in the Exacerbation of Contradictions"]

[Text] Here at the middle of the 1980's contradictions between Latin American countries and the United States have reached a new level. Protests against imperialist exploitation, which is leading to national catastrophe, and dissatisfaction with Washington's imperial policy, which threatens national sovereignty, have come to be universal. In relations between the United States and countries in the region new traits have appeared as the result of a process of democratization which is currently underway in the countries of Latin America, and also as a result of the rapid growth of foreign indebtedness and the Central American conflict.

Reaganism in the Role of "Champion" of Democracy

At the beginning of this decade Latin American countries entered a period of lengthy economic crisis, the political effect of which was intensification of dissatisfaction on the part of the masses of the people and a sharp increase in anti-imperialist sentiments. Contradictions within the ruling bloc were exacerbated. The combination of these factors has led to the fall of regressive governments and the establishment of bourgeois democratic regimes in a number of states.

The economic crisis has also had an active effect on the domestic political situation in those countries where civilian governments were already in power. Increased activity by the left, intensification of the struggle through strikes and growing number of general democratic actions have led, specifically, to a change of leadership in Peru and Venezuela, where right-centrist forces have given way to parties in the political center. A mighty wave of popular revolt swept away Duvalier's bloody tyranny in Haiti. Thus, dictatorial regimes remain only in Paraguay and Chile.

However, this "wave of democratization" has not brought with it any serious changes of a socioeconomic nature. Economic and financial power remains in the hands of a local oligarchy and multinational corporations. The democratic process has affected only part of the political realm, and essentially has led

only to a regrouping of rightwing circles; no real transformation of the system of power has occurred. However, the fall of fascist and quasi-fascist dictatorships and the establishment of even weak and inconsistent bourgeois democracies have facilitated further growth of the democratic, antifascist and anti-imperialist movement and the struggle against exploitation and in favor of social and national liberation. Democratization has also helped to reinforce positive tendencies in foreign policy.

The general principles of international relations proclaimed by democratic governments -- sovereignty, independence, noninterference in the internal affairs of other states, renunciation of the use of force to resolve disputes, and economic cooperation -- have been combined with a course aimed at pluralization of foreign policy ties and development of relations with developing countries and socialist countries. The struggle to establish a new international economic order has been proclaimed a primary foreign policy priorities. Development of Latin American cooperation has also taken a priority position in the diplomacy of many states in the region. A consciousness of being part of world affairs is growing, and the defense of peace is beginning to be regarded by the leaders of a number of countries as an urgent task of primary importance. Substantial progress has been made in the positions of a number of countries vis-a-vis Cuba. Brazil, Bolivia and Uruguay have reestablished diplomatic relations with the first socialist state in the Western Hemisphere. Peruvian-Cuban relations, which were at a low ebb in the mid-1970's, have also been normalized.

These new circumstances have created serious difficulties for the United States. Although in the final analysis moderate democracies do in fact represent the same social and class alternative as rightwing authoritarian dictatorships, and their strategic objectives do in part correspond to Washington's interests, the very nature of representative systems involves, at least in vestigial form, the possibility of developments which could be highly undesirable from the standpoint of U.S. interests, and even dangerous over the long term.

Under conditions of bourgeois democracy governments may encourage (or, more precisely, cannot always prevent) the creation of an atmosphere favorable to the democratic, anti-imperialist movement, which represents a real threat to U.S. positions. The foreign policy activities of democratic governments, which are aimed at reinforcing national sovereignty and defending national interests, contain an element of protest against imperialist exploitation. All this has definitely not favored Washington's plans in Central America and has not guaranteed a solution to the foreign debt problem which will be painless for the West -- these are the main points of contradiction between the United States and Latin American countries at the present time.

In this situation it has become Washington's primary task to establish strict control over the process of democratization. The United States has had to achieve a "separation" of the rightwing or moderate opposition from the leftwing opposition, isolation of the latter and support for moderate (hopefully right-of-center) potential U.S. allies. For example, one year prior to the overthrow of Duvalier, Washington realized that "Baby Doc" would not be around forever. Preventive measures were taken: covert U.S. pressure

led to changes in the high-ranking military, which was the segment of the military most dedicated to the dictator. And when, at the beginning of February 1986, the situation in the country became irreversible, the present replacement for Duvalier was essentially already prepared.

The Pinochet regime has been one object of Reagan's "quiet diplomacy." The replacement of Tiberge, an admirer of the Chilean fascists, with Barnes as American ambassador in Chile was designed to demonstrate that the United States intends to support Chile's "peaceful transition" to democracy. The new ambassador has made contact with the moderate opposition, in which an important role is played by the right-of-center parties, and has made a number of statements which are intended to serve as a warning to the junta of a change in the American position.¹ Some other steps have been taken as well. Analyzing the possibility of replacement of the fascist regime by a right-centrist government, L. Corvalan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Chile, has noted that "such a government would not be capable of leading the nation out of its crisis, much less satisfying the urgent needs of the masses."² This conclusion fully confirms the reality of democratization according to the American scenario: replacement of dependent dictatorships with dependent democracies.

Steps have also been taken to change the political facade in Paraguay. The American ambassador there, following the example set by his colleague in Chile, has established relations with Paraguayan opposition parties. Some means of economic pressure have even been tried: Paraguay is not being given official aid, and the volume of trade ties remains insignificant.³

Washington's position with respect to the democratic process in countries in the region has taken the form of a foreign policy doctrine, known in the press as the "Reagan Doctrine." In March 1986, at the height of a campaign to give \$100 million in aid to the Nicaraguan "contras," the President sent a message to Congress in which he especially emphasized that democratic changes should be encouraged "cautiously, with an attitude of respect for the traditions and political realities of other countries," and that the United States would oppose "any tyranny, whether from the left or from the right."⁴

Reagan's statement received positive responses in political circles in the West and in the mass media. The liberal wing in Congress eagerly hailed the government's foreign policy course: in June 1986 the House of Representatives approved the amount requested by Reagan, which it had refused three months previously. Even those who were of the opinion that "the United States cannot take the credit for the fall of tyrants in many countries of Latin America," emphasized that Reagan's statement deserved a positive response, regardless of the Administration's motives.⁵ The bourgeois press hailed the new doctrine as "an important turning point" in American policy, underscoring the "constructive beginning" of this step, and so on. The LONDON TIMES noted that the United States could take credit for the process of democratization over the past decade. The French newspaper LE MONDE saw in the "Reagan Doctrine" significant evolution" in the policy thinking of American government circles.⁶ Influential American press organs wrote the same thing: "The Reagan Administration came into office following a course of more or less nonselective support for anticommunist regimes, but it soon realized that

militant anticommunism and rhetoric alone are not enough to make a country a dependable U.S. ally."⁷

Even experienced politicians shared this illusion with regard to "change," although many of them evaluated it in a different manner. The "Reagan Doctrine" met with a critical response from "the right," specifically from former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who hastened to interpret this "turning point" in American policy as a course aimed at the overthrow of rightwing authoritarian dictators. Since similar fears could be aroused among Washington's "most faithful friends," which, considering the global aspect of the problem, could create serious difficulties for U.S. policy, government officials hastened to deny rumors concerning a toughening of the U.S. stance with regard to extreme rightwing governments. "Attacks on friendly regimes are not among our tasks,"⁸ stated official spokesmen for the Administration. Furthermore, aid to repressive regimes through multilateral channels turned into a veritable flood.⁹

This was done not only for the purpose of reassuring the remaining dictators. The U.S. position was a reflection of a deeper motivation. The essence of the doctrine "in opposition to dictatorships of the right and the left" lay not only in overt condemnation of "old allies" and in attacks on socialist countries. The "Reagan Doctrine" warned: the overthrow of rightwing regimes could create a situation which would be much more dangerous for American interests. It could bring to power those who, in contrast to the fascist and quasi-fascist leaders of the recent past, could by no means be regarded as a possible bulwark of the monopolies or junior partners of the U.S. military. In this connection the doctrine once again affirmed -- and this is central -- a course aimed at the overthrow of regimes which are considered too progressive by Washington.

Essentially, Washington's position has not changed. Reagan is not relying to any great degree on moderate Latin American democracy. The American press has warned: "We must realize that the most important stage does not end, but rather begins, after the overthrow of a dictator."¹⁰ Spokesmen for official circles recall the Nicaraguan "experience": "Many people are overjoyed at the fall of rightwing dictators. But the lesson here is that the situation can worsen considerably. The Administration understands this very well."¹¹

Such statements reveal the true meaning of Washington's attitude toward the democratic process in Latin America. The position of American ruling circles is determined by a clear-cut awareness of the real danger with which democratic progress, elimination of rightwing and extreme rightwing forces and renewal of the social climate in Latin American countries is fraught; this involves (or opens up the possibility of) increased political consciousness on the part of the masses and an increase in the activism and authority of leftwing forces. There arises the possibility that the struggle against repression and authoritarianism will be transformed into protest against all forms of oppression, social injustice and exploitation in the wake of the overthrow of dictators. There is the possibility of a choice: either a country will take the path of profound socioeconomic and political transformations, or else it will limit itself to cosmetic measures to renovate the political facade and will preserve the inviolability (as has thus far been

the case in Latin America in the transfer of power from military to civilian governments) of the foundations of the old social order. As long as this choice exists, Washington cannot feel completely secure.

Hence the cautious attitude toward "old friends," and the principal practical conclusion: "If in specific cases there is no stable democratic alternative, then there is no basis for destabilization of dictatorial regimes."¹² A "democratic alternative" is understood to mean rightwing and right-centrist governments which will be capable of guaranteeing domestic political stability and a pro-American (or at least pro-Western) foreign policy course. The most eloquent illustration of Washington's actions is the American policy on El Salvador, where the Reagan Administration is attempting to create artificially the appearance of such an alternative, guaranteeing the powerless Christian Democratic government the support of a military which is completely dependent on U.S. aid.¹³

However, one can hardly speak of a "turning point" or give Washington special credit for the democratic changes in Latin America in a situation in which the United States' Latin American policy essentially continues to be based on the theoretical concepts contained in the works of J. Kirkpatrick and in the well-known "Sante Fe Document." The "new" formula enunciated by Washington fully includes the approach taken by J. Kirkpatrick, calling for "a clear-cut delineation" between "friendly authoritarian" and "hostile totalitarian" regimes, the latter designation being applied to socialist countries and countries with a progressive orientation. This system of classification is intended to serve as the basis for the struggle against "international communism": "The Administration can support the wave of democratic changes against authoritarian dictatorships; against totalitarian regimes it will continue to arm 'freedom fighters'.¹⁴

Despite liberal statements to the contrary, there has been no actual White House shift toward more moderate positions. The "Reagan Doctrine" has only confirmed the previous course and reinforced a policy which was already being pursued, a course which, incidentally, has always combined support for rightwing authoritarian dictatorships with broad utilization of rhetoric concerning U.S. dedication to democracy. For its part, the U.S. Administration has not concealed its intentions and has not attempted to create the impression of a turning point or changes in its position. On the contrary, it has done everything possible to underscore the consistency of American policy. Positive appraisals by the liberals and the vote in Congress are not testimony to a transition by Reagan's supporters to more moderate positions, but rather to the wishful thinking of moderate political forces in the United States, which have hastened to expressed their satisfaction with the mere fact of the "restoration" of antidictatorial language in official documents.

However, if this new doctrine was not a policy "turning point," then it was a refinement of the former course to suit new conditions. Previously, Washington limited itself to constant declarations of its dedication to democratic principles and ascribed positive changes in the region's political panorama to its own strategy, avoiding, however, demonstrative condemnation of antidemocratic governments. The lifting of the ban on criticism of rightwing

authoritarian dictatorships was aimed at several "consumers" simultaneously, the chief of which was the U.S. Congress. On the other hand, there was also a global aspect to the problem: it should not be forgotten that the "Reagan Doctrine" appeared after the fall of the Phillipine dictator Marcos, but with other Washington-controlled dictatorships still existing around the world, for example in South Korea. Therefore it was these friends of the United States who needed the caveat that "left is always worse." This was also dictated by the need to curb the wave of anti-Americanism which had swept over even some rightwing circles in Latin American states in the wake of the events in Manila. Furthermore, the White House had a stake in establishing or improving its contacts with those forces in the countries of Latin America which had come to power under conditions of a growing debt crisis.

In the Grip of Debt Servitude

Foreign debt is the most acute problem facing states in Latin America. A number of countries have been forced to acquiesce to IMF demands and curtail state expenditures, raise taxes, devalue national currencies, make cuts in social programs, freeze wages, encourage private initiative and denationalize industry, i.e. reduce domestic consumption and redistribute funds to export sectors for the purpose of increasing hard currency income which can be used to pay debts.

The results of this economic policy have been increased social injustice and further political polarization of forces in the countries in the region. Everywhere there has been intensification of the struggle against imperialist dictates and IMF policy. Mass demonstrations have been accompanied by the demand that a moratorium on payment of foreign debts be declared and by protests against the harsh measures recommended by the IMF. Discontent has been provoked not only by the policy of the international exploiters, but also by that of the local ruling circles; ever more widespread is the demand that no responsibility be accepted for the obligations of financial groups which used the funds received by them for purposes of speculation and the accumulation of personal wealth, illegally transferring abroad the same capital which returned in the form of loans, thus increasing the burden of debt.

Public sentiments and the extremely difficult economic situation cannot fail to have an influence on the positions of governments which favor settlement of the debt problem through means compatible with national development tasks. A number of countries, as is well known, have declared a unilateral moratorium on the payment of their debts. Brazilian president J. Sarney has levelled sharp accusations at the IMF. Since the first half of 1985 Mexico and Brazil have, despite IMF recommendations, increased government expenditures for the purposes of relieving social tension and encouraging economic growth. Representatives of the new Guatemalan Government are of the opinion that IMF measures are a disaster for their country. Even Honduras, which Washington has transformed into a staging area for the conducting of its war against Nicaragua and against liberation movements in other countries in the subregion, has allowed itself the liberty of expressing dissatisfaction with IMF policy.

Virtually all countries support in one form or another a review of debt

agreements and the overall responsibilities of debtors and creditors and see the need to link the problem of indebtedness with basic points in the New International Economic Order program like lowering of developed countries' protectionist barriers, defense of sovereignty over natural resources, establishment of equitable economic relations between states, etc.

However, the acknowledged need to eliminate the causes of the debt crisis is not being translated into practical, consistent anti-imperialist policy. This is due to unequal regional development, reflected in the scale and nature of the influence of foreign debt on various countries, and to the selfish interests of the ruling elites and U.S. policy, which are utilizing any means at their disposal to prevent the carrying out of any effective joint actions by debtor states.

These factors create a situation in which, despite the continent's powerful mass social protest against debt servitude, there exists a rather strong (and practically implemented) countertendency in the direction of bilateral negotiations with imperialist centers, above all the United States, and resolution of the problem on a country-by-country basis rather than at the regional level. Thus, the decision by Peruvian president Alan Garcia to limit payments to a sum not to exceed 10 percent of Peru's total income from exports has provoked open dissent on the part of many governments, and the "Cartagena Group" has promised to study the problem and has called for the development of "more flexible conditions."¹⁵ Peru's conflict with the IMF is in sharp contrast, for example, to Argentina's stance of appeasement. The Argentine Government's anti-inflation program and "conscientious efforts" to cope with its \$50 billion debt are being held up as a model by creditor nations.¹⁶

This important argument is widely used to ease the creditors' position. Thereby the goal of reinforcing bourgeois democratic regimes has been the achievement of a compromise with imperialism on matters pertaining to the payment of their debts, on the one hand, and to the socioeconomic stability of their countries, on the other. The most important thing is economic growth, stated Dante Caputo, Argentine minister of foreign affairs: "The people want this, and this is a precondition for stable democracy in Latin America."¹⁷ The contradictory nature of such a position results in peculiar features in the development of the region's domestic political situation, which has prompted Washington to support democratic tendencies in some instances while preserving its conservative structures of dominance in others. Ruling circles in the United States also sense that the debt crisis, the more insoluble it becomes, is being transformed into a "time bomb." Therefore their policy includes both new measures "to rescue the economy" of Latin American countries,¹⁸ as well as the ever-present American arsenal of repressive means of retaliating against the most "disobedient" debtors and countries, as attested to by the Central American crisis brought on by the United States.

The Continent's Hot Spot

A third point of contradiction between the countries of Latin America and the United States is the conflict in Central America. Only a small group of states takes a stance similar to that of the United States with regard to revolutionary Nicaragua: these countries are located directly in the zone of conflict and comprise the so-called Tegucigalpa Group (El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica); under pressure from the United States they continue to undermine the signing of a peace accord and refuse to remove American advisors from their territory.

The most active element of political resistance to imperialism in Central America by bourgeois governments is the "Contadora Group." The positions of its members vary widely. Its undisputed leader is Mexico: its historical tradition of struggle against American interventionism, its governing circles' foreign policy experience and its high level of prestige in the international arena explain the activism and consistency of Mexico's efforts within the framework of the "Contadora process." On the other hand, the positions of Venezuela and Colombia are notable for their high degree of moderation. Colombia has recently begun to demonstrate a particular inclination to compromise with imperialism. As for Panama, despite the vacillations of its ruling circles, both the bourgeoisie and the armed forces realize that the possible regionalization of the Central American conflict threatens the Panama Canal agreement, above all the neutrality of the canal.

However, despite all the limitations of national-reformist or like-minded governments -- the members of the "Contadora Group" -- all of them are deeply aware of the fateful consequences for each of them which could result from U.S. intervention in the region. For that reason the very possibility of such an invasion of Central America reinforces the positive anti-interventionist tendency in their foreign policy, and fears of U.S. aggression prevail over the fear of the spread of revolution which has been created by imperialist propaganda.

The group's activities have received highly positive appraisals from representatives of the continent's official circles and public, who see therein a "challenge to the empire" and a demonstration of Latin American initiative in a realm which the United States has traditionally regarded as its exclusive and undisputed bailiwick. Despite the fact that the actual results of Contadora activities have been very limited, its authority has increased and received, as is well known, significant affirmation by the very fact of the creation of a "support group" comprised of Peru, Argentine, Brazil and Uruguay. It should be recalled that these countries formulated their position in August 1985 at a meeting with the members of the "Contadora Group": "If a peaceful solution through negotiations is not found this will harm social stability throughout Latin America."¹⁹ Peru and Argentina have taken the most resolute stand. In February 1986 eight countries involved in the "Contadora process" demanded that the United States cut off aid to the Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries and renounce its pressure tactics, which are impeding a peaceful settlement in Central America. Thus, virtually all the countries on the continent (with the exception of Chile and Paraguay) favor a political settlement of the conflict. Essentially the United States,

in the words of an American observer, "has become isolated in the face of almost unanimous regional opposition to aid for the rebels who are fighting a civil war against the Sandinista government."²⁰

Despite all this, the Reagan Administration has continued to pursue its policy of force in Central America, and its attitude toward the "Contadora process" has remained negative. Each time that the "Contadora Group" has come close to completing its work to draw up an agreement and brought up the question of adopting a final document, the United States has openly sabotaged the signing of such a document (in October 1984, September 1985 and March and July 1986). According to information leaked to the press, in a secret State Department document it is stated that "the failure of the Contadora Group would be better than a bad agreement."²¹

However, thus far this imperial policy has not yielded the desired results. In this situation many observers are hastening to evaluate the appearance of new elements in Washington's Latin American policy as a retreat from its originally stated positions. Of course, one should not completely exclude the possibility of a change in the ideologically-charged course of the U.S. Administration in the direction of a more flexible and pragmatic approach to the Central American region's problems. The economic and financial crisis of unprecedented scale which has gripped Latin America in the 1980's threatens the world capitalist system, of which the Latin American region is a part. American political tradition also admits (theoretically, at least) the possibility of a new turnaround in the direction of liberal thinking at the highest levels of power. However, the general nature of the neoglobalist course and in particular the continued toughening of Washington's policy in Central America are making a renunciation of the policy of force an extremely remote possibility.

* * *

Contradictions between the United States and states in Latin America continue to worsen. This worsening of intergovernmental relations is occurring simultaneously with a general democratic upsurge and intensification of workers' struggle for their rights. The interaction between these processes is raising the liberation movement to a new stage. Analyzing the current stage in the development of the national liberation struggle in this region, K. L. Maydanik comes to the following conclusion: "On the one hand, this is a struggle for a 'minimal program', directed against the external -- and most intolerable -- forms of economic dominance (neocolonialism) and political interference... [This struggle] is being carried on primarily in the realm of relations between individual states, on behalf of nations... On the other hand, this is a struggle against imperialism as a system of dependency a struggle which is interwoven and intermingled with the democratic (against anti-popular authority), social (against inequality and social injustice) and class (against exploitation) struggle of the masses in each country."²²

Communists in the countries in this region proceed in their work on the basis of this complex dialectic (struggle for democracy and national sovereignty and struggle for a new society). Bearing in mind the limited nature of the foreign political potential of bourgeois governments, they give due credit

both to positive steps in the world arena and to attempts to resist the dictates of international financial capital in their domestic policies. As R. Arismendi, general secretary of the Argentine CP Central Committee, has correctly noted, "the crisis can be combatted within familiar bounds, or also by implementing structural reforms, repudiating foreign debt and IMF policy, and bringing about general democratic transformations, thereby encouraging social progress and the struggle for Latin American integration and a new international economic order..."²³

Although class interests are weakening the positions of Latin American governments and leading to compromise with imperialism, resistance by those governments to neoglobalist dictates and neocolonialist exploitation are creating objectively favorable conditions for struggle by forces which oppose aggression and war and favor the attainment of genuine independence, democracy and social progress.

FOOTNOTES

1. THE ECONOMIST, London, 22 March 1986.
2. See: PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA, No 1, 1986, p 14.
3. For further details see: LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 10, 1986, pp 32-45.
4. TIME, New York, No 19, 1986, p 37.
5. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, Paris, 18 March 1986.
6. THE TIMES, 19 November 1986; LE MONDE, Paris, 18 March 1986.
7. TIME, op. cit., p 37.
8. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 21 April 1986.
9. LATIN AMERICA WEEKLY REPORT, London, 4 October 1985.
10. TIME, op. cit., p 37.
11. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 22 April 1986.
12. Ibid.
13. "Central America and the Western Alliance," New York - London, 1985, pp 22-23.
14. THE ECONOMIST, 22 March 1986.
15. LATIN AMERICA WEEKLY REPORT, 2 August 1985, p 1.
16. LATIN AMERICAN INDEX, Washington, 1 April 1986, p 24.
17. LATIN AMERICA WEEKLY REPORT, 29 November 1985, p 6.

18. For example, the "Baker Plan." See: LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 6, 1986, pp 142-144.
19. LATIN AMERICA WEEKLY REPORT, 20 September 1985, p 4.
20. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 18 March 1986.
21. LATIN AMERICA WEEKLY REPORT, 20 September 1985, p 4.
22. "Razvivayushchiesya strany v sovremennom mire: puti revolyutsionnogo protsessa" [Developing Countries in the Modern World: Paths of the Revolutionary Process], Moscow, 1986, pp 297-298.
23. PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA, No 6, 1986, p 14.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

12825

CSO: 1807/186

LATIN AMERICA

LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE TRENDS IN 'LIBERATION THEOLOGY' VIEWED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 1, Jan 87 pp 20-30

[Article by A. S. Popov and A. A. Radugin: "The Struggle Between Tendencies Within Catholic Theology"]

[Excerpts] At times it seems that the Latin American continent is literally woven out of contradictions and paradoxes. Extreme poverty and great luxury, the spasmodic development of political processes, unemployment and huge foreign debts which there is no possibility of paying off -- all these side by side, all of them part of Latin America's "calling card." One major trait of the region is the fact that the more repressive a given regime is, the more deeply the Latin American church in that country is embroiled in sociopolitical affairs. This may be explained as follows: under a totalitarian regime the clergy and the church must take upon themselves functions which often are not purely religious, but rather political and otherwise, thus substituting for those public organizations which do not exist. Indicative in this regard is the popularity of the so-called basic (grass roots) communities (also known as "the people's church"), which are involved in the search for solutions to current sociopolitical issues.¹ In many cases these communities are the sole possible legal form of assembly on account of bans on political parties and trade unions.

From the standpoint of repressive dictatorships (and they prefer to present themselves in the role of "defenders of Christian values") these communities are involved in rather suspicious activities. The term "people's church" is also not recognized by official Washington. However, facts are facts: the church in Latin America today is not a monolithic formation. It is in a state of genuine schism.

At the present time one could speak of the existence of three tendencies within the Latin American church: traditional conservative, liberal reformist and liberational (leftwing radical). Certain gradations also exist within these three groups. In what way do these theological tendencies differ one from another? Primarily at issue are the traits of their social interpretation of Christianity, the understanding of theologians of the place and role of the church in society, the relationship between faith and politics, Christianity and revolution, etc.

The following "geographical" differentiation of churches by region has been noted. The conservatively inclined hierarchy's sphere of influence extends primarily to Colombia, Argentina and Mexico. Among the radical, "rebellious" pastors Central American and Brazilian clergymen stand out.²

In the 1950's and 1960's failure to undertake any serious social transformations or anti-imperialist acts was typical of both the episcopate and the overwhelming majority of lay Catholic organizations in Latin America. The high church hierarchy paved the way for U.S. policy on the continent. There was strong support for the idea of creating an "Alliance for Progress." The ideological foundations of this program of "aid" was the concept of "development," which propagandized reformism under the guise of so-called regulated revolution. In the Latin American Catholic Church "development theology" was also remarkably widely disseminated.

However, as early as the beginning of the 1960's the true nature of the "Alliance for Progress" had been completely exposed. It became quite clear to broad strata of the population that this "aid" would merely reinforce the dominance of foreign monopolies, and the "Alliance for Progress" was nothing but a tool of U.S. neocolonialist policy. "Development theology" failed along with the failure of the illusions created by the ideas of the "Alliance."

The inability of reactionary ruling groups to bring the region out of the dead end of economic backwardness, limit external influence or conduct agrarian transformations, as well as the political and ideological bankruptcy of national reformism, led to radicalization of the political consciousness of the masses of the people. A considerable segment of the population gradually came to believe in the need for a social revolution as the most acceptable means of resolving their urgent problems. Many priests and theologians also made their political choice. Proof of this is the origin and rapid spread throughout the continent of "liberation theology" at the end of the 1960's and beginning of the 1970's.³

It should be noted that the adherents of this theology had a rather original interpretation of the idea of the 2nd Vatican Council (1962-65), which opened up regenerative processes within Catholicism, concerning the Church's lack of connection with any sociopolitical system. If the church has no a priori obligation to defend a certain social order, being instead the "protector" of all people, and especially of the poor, then does it not follow from this that the church should become involved in the struggle to liberate those same people? If the church is not oriented toward the system in which poverty, repression and other ills incompatible with Christian ideals arise, then does this not mean that it should oppose that system? Yes, it should, replied many Latin American church officials who joined in the struggle to change existing social systems and who regarded this stance as practical realization of Christian precepts.

Of some interest are the following ideas of Elder Camara, a Brazilian archbishop, which are a good reflection of the essence of the views held by proponents of "liberation theology," and of their understanding of its role in Latin American society. "There are regions," he notes, "which still exist in a prehistoric state, where the inhabitants, living like cavemen, are happy to

find anything to eat in trash cans! What should I tell them? That they must suffer in order to get into heaven?!... The church demands that I work to liberate the soul. But how can I liberate the soul if the body is not free? My goal is to send human beings to heaven, not undernourished dogs, deformed by torment, with empty stomachs."⁴

Once again it should be noted that "liberation theology" is heterogeneous. Within it one finds various orientations and tendencies, which reflect the specific socioeconomic and political conditions existing in various countries in the region, of the social forces and movements toward which its ideology and the fervor of the class struggle at a given point in time are oriented. Progressive tendencies are more clearly expressed among representatives of the revolutionary democratic wing of the Latin American version of "liberation theology": Hugo Assman, Gustavo Gutierrez, Leonardo Boff. They are critical of capitalist systems and attempt to help believers overcome the contradictions between their awareness of the need for revolutionary changes and their religious faith.

Leftwing radical proponents of "liberation theology" are attempting to lend social content to the conceptual apparatus according to which theology operates as it explains the meaning of religious doctrine. The basic concept in Christian ethics -- "salvation" -- is interpreted in this variety of theology as "liberation." From the standpoint of "liberation theologians" there is no point in speaking of abstract "salvation." For them, "salvation" is "liberation" in each specific moment from a definite type of oppression caused by some specific form of "sin."

It is important to point out that the representatives of this theological variation also resolve questions concerning methods and forms of struggle from revolutionary democratic standpoints. They reject the idea that only nonviolent actions are specifically Christian. The question of whether to favor violent or nonviolent actions, from these theologians' viewpoint, should be resolved on the basis of scientific analysis of the situation at hand. And that is not the prerogative of theology. Thus, H. Assman underscores the fruitlessness of purely theological speculation on the subject of revolution. The question of revolution is, in his opinion, a social problem, and it should be considered on the basis of practical experience. The most adequate method for applied analysis of social reality, point out supporters of the revolutionary democratic wing of theology, is to be found in Marxism. And in their final conclusions on social problems Christians should rely on it.

Christian revolutionary democrats are striving to orient the activities of the "people's church" in the direction of social realignment of existing systems. The members of basic church groups have, in their opinion, an obligation to set an example of social activism and become a symbol of freedom and participation in all progressive social movements.

Progressive tendencies in Latin American "liberation theology" cause the official Catholic leadership great concern. They regard the dissemination of such ideas as a direct threat both to the existing social order and to their own influence over the masses. John Paul II, head of the Roman Catholic Church, strove to underscore a negative attitude toward this tendency in

"liberation theology" during his visits to Latin America. "The concept of Christ as a political figure, revolutionary, instigator and destroyer from Nazareth is in contradiction to the church catechism,"⁵ he stated at the 3rd Conference of Latin American Bishops in Puebla (Colombia, 1979). During another visit (in January-February 1985), speaking in Caracas, the pope once again condemned those who, in his words, "are distorting the Gospel message, turning the beatitudes into an instrument of ideology and political strategy," those "who are seeking an illusion of earthly liberation rather than the liberation which comes from the church."⁶ He urged Latin American priests to "leave the barricades and return to the sacristy."

In order to depoliticize the church, the current head of the Vatican has even issued a bull forbidding Catholic priests to hold political posts, deliver political speeches or speak out on political issues in general. Those who do not heed this order are threatened with suppression. Obviously such a demand, when made of, for instance, those Nicaraguan priests who are participating in the revolutionary transformation of society, takes on a direct political significance.

The Holy See has unleashed a genuine campaign of repression with regard to the most visible and active proponents of "liberation theology." The case of Leonardo Boff is an example of this. In September 1984 he was summoned to the Congregation for Matters of Faith, where Cardinal Ratzinger warned him that if he did not repent and cease the dissemination of seditious views, then serious disciplinary measures would be taken against him. L. Boff stood his ground, and on 20 March 1985 the official Vatican newspaper OSSERVATORE ROMANO printed a "Notification," signed by Ratzinger, concerning the book "The Church: Charisma and Power." Its contents were subjected to scathing criticism, and the author was accused of promoting ideas which contradicted the Catholic concept of the church, its dogmas and mysteries.

The culmination of the Vatican's struggle against the revolutionary democratic wing of "liberation theology" was the publication by the Holy Congregation on Doctrinal Affairs of two special documents entitled "Admonitions Concerning Certain Aspects of 'Liberation Theology'" (September 1984) and "Admonitions Concerning Christian Freedom and Liberation" (April 1986). They were closely echoed by John Paul II's fifth encyclical, entitled "Dominum et vivificantem" (Lord and Creator, end of May 1986).

The first of these documents is of a sharply critical nature. Its primary goal is to discredit in believers' eyes the "heretical" ideas of "liberation theology" and to undermine its authority. The purpose of the other two was to formulate a positive, from the church's viewpoint, concept of the "correct" Christian understanding of "freedom" and "liberation" with which to counter to the radical leftist concept.

As many progressive commentators in the West have correctly noted, the ulterior motive behind these Vatican documents is to keep millions of Catholics in Latin America and other regions of the world from taking part in the struggle for social liberation. From the Holy See's standpoint, encouragement of such participation is the principal "deviation" of "liberation theology." It is interesting to note that a number of members of

the religious hierarchies of other faiths have understood quite well the specific political content of official Vatican activities in recent years. For example, an interview with Filaret, the metropolitan of the Russian Orthodox Church in Kiev and Galich and chairman of the Holy Synod's Commission on Matters of Christian Unity, in the Italian newspaper UNITA, the following was underscored: "We were very surprised," said the metropolitan, referring to the "Admonitions," "that the Doctrinal Congregation deemed it possible to include material of a purely political nature in this document... Considering... the large section in it devoted to criticism of some Marxist theses, one cannot fail to arrive at the conclusion that this was done in an attempt to warn Latin American Catholics against choosing the socialist path of development."⁸

It should also be noted that, in describing the views of the revolutionary democratic wing of "liberation theology," Catholic leaders do without a doubt exaggerate. None of the Latin American representatives of this tendency draws such radical conclusions as have been ascribed to them. This was stated in no uncertain terms by the "fallen" L. Boff. "Liberation theology," he stated, "in no way denies the divine nature of Christ, nor the redemptive value of this death, nor the Mass as a form for actualization of the divine Saviour and His eucharistic presence." As for Marxism, "it (i.e. liberation theology -- authors' note) is interested in it insofar as Marxism is an aid to a better understanding of the reality of exploitation and gives one a perception of the possibility of doing away with an anti-people system like capitalism."⁹

Examining the specifically political aspects of the development of the revolutionary process around the world and on the Latin American continent, these theologians conclude that the working class in industrialized capitalist states is fully integrated into the system, and existing forms of socialism cannot be the real answer to the "human problem." They also repeat the thesis concerning the relocation of the revolutionary center to "the periphery." From this standpoint "communist" and "liberal" (bourgeois) ideology are basically rejected as being of one and the same type; it is simply that in one system individual wealth is the fetish, and in the other this is replaced by collective wealth. In the final analysis both systems are condemned on account of their "materialism" and orientation toward consumption.

Basing their observations on these maxims, conservative proponents of the Latin American version of "liberation theology" have laid the intellectual groundwork for the idea of the need for a "third path" of development on their continent. One of the major traits of Latin America, asserts F. Andre-Vincent, a Catholic theologian, is that a tradition of "coexistence" ("convivencia") is deeply established there. That is to say, a desire of everyone to live together, to "sit down together at one table." He characterizes this tradition as an embodiment of the principle of love toward all people, as a sign of the "Catholic unity of Latin American diversity."¹⁰ From P. Andre-Vincent, Latin America's "third path" cannot be realized through a political compromise between leftwing and rightwing forces, or through "ambiguous accord between Christians and Marxists," born of civil war or pre-election political battles. He cites historical precedent for efforts at harmony between peoples, seeing these efforts at unity as prompted by the very land on which they live, by the language which they speak, by the blood which

flows in their veins, by everything in which they hear the voice of the universal Lord Jesus, the Creator.

Latin American conservative theologians have their own interpretation of the activities of the grass roots congregations as well. In their opinion, these are intended to cement society; a "civilization of love" should be built, using them as its foundation. In a "holy congregation," underscores P. Andre-Vincent, there should be no room for either class struggle or power struggles.¹¹ He regards the Christian family as the model for such communities, which are called upon to weave a new fabric of human relationships.

Today the official Vatican is to an ever greater extent pinning its hopes on the conservative wing of Latin American "liberation theology" (without renouncing its support for overtly reactionary church factions on that continent, of course). Its primary objective is clear: to create a schism within the movement, to weaken its revolutionary democratic potential, to depoliticize it, to rid it of "ruinous" Marxist influence. The "true," "authentic" church is conceived of by the Holy See in precisely this form. The fact that the conservative branch of "liberation theology" sees human sinfulness rather than social structures as the source of evil impresses the Catholic leadership. There is indeed common ground between this branch of theology and traditional currents in Christian ideology.

The struggle between tendencies in Catholic theology and in sociopolitical interpretations of religion as applied to Latin American conditions continues. It is being fought in unique, and oftentimes quite unconventional forms. The appearance in the Latin American arena of such figures as the theologians Elder Camara, Leonardo Boff and Gustavo Gutierrez, the El Salvadoran archbishop Oscar Romero -- killed by rightwing extremists in the spring of 1981 while celebrating the Mass -- and the priest Camilo Torres, who died, weapon in hand, during military action with a partisan unit, is a characteristic trait of the current political situation on the continent.

The historical significance of the left wing of "liberation theology," noted Fidel Castro in talks with the Brazilian Dominican monk Friar Betto, talks which formed the basis of the book "Fidel and Religion," lies in the fact that it is having a positive effect on the molding of believers' political consciousness. Under present-day Latin American conditions, the Cuban leader pointed out, it would be a great mistake to emphasize the philosophical and world-view characteristics of the views of Christians, who are also the direct victims of an exploitative system, rather than uniting all who strive to establish social justice. It is also important, added Castro, that "liberation theology" try to deprive the exploiters of such a valuable tool for oppressing and deceiving the masses."¹²

In a speech at the 3rd Congress of the Cuban Communist Party, F. Castro emphasized that Marxists regard the appearance of "liberation theology" as an expression of the goodwill of many Christians toward the building of a new world in which social justice and fraternal relations among people will

prevail. This is the context in which one should consider the development of a dialogue between communists and progressive Christian organizations in Latin America.

FOOTNOTES

1. See: V. P. Andronova, "Khristianskiye nizovyye obshchiny -- novaya forma sotsialnogo protesta veruyushchikh" [Christian Low-Level Congregations: A New Form of Social Protest by Believers], LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 11, 1984.
2. In Brazil a considerable number of priests "with communist inclinations" was removed immediately prior to an Extraordinary Catholic Church Synod in 1985.
3. See: E. V. Demenchonok, "Problema 'osvobozhdeniya' v radikalnoy teologii" [The Issue of "Liberation" in Radical Theology], LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 10, 1986.
4. ZHURNAL MOSKOVSKOY PATRIARKHII, No 1, 1972, p 46.
5. "Grâce à l'Évangile l'église possède la vérité sur l'homme" [Thanks to the Gospel the Church Possesses the Truth Concerning Man], INFORMATION CATHOLIQUE INTERNATIONALE, Paris, No 535, 1979, p 9.
6. L'ACTUALITE RELIGIEUSE DANS LE MONDE, Paris, No 20, 1985, p 16.
7. Several other official documents were also published. For example, at the end of 1984 the Pope published an apostolic missive entitled "Reconciliation and Repentance," in which he once again condemned class struggle and those who focus on the social causes of evil rather than on "sin as an individual act." It is clear against whom the Pontiff of Rome is directing his arguments.
8. ZHURNAL MOSKOVSKOY PATRIARKHII, No 6, 1985, p 64.
9. L'ACTUALITE RELIGIEUSE DANS LE MONDE, No 5, 1984, p 15.
10. Ph. Andre-Vincent, "L'église dans la révolution de America Latina" [sic] [The Church in Revolution in Latin America], Paris, 1983, p 36.
11. Ibid., pp 221-222.
12. "Fidel y la Religión. Conversaciones con Frei Betto" [Fidel and Religion: Conversations with Friar Betto], Havana, 1985, pp 290-291.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

12825

CSO: 1807/186

ARTICLES ON THEME OF 'LEFTIST REVOLUTIONARIES' SOUGHT

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 1, Jan 87 pp 118-120

[Article by I. Tverskoy under the rubric "Polemical Comments": "Concerning an Article in This Journal"]

[Text] In No 10 of this journal* there was published an innovative -- innovative for the past 30 years, in any event! -- article by Comrade N. A. Vasetskiy, on the problems of revolutionary activity and, in particular, its dead-end routes. The author obviously hopes to summarize your journal's examination of the theoretical and political problems of revolution. For this purpose he decides first and foremost to attack the heritage of reactionary petty bourgeois revolutionary activity.

It has been such a long time since I have read anything like this! Thus I would like to respond: the article was written in an intelligent and entertaining style, and the topic was developed in a detective-like manner. This applies most of all to the classic question in this genre: who is writing? what is the article about? One receives an answer to the first question by reading through the entire article. Yet the answer to the second is at first unclear. "Trotskyites and Anarchists"? But little by little the experienced reader will begin to suspect that Trotskyism is actually more of a red herring, as is proper for a detective story. Because the author has already said everything he can say about the Trotskyites in his previous article in this magazine (see: No 11, 1985**). Furthermore, there are probably fewer live Trotskyites in Latin American than there are paragraphs in the two articles. One gets the impression that the author is doing an advertisement for them. Thus, is this an article about anarchists? That is to say, about those who are opposed to any form of state or revolutionary organizations? But is such a position really that typical of leftists in Latin America? (but there are so terribly many of them there!)..

The reader is by now intrigued by the mystery, and excitedly leafs through the pages in search of an explanation. The real subject, or rather the author's alleged subject, is our old friends the "tupamaros" and "montoneros, MIR [Movement of the Revolutionary Left] members, etc. Original manipulation of figures and data by these organizations has avoided a real answer to the question of what objective their ideologies pursue. The author's answer is very simple: their "political objectives coincide with those of imperialism,"

they are participants in "reinforcement of the alliance between all reactionary forces and tendencies in the struggle against the forces of social progress and national liberation" and they are "typically reactionary petty bourgeois tendencies," which "are being used by imperialism."

In this bold and uncompromising fashion, sparing no one, the author tears away the blood-stained garb of these servants of imperialism, exposing to us their true nakedness. The author's scorching pen leaves no stone unturned by his thoughts regarding "revolutionary nature," "heroic death," items of which the inspirers of all these tendencies are so fond, as are those who would appease them. Of course, not everything has been said which could have been said. No mention was made of the Central American leftists who are violating the peace in that region. Evidently in order to avoid repeating arguments being heard from across the ocean... Thus far no thorough evaluation has been given concerning the Chilean terrorists who conceal themselves under the pseudo-slogan of struggle against Pinochet. Thus far Comrade N. A. Vasetskiy has also not touched on such timely topics as the appeasement of and, quite frankly, alliance with petty bourgeois leftists which is being practiced by many parties which call themselves communist.

Essentially, it seems to me that those readers toward whom the editorial board has been oriented in its treatment of the question of revolution over the course of many years will definitely not be the ones who are capable of properly appreciating Comrade N. A. Vasetskiy's articles.

Just look at Comrade N. A. Vasetskiy's contribution to world revolutionary theory! For example, this paradoxical, bold thesis, a genuinely scientific discovery -- that is not saying too much: "leftist ideologists cannot directly be called oppressors." How that resounds! Or pointing out the fact that these pseudo-leftists "have secretly set themselves the objective -- under the guise of struggle against imperialism -- of impeding the onward march of the world revolutionary process" (emphasis mine -- I. T.). Of course, some other scribbler will most likely question the phrase "under the guise of struggle," as well as "secretly" and "impede." But the author is aware that the apparent contradiction, that this neologism is, so to speak, the dialectic of real life, standing in contrast to the oversimplified view according to which if someone is fighting imperialism that person must be an anti-imperialist fighter.

As for dialectics, the author can generally hold his own with any leftist philosopher, the fundamental characteristic of which is "conformity to the metamorphoses of reality, to the sequence of historical events, to their zigzags" (the author includes many examples of this type of unseemly behavior). These servants of imperialism obviously assume, as did 19th-century philosophers, that "theory is dry, but the tree of life is forever green." But the author knows what is concealed behind these verdant landscapes: "lack of adherence to principles and vacillation." Among present-day fighters slogans and tactics are like wine: the older, the better, and so much the worse for any metamorphoses of reality.

In general there is a great deal which attracts me, a dilettante, in this article, written by a "professional revolutionary." I envy his knowledge, and

in particular his feel for Latin America. Just read this passage about leftists: "long-haired children in ragged denim, with bicycle chains, rubber hoses or clubs in their hands, ready to smash store windows... ready to pick a fight, and primarily with participants in antigovernment demonstrations or strikes." And how precisely the author depicts relations between leftists and the pro-imperialist segment of the reaction in Latin America: "Leftists receive the support of those against whom they declare the most resolute struggle." And, indeed, is this not attested to by the cases of Marigella, Enriquez, Ero, Torres, Santugo and others, for whom the bourgeoisie did cheap advertising by staging their "heroic deaths"? One could even draw the conclusion that it was for this purpose that the CIA launched a large-scale operation by the Bolivian armed forces against Che Guevara. Or this, for instance: "Appealing to the petty bourgeois masses, leftists take into account that their appeals (to resolute struggle, perhaps -- I. T.) correspond to the views which have been inculcated in those groups by bourgeois propaganda." How subtly they operate! And further: "The most farsighted realize that it would be virtually impossible to keep the masses under their control without joining forces with petty bourgeois pseudo-radicalism." Or the revelation of the social-reformist nature of the Chilean MIR, a thought which is staggering in its cutting truth.

Really, is there any need to continue? I would especially like to note only the editorial board's sensitive attitude toward the unique style of this article, their care in handling the author's text, and the preservation -- I do not hesitate to say it -- of the virgin nature of the author's words, of his logic. I will mention just a couple of examples: "The unemployed in capitalist countries, like working people in the countries of the 'Third World,' represent -- or so the Trotskyites claim -- the most exploited segment of the population." This approach reveals the common features of all who are linked by their nonacceptance of scientific socialism. Those who set themselves the task of "secretly... impeding the onward march of world... progress and, if they succeed, of then attempting to drive it from those positions which it has already won." And further: "The coincidence of the political goals of leftism and imperialism are the tip of the iceberg by which one can unerringly gauge the strength of the alliance of all reactionary forces and tendencies in the struggle against social progress..."

It is very, very regrettable that the author did not tell us what is going on in the underwater portion of the iceberg; evidently he simply wished to spare us the shame... And the way he phrased some things! For example, "The Originality of the 'Ideological Test'" (a subchapter). Or: "under a certain coincidence of circumstances leftist protest can find its social audience."

And there is one other point which I would like to mention in particular. The author modestly, without flaunting his daring (unlike those pseudo-heros, the leftist terrorists) emphasizes that it is "dangerous to touch" the leftists' concepts and principles. "Because in doing so the risk that they will finally disintegrate increases considerably." Of course, what is referred to in this passage is not the toothless humanistic position, because the author is not sorry for those doing the "disintegrating." But what is referred to is a danger, a risk for -- the author himself: it is not difficult to see how the disintegration of leftism would affect the publication of books and articles

concerning it. Nevertheless, N. A. Vasetskiy, with the self-sacrifice of a true scientist and professional fighter, is willing to take that risk. One would think that the period of time which has elapsed since the publication of such a powerful blow to the rotten teeth of leftism would suffice for the latter's partial disintegration. In that case, what is left for Comrade Vasetskiy to write about?

(From the editor: When it published Comrade N. A. Vasetskiy's article entitled "The Dead Ends of Pseudo-Revolution," the editorial staff had no doubt that the article would prove to be a source of debate. Obviously, however, Comrade N. A. Vasetskiy's views are shared by others as well. Therefore, in our opinion it was appropriate to publish that article, as well as objections addressed to its author. The editorial staff is awaiting more in-depth arguments on the questions which have been brought up, especially since the actual experience of the revolutionary struggle in Latin America is yielding a wealth of material for applied historical analysis, to which schematics and dogmatic, sectarian biases are alien.)

FOOTNOTES

* See: USSR Report: International Affairs. JPRS-UIA-87-002 pp 49-60

** See: USSR Report: International Affairs. JPRS-UIA-86-020 pp 55-56

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

12825

CSO: 1807/186

LATIN AMERICA

BOOKS ON LATIN AMERICA FROM 'PROGRESS' PUBLISHERS SURVEYED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 1, Jan 87 pp 132-137

[Article by N. P. Kalmykov, under the rubric "Bookshelf": "Books About Latin America from Progress Publishers"; first paragraph is source introduction]

[Text] With this summary by N. P. Kalmykov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences General History Institute, concerning Progress Publishers publications on Latin American topics our editorial staff begins its publication of materials concerning the work of the major Moscow publishing houses to propagandize and popularize knowledge about that distant continent.

Latin America long ago ceased to be merely a land of rare and exotic things for us. Expanding trade and economic ties, the exchange of public delegations, guest performances, art exhibits, large editions of works by writers from that distant continent and hundreds and thousands of Latin American students at Soviet VUZs: all this has drawn us closer to that contradictory and grippingly interesting world. The more we learn about the region's peoples, their rich history and native culture, the complex present-day processes underway there, the stronger becomes our interest in Latin Americans' past and present. One of the main sources which feeds our interest, which grows with each passing year, has been books from Progress Publishers. In this short summary we will mention only a few of the most typical publications, those which represent the main areas of that publishing house's publications on Latin America.

There is a field of Latin American studies, and it is of equal interest to specialists and the mass audience alike. This field includes the history of ancient Indian civilizations and the discovery and conquest of the continent by Europeans. A prominent place among works on this subject is held by the repeatedly reprinted books of M. Stingl (CSSR), a well-known popularizer of historical science: "Tayny indeyskikh piramid" [Secrets of the Indian Pyramids] (1977), "Indeytsy bez tomagavkov" [Indians Without Tomahawks] (1979), "Gosudarstvo inkov: slava i smert 'synovey Solntsa'" [The Inca State: The Glory and Demise of the "Children of the Sun"] (1985) and "Poklonyayushchiesya zvezdam" [Worshipping the Stars] (1983). All the books by this author are notable for their high level of literary accomplishment, as well as for their professional mastery of their subject matter. In them, the chapters on the campaigns of Hernando Cortez and other conquistadores seeking

the legendary land of El Dorado are equally as interesting as chapters on the fate of the Indians in the 19th and 20th centuries. Stingl's books, which sell out almost immediately, also do not gather dust on library shelves, where they are flanked by other Progress publications about Indians of the pre-Colombian era and the age of great geographic discoveries.

But, no matter how entertaining the popular science genre is, Progress Publishers devotes its primary attention to the publication of serious scientific literature. Latin American studies is a complex science, and the publishing house takes into account the interests of a broad range of specialists working in various humanities fields: economists, geographers, historians, sociologists, etc. The publishing house's efforts to publish books on a carefully considered and well-planned basis are clearly evident.

Thus, its series on the economic geography of Latin American countries stands out. In small (usually 10-12 printed pages) publications the fundamental characteristics and developmental tendencies of a number of the continent's states are given, abundant factual material cited and original research methodology demonstrated. In A. [Bassols Batalya]'s book "Ekonomicheskaya geografiya Meksiki" [Economic Geography of Mexico] (1981),¹ for example, one topic of interest is how to solve the problem of economic geographical regionalization both with respect to economic sectors, specifically, evaluation of the conditions and status of agricultural development in various zones), and to the scale of economic activity (definition of average economic geographical regions). In this book there is a very appropriate forward by V. V. Volskiy, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, dedicated to the history of the formation of a progressive orientation in Mexican geographic science and the place held therein by the book's author. Also useful for specialists is a summary-style monography by P. Martinez Natera entitled "Ekonomicheskaya geografiya Venesuely" [Economic Geography of Venezuela] (1983).

Literature on economics published by Progress Publishers is primarily designed to expose the antinational activities of multinational corporations in Latin American countries. Books in this category are published in the most diverse formats. In a summary of the sectors and branches of the national economy by the Colombian Marxist scientist J. Silva Colmenares entitled "Podlinnyye khozyayeva strany: oligarkhiya i monopolii v Kolumbii" [The True Masters of Our Country: The Oligarchy and the Monopolies in Colombia] (1981) applied research is integrally linked to serious theoretical generalizations. A brief annotated list of financial groups reflects the cast of characters in this tragedy, which is occurring in real life in a country which is fantastically wealthy yet at the same time semi-impoverished. In a monograph by the Brazilian entrepreneur K. Mirou and American international economist G. Maurer entitled "Pautina vlasti. Mezhdunarodnyye karteli i mirovaya ekonomika" [The Web of Power: International Cartels and the World Economy] (1984)² the mechanism of monopoly dominance is studied. The large body of factual material collected by the authors bears witness to efforts to strengthen the positions of the multinationals within the world capitalist economy. Of particular interest are the chapters and sections devoted to such vital issues as the dominance of the leading imperialist monopolies in the energy field, oil production and the electronics industry. Also included in this group of

works are monographs by K. Tugendhet and A. Hamilton "Neft. Samyy bolshoy biznes" [Oil: The Biggest Business] (1978) and R. Vernon "Burya nad mnogonatsionalnymi" [Storm Over the Multinationals] (1982); these monographs contain solid material on the operations of multinational corporations in Latin America. Finally, such literature might include analysis of the activities of any single monopolistic association living as a parasite off the economies of Latin American countries (for example, T. Macken's book "Amerikanskaya kompaniya. Tragediya 'Yunayted frut'" [An American Company: The Tragedy of the United Fruit Co.], 1979). The overall theme which connects these books is the incompatibility of the interests of imperialist monopolies with those of Latin American states.

The continent's economic subordination to the interests and ambitions of foreign, primarily U.S., capital is reinforced by a whole system of political actions, including acts carried out in secrecy. Progress Publishers is doing its part to expose the policy of state-sponsored terrorism being carried out by the United States with regard to the region's progressive forces and revolutionary movement. It has published an entire series of works on the behind-the-scenes activities of U.S. intelligence services and diplomacy in South America and Central America. A book bearing the typical title "Skrytyy terror" [Hidden Terror], by E. J. [Lengut], published in New York in 1984, sketches an exact picture of the United States' unpardonable interference in the internal affairs of two Latin American countries: huge Brazil and little Uruguay. However, regardless of whether a large or small state becomes the object of special American attention, the essence of U.S. policy remains the same: not merely support for, but actual organization of the most reactionary forces in Latin American countries for the purpose of repressing not only revolutionary movements, but also all sociopolitical tendencies which to any degree whatsoever oppose the dictates of American imperialism.

U.S. ruling circles are pursuing an especially brazen and cynical policy with regard to the Island of Freedom. In a book by American authors W. Henckel and W. Turner, published by Progress in 1983 and entitled "Ryba krasnogo tsveta. Istoriya odnoy taynoy voyny" [The Red Fish: The History of One Secret War], the close contacts between the CIA and Cuban counterrevolutionary rabble and Mafia killers are exposed. Staging of diversionary acts, conspiracies for the purpose of disposing of the leaders of the Cuban revolution, armed provocations along Cuban shores and in Cuban airspace -- and all with full White House approval and on White House instructions.

The subject of "Labirint" [Labyrinth] (1986), a book by T. Branch and Yu. Propper, was not the fate of Cubans, but rather of Chileans: Orlando Letelier, one of the leaders of the Chilean people's government, and his comrades. This book could have been entitled "Manhunt," since it deals with the political terror practices employed by Pinochet's security forces. The more carefully one delves into this work, the more clearly one sees, sketched out behind the murderers in the Chilean political police and Cuban counterrevolutionary groups, the face of their real master: American imperialism, which has flaunted the ideals of freedom and human rights in its own house.

Revolution and counterrevolution are one of the central topics of Progress publications on Latin America. There has probably been no major revolutionary event in the past few decades to which Progress Publishers has not responded in its books, and that not just in cutting, timely publicistic literature, but also in analytical works and collections of documents.

Interest in the Sandinista revolution gave rise to the idea of publishing the valuable book "Ideynoye naslediyе Sandino" [Sandino's Ideological Heritage] (1982),³ which is an anthology of documents and materials on the history of the liberation movement in Nicaragua from the end of the 1920's to the beginning of the 1980's. Material was carefully selected to cast light on the life and activities of Sandino and the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary movement on the road to power.

A sort of introduction to the analysis of the revolutionary process in Nicaragua and El Salvador may be found in the book "Revolutsiya v Tsentralnoy Amerike" [Revolution in Central America] (1985). Its authors -- R. Andino, D. [Mis] and R. Schmidt -- have made a successful attempt to discover the causes of the upsurge in the revolutionary movement in this region of Latin America. They classify Central America as a group of dependent and poorly developed capitalist states with extremely acute social contradictions and deep revolutionary traditions. In the book the interrelationship of the processes occurring the modern world is underscored. "In the liberation struggle," writes Miguel Marmol, a veteran of the communist movement in El Salvador, in his introduction to the chapters on that country, "we are inspired by the example of the socialist countries, by the victorious Cuban and Sandinista revolutions, and by the struggle of other peoples and progressive forces in capitalist countries, who brand with shame the genocidal policy which is being carried out by the junta toward our people" (pp 115-116). In their analysis of the problems of the El Salvadoran revolution, the authors have based their study on the work done by the El Salvadoran Communist Party. They offer a well thought-out periodization of its political development over a span of 10 years; this helps explain conformances to law in the present phase of the revolutionary process.

Another publication on El Salvador by Progress Publishers is a book by Shafik Jorge Jandalia, general secretary of the El Salvadoran CP Central Committee, and Comandante Anna Guadalupe Martinez, member of the Revolutionary Democratic Front, entitled "My pobedim. Taynyye tyurmy Salvadora" [Venceremos: The Secret Prisons of El Salvador] (1984). Any reader who becomes familiar with this book will reach the conclusion that revolution in this small Central American country is not in the hands of the individual oppositional groups, but rather is a struggle in which the broad masses of the population are involved. And therein lies the guarantee of approaching victory.

The drama of revolution in Chile continues to excite interest. The further the events of 1970-1973 recede into the past, the clearer we can see the achievements and mistakes of the People's Unity coalition. Among books published in recent years, a work by well-known Cuban writer Lisandro Otero, "Razum i sila Chili. Tri goda Narodnogo yedinstava" [The Reason and Strength of Chile: Three Years of People's Unity] (1983), stands out on account of its perceptiveness and emotional impact. The events described by the author come

sharply to an end in September 1973. Then we have a kind of continuation: "Bol i nadezhda" [Pain and Hope], the title of a book by the young Chilean communist Luis Alberto Corvalan, published in 1982. This is a passionate accusatory document, a truthful account of the executioners of the Chilean people and at the same time a hymn to the antifascists who have maintained their dignity and humanity in Pinochet's dungeons. Even there, in the stadiums and farflung mine dumps which have been converted into concentration camps, on the desert islands where no trees grow, in people's hearts love for their homeland, their people, their family and friends has not grown cold. The lofty moral stature of the patriots who have not bowed their heads to tyranny contrasts with the lowliness and cruelty of their tormenters. L. A. Corvalan's book was his testament to his comrades in the struggle, urging them to see the liberation of Chile through to the end.

The documentary genre has also demonstrated its power of conviction in the account of the tragedy of the people of the little island of Grenada, whose revolutionary experience was abruptly interrupted by the U.S. military. In an anthology of documents and materials entitled "Grenada: mir protiv prestupleniya" [Grenada: The World Opposes the Crime] (1985) responses to this monstrous act of American imperialism were gathered from around the world. A special section was devoted to the subject of "Cuba and Grenada." It explodes the lie by official American propaganda concerning the Cuban republic's so-called "expansionist plans." "The interventionists are attempting to humiliate, persecute, throw into prison and even murder revolutionaries, but they will never be able to erase from people's memories the example of Grenada, which was a friend and comrade, the pride of small peoples around the world, which by its successes and original solutions to complex problems made a contribution to the age-old struggle of all peoples for their freedom": the words of Raul Castro at a memorial service in Havana, as quoted in the book (p 216).

Revolutions do not happen by themselves; they are made by people. And the people behind revolutions are also told of in books from Progress Publishers. The work "Che: moi mechty ne znayut granits" [Che: My Dreams Have No Limits] (1984) by progressive West German journalists H.-E. Gross and K.-P. Wolf is devoted to the life and work of a man who became a legend during his own lifetime. It would seem that everything is already known about Ernesto Che Guevara: hundreds of books and articles have been written about him. Yet the authors were nevertheless able to find new facts which help reveal in greater detail the picture of this notable revolutionary, to trace the path of the formation of this man of unyielding character and boundless love of people. The reader will refuse to accept the thought of this hero's death, just as many years ago it was impossible to accept the death of Ovod-Rivarez. But this time the subject is not merely a character in literature, but instead a real human being, our contemporary.

Progress Publishers periodically acquaints us with the best models of public thinking in Latin American countries. Two books stand out in particular among those which have been published on this subject in recent years. Firstly there is the thorough study by the great Mexican philosopher Leopoldo Zea entitled "Filosofiya amerikanskoy istorii. Sudby Latinskoy Ameriki" [The Philosophy of American History: The Destiny of Latin America] (1984), in

which he traces the formation of popular Latin American culture, which has incorporated in itself elements from the cultures of various races and peoples. The author compares this process with other forms of culture in the New World. Under conditions of intellectual expansion from the north, or rather the expansion of non-intellect, this analysis of the origin and realization of various "projects for the liberation" of America is timely and fresh. The projects include in particular the Anglo-Puritanical, which from the very start high-handedly refused American Indians the right to participate in the creation of the new society and its culture, but also sanctified the extermination of the native population with the word "freedom." In his book Zea demonstrates that the dialectic method is not unknown in national schools of philosophy. One characteristic example is research on the Iberian heritage in Latin America, which gives rise, on the one hand, to the conservatism of sociopolitical institutions and traditions and, on the other, encouraged consolidation of the anticolonial struggle against Spanish rule. There is much in the book which is debatable, but it would be a debate centered on a living concept which is the fruit of serious thought concerning the historical destinies of the continent's peoples.

The other book, "Vskrytyye veny Latinskoy Ameriki" [The Veins of Latin America Revealed] (1986), stems from the pen of Uruguayan writer Eduardo Galeano. Without exaggeration it can be said to be on the very highest level of publicistic historical writing. Integrity of thought, colossal erudition, attention to facts and a magnificent aphoristic language: such are the basic characteristics of this work. "Vskrytyye veny Latinskoy Ameriki" is the account of how it happened that a talented and hardworking people living on land from which innumerable riches literally spring forth, remains poor and deprived of its rights. In reading this book one involuntarily sees the image of a person winning his daily bread through hard labor, yet not able to satisfy his hunger with that bread on account of the greed of a flock of vultures which tears the food from his hands.

For centuries the Spanish, Portugese and English squeezed Latin America dry. Yet the most unquenchable vampires are American monopolies. "The Riches in the Depths of Latin America Are as Essential to the U.S. Economy as Air Is to the Lungs" -- this is the title of one section of the book. The monopolies not only rob the riches found in the depths of Latin American countries, they also seem to be intoxicated with the fabulous opportunities to exploit a cheap labor force. In its race for profit, big business relies on the oligarchy and the darkest forces of reaction, protecting them and generously rewarding them. This Uruguayan writer realistically demonstrates how this sinister alliance is formed. Not all sections of the book are equally successful, and one cannot agree without reservation with everything which it contains (for example, the typology of Jesuit missions in Paraguay during the 17th and 18th centuries seems dubious), but the overall conclusion is incontestable: this is one of the most interesting books ever written by a Latin American about Latin America. We should also note that we were delighted to encounter in this work repeated references to and citations from Soviet literature; this is convincing evidence that the voice of Soviet Latin America scholars is being heard more loudly around the world. The only possible cause for complaint is that this book, first published in 1971, did not become available to Soviet readers until 15 years later.

The publishing house's abundant production in the Spanish language can be divided into two major groups: the first consists of works by progressive figures from Latin America, the second consists of research by Soviet scientists. There is no doubt as to the need for the publication of both groups. It is difficult to imagine a specialist or student preparing to become a Latin America specialist who would not have read or who would not quote from the 1983 Progress book "Lenin i nashe vremya" [Lenin and Our Times], written by Rodney Arismendi, an outstanding thinker and politician in present-day Latin America. It is not only the book's flawless logic and revolutionary enthusiasm which attract the reader. One cannot remain indifferent to the brilliant publicistic language of R. Arismendi's works, a language which speaks to millions.

Though there is no room in this article to go into detail concerning all books on Latin America by Soviet authors, we will mention only three which are quite typical of the main thrusts of work by the publishing house in this area. On issues of class struggle we will mention the work "Rabocheye dvizheniye v Latinskoy Amerike" [The Workers' Movement in Latin America] (1985) by V. I. Koval, and also a book by the patriarch of Soviet Latin American studies, I. R. Grigulevich, entitled "Katolicheskaya tserkov i osvoboditelnoye dvizheniye v Latinskoy Amerike" [The Catholic Church and the Liberation Movement in Latin America] (1984). On international relations a monograph entitled "Evolyutsiya latinoamerikanskoy politiki SShA" [Evolution of U.S. Latin American Policy] (1983), by A. Glinkin, B. Martynov and P. Yakovlev, stands out on account of the timeliness of its subject matter.

To conclude this brief and incomplete summary of literature on Latin America which has been published in recent years by Progress Publishers, I would like to note that they are doing a major, much-needed job. They are doing it with interest and love. Soviet readers can expect to see many notable works of classic publicistic writing such as, for example, "Fakundo" by D. F. Sarmiento or "Sertany" by E. da Cunha, as well as other interesting works. Of course, I would like to see more works on history written by the most prominent representatives of the national Latin American schools of historiography, and the list of works by Soviet scientists translated into the languages of Latin American peoples could well be expanded. But there is another point which I would like to underscore: Progress Publishers is making a major contribution toward strengthening friendship and mutual understanding between Soviet and Latin American peoples; it is building bridges over the long term, and this gives reason to hope that the fertile Latin American fields of Progress Publishers will again, and more than once, yield an abundant and long-awaited harvest.

FOOTNOTES

1. For a review of this book, see: LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 3, 1982.
2. LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 12, 1985.
3. See: LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 2, 1984.
4. LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 3, 1986.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstov "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

12825

CSO: 1807/186

BOOK ON LATIN AMERICAN S&T DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS REVIEWED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 1, Jan 87 pp 140-141

[Review by Ye. V. Kovalev of the book "Problemy nauchno-tekhnicheskogo razvitiya stran Latinskoy Ameriki" [Problems of Scientific and Technical Development In Latin American Countries], edited by Yu. M. Girgoryan, Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1986, 214 pages]

[Text] Exploitation of developing countries by developed capitalist powers is acquiring an ever more technical nature, and the struggle by the former for their economic independence is to an every increasing degree becoming a struggle for technological independence. A multifaceted analysis of the complex of problems created by the scientific-technical revolution on the Latin American continent is contained in this collective monography prepared by the staff of the USSR Academy of Sciences Latin America Institute.

This book is a basic study of one of the most important, timely and as yet inadequately studied issues not only in our own country, but also abroad. This work is structured according to a problem-solving approach, which makes it possible to examine all the basic aspects of the processes being studied taken together and on a country-by-country basis, showing all their diversity. The authors' suggestions for a typology reflect not only the standing of countries in this region in terms of scientific and technical development, but also the nature, orientation and intensity of this process in the countries thus classified.

In the monograph a broad range of issues are analyzed, including the current status and level of development of scientific research and development in the region, the degree to which these are utilized in physical production and the dependency of their introduction on the availability of trained personnel, especially in industry. The authors have succeeded in demonstrating that in and of itself the acquisition of new technology under conditions of economic dependence not only does not free Latin American peoples from technological exploitation, but, quite the contrary, as a rule intensifies that exploitation. The conditions under which technology transfer occurs are the decisive factor in economic development, including technological development. This book contains a detailed examination of the channels, scale and real price of the technology transferred. On the basis of applied analysis of documents containing agreements on technology transfer, the authors

convincingly prove that many points in such agreements at first glance appear to be insignificant or of a purely technical nature, yet in fact place the recipients of technology in an extremely disadvantageous, unequal position and, essentially, form the links in that chain of technological dependence with which imperialism is impeding the economic development of Latin American countries.

This book devotes a great deal of attention to consideration of the problems of the time frame included in technology transfer agreements. In a well-argued and logical manner the authors lead the reader to the conclusion that under the conditions existing in the scientific and technical revolution technological transfer has been transformed into one of the basic forms of imperialist exploitation of Latin American countries and the developing world as a whole, and that neocolonialism in the era of the scientific and technical revolution is becoming primarily scientific-technical neocolonialism. Multinational corporations play the role of leading exploiters in the technological realm. "By the beginning of the 1980's," it is emphasized in the monograph, "more than two-thirds of capitalist trade and four-fifths of world capitalist technological exchange was controlled by multinational corporations, primarily American ones" (p 210).

A large part of the book is devoted to the problem of so-called "intermediate technology." There exists a large number of definitions of this concept, but it seems to us that the one which comes closest to expressing its actual nature is that of technology which is not traditional but also is not the most modern, technology located somewhere in the "middle," and which corresponds to the greatest degree to the socioeconomic conditions prevailing in developing countries. The authors, we feel, have taken the correct position with regard to the concept of "intermediate technology," noting the utopian nature of its searches, and thereby underscoring the fact that the worldwide nature of the scientific and technical revolution under present-day conditions makes attempts to deviate from the general direction of technological development and find a separate "regional" or "national" technology unrealistic. In the book attention is also drawn to the fact that at the present time developed capitalist powers are also putting forth considerable effort to create "intermediate technology" for developing countries. Thereby the centers of capital are seeking new spheres for the application, specifically, of outdated technology, in order to keep developing countries on a lower level in the spiral of scientific and technical progress.

The analysis of the problem of scientific and technical development in this monograph is conducted in close connection with the overall economic situation of Latin American countries, and one of the work's basic conclusion is as follows: "...a poorly developed economy slows down the creation of scientific and technical potential, and poorly developed scientific and technical potential impedes economic growth" (p 209). The most important means of accelerating the development of both are profound socioeconomic transformations in the countries in the region which would overcome the internal barriers on the path of economic development, including scientific and technical development. This would make it possible to uncover additional untapped physical and labor resources and harness the intellectual potential

of new generations to meet the requirements of scientific and technical progress.

In the monograph there is also an analysis of the development of scientific and technical contacts between Latin America and CEMA countries; these contacts are acquiring ever greater significance.

Along with its indisputable achievements, this work also manifests some shortcomings. For example, the book contains the following statement: "Marxist-Leninist theory does not reject an active independent role by the social superstructure, including such branches as the educational system" (p 52). It is not completely correct, it seems to us, to consider the educational system as a branch of the superstructure. What is at issue here is a rather complex concept which to an immeasurably greater degree relates to society's productive forces. On p 66 the following statement is made: "The restructuring by multinational corporations of the structure of agricultural production in Latin America in the direction of expansion and diversification of exports primarily serves the interests of the multinationals and the imperialist powers." It seems to us that such a categorical statement requires some proof, to say the least. Of course, multinational corporations do have a tremendous influence on the structure of agricultural production, but the assertion that today they are carrying out a realignment of that structure is a considerable exaggeration of their role. Too many other economic, social and even political factors are also influencing the evolution of this structure.

Finally, in some places this work asserts the idea of the backwardness of Latin American countries in an overly simplistic manner. Its point of departure seems to be "presumption" of the region's "backwardness," even in those passages which discuss certain achievements in the fields of education and technological development (pp 30, 32, 33 and following).

In conclusion we would like to express the hope that this monograph will serve as a starting point for a whole series of studies on this topic.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

12825

CSO: 1807/186

BACKGROUND, 1978 EVENTS IN JONESTOWN RECALLED, CIA IMPLICATED

Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 25 Mar 87 p 3

[Article by B. Borisov: "The Killers"; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA LITVA introduction]

[Text] In Moscow a documentary book investigation has been published about the killing of more than 900 citizens of the United States, who had asked for political asylum in the Soviet Union. (Footnote 1) (S. F. Alinin, B. G. Antonov, "Gibel Dzhonstauna--prestupleniye TsRU" [The Downfall of Jonestown--Crime of the CIA], Yurizdat, Moscow, 1987). It reveals the monstrous act of the premeditated extermination, on 18 November 1978, of the members of a political protest organization--the "Peoples' Temple" [as published; subsequently corrected in the translation], who had emigrated from the United States to Guyana and intended to transmigrate from there to the USSR. American propaganda depicted them as "religious fanatics, who committed mass suicide." However, the existing documents, the testimonies of the press and eyewitnesses, and the conclusions of lawyers, physicians, and other experts completely disprove this false version.

In the morning of one of the December days of 1977, the Soviet consulate in the capital of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana, Georgetown, received a visit from unusual visitors. They requested a meeting with the consul of the USSR.

"In the reception hall I saw two women and a man, who presented themselves as members of the leadership of the "People's Temple" commune," F. Timoveyev, the former consul of the USSR in Guyana, recounts. "These citizens of the United States reported that they had left their country for political reasons and had created a commune in Guyana, trying to utilize the experience of the Soviet state. They asked for literature on the Soviet Union and showed a special interest in how the national question is solved under socialism, how the economy is conducted, how the culture of the peoples of the USSR is developing, etc."

The guests received books about our country, the Constitution of the USSR, and copies of the newspaper SOVIET WEEKLY. In their turn, they gave to the consulate articles and prospectuses about the history of the commune and about the life of the American immigrants in Guyana. In them it was related that the "People's Temple"--an organization of unfortunate inhabitants of the United States--originated in the mid-1960's in the city of Indianapolis and operated mainly in California, trying to create human conditions of existence for the

most exploited and oppressed inhabitants of the United States. Officially registered as a religious commune, this organization actively spoke up in the political arena against racial oppression, for civil rights, for peace and democratic freedoms. It was subjected to persecution and victimization by the secret police and badgering in the press. This was the biography of its leader Jones.

The "Temple" supported the South African liberation movement, the anti-Fascists in Chile, and the patriots in Northern Ireland. It helped the American Indians, the political emigrants in South Korea and other countries, resolutely supported the countless political prisoners (such as Angela Davis), and came out in favor of the liberation of Ben Chavis and the members of the "Wilmington Ten."

In the conditions of the United States, such actions are extremely risky undertakings. Jim Jones became the object of persecutions organized by the reactionary ruling circles. He was threatened, he was shot at, the members of his family and friends were terrorized, tracked, ambushed, and beaten unmercifully. The houses of the "People's Temple" were subjected to acts of vandalism, they were burned and bombed. Attempts were made to introduce provocateurs into the organization and false accusations were fabricated against it.

All of this compelled about a thousand people from the "People's Temple" to leave their homeland in the mid-1970's for political reasons. They emigrated to Guyana and organized an agricultural commune of a new type there--the settlement of Jonestown (named after Jim Jones). The way of life in it differed radically from the capitalist way of life. This was an unprecedented act of political protest in the history of the United States, which called forth a reaction of the punitive apparatus unheard of in terms of its cruelty.

In the capital of Guyana, the "People's Temple" Commune rented a house (2 kilometers from the Soviet consulate). It was, in essence, a small hotel. Here guests from the United States and other countries travelling to Jonestown were accommodated. Here its picturesque staff, coordinating the life of the commune with the government institutions of Guyana, and the radio station were found.

"We Would Like to Live in the USSR"

On 20 March 1978, a delegation from Jonestown visited the Soviet consulate and on behalf of the leadership of the "People's Temple" declared that the commune wants to transfer all of its monetary assets to a Soviet bank. All of its members intended to make application for Soviet citizenship and after receiving agreement on this to leave for the Soviet Union. The delegates delivered official appeals. In one of them, signed by the general secretary of the agricultural cooperative in Jonestown, Richard D. Tropp, in particular, it was stated: "In the interests of the security of our cooperative, which is threatened by American reactionaries, for it is a successfully developing socialist collective with a Marxist-Leninist perspective and fully supports the Soviet Union, we declare on behalf of the commune (a group of Americans who came to Guyana to assist in the building of socialism) our desire to send a delegation of members of our leadership to the Soviet Union to discuss the question of the journey of our people to your country as political emigrants.

About the population of the cooperative: A total of 1,200 (including 200 residents of the United States, who soon were to come to Guyana). Under 18 years--450 persons, 18 and older--750 persons.

Length of stay in the USSR--permanent, until conditions in the United States will make it possible to return, to be of use in the process of social transformations in this country.

Conditions of stay: Any that are acceptable for the USSR--either a socialist cooperative, or the settlement of the families individually. We have become used to the collective life. We could create a model which, possibly, could be useful to the Soviet Union. Our approach is flexible to a sufficient degree. We would prefer a warmer climate, for the members of our commune who are of advanced age have become used to a warmer climate, but we will be grateful if we are allowed to settle in any place.

Finance: We have for a long time collected the necessary funds. Some people sacrificed all of their personal means for the needs of the collective.

The reason for this request: The "People's Temple" actively fought against injustice and for civil rights during 25 years in the United States. The commune [obshchina] which comrade Jones has organized here, in Guyana, represents a successful attempt to create a commune [kommuna], one free of the economic and racial oppression from which millions of people of various races and ages are suffering--from children to very old men. The "People's Temple" has always felt deep respect for the Soviet Union. Your impressive successes during the 60 years of the construction of socialism, the victory in a war full of sacrifices, a war which the Soviet people endured defending the homeland (and thereby the entire world) against fascism, and the constant support, by the Soviet Union, of the liberation struggle in the whole world, were an inexhaustible source of great inspiration for us.

We have demonstrated the complete inability of the capitalist system to guarantee human conditions of existence. Among us there are many people who can (and who would very much like to) come forward in the role of eyewitnesses. With facts from their own experience, they are ready to demonstrate this tragic and complete failure of the capitalist system and the destruction of our rights by it.

Jim Jones is an open opponent of American imperialism.

The actions aimed at the undermining of our organization confront us with the problem of security. We know, proceeding from long experience, about the insidiousness of the reactionary forces in the United States, and here, finding ourselves in isolation, in a relatively remote region, we do not close our eyes to the possibility of our complete destruction without special efforts--a possibility which we realize with all seriousness.

A real threat to destroy our movement exists. In the Soviet Union, we would be secure. A bright future would be guaranteed there for our children. We all desire enthusiastically to work in the Soviet Union in the interests of socialism. We are all industrious, disciplined, and in agreement with the idea of

the collective structure of society. Our own democratic and voluntary structure functions very well, being oriented toward the worthy imitation of the achievement in the labor of the members of the commune and the workers that show initiative, which makes it possible for us to attain successes, as is confirmed by many of our guests. . . ."

As Guests in the Commune

On 27 September 1978, F. Timofeyev and the physician of the Soviet consulate, N. Fedorovskiy, came to Jonestown at the invitation of the leadership of the commune. Here is their story about this visit:

We were surprised by the fact that many residents greeted us in Russian: "How are you, comrades!" I asked them from where they know the Russian language. They answered that, after the members of the commune unanimously decided to move to the Soviet Union, all, without exception, began intensive study of the Russian language.

After the creation of the settlement, it was visited by more than 500 people--Guyanese and foreign citizens, staff members of the consulate of the United States, and the representatives of other consulates in Guyana, statesmen and public and political figures, and journalists. We were shown a book of comments, in which many of them made entries. In this album in rich leather cover, there were 50 pages or so. The entries are testimony to the inspiration of the people, who had seen a unique agricultural commune flourishing in the center of the wild Guyanese jungles.

We also made an entry. Where is it now, this book? There is every reason to believe that the special services, which were involved in the extermination of the members of the "People's Temple", captured its documents. For example, the text of the discussion of the delegation of the "Temple" in the Soviet consulate on 23 March 1978, which was known only to the Soviet side and the leadership of the commune, was published in the United States and distributed by American agencies throughout the world 3 days after the murder in the jungles. . . .

We had dinner with Jones. We ate onion soup from wooden cups, salad, and fried chicken. I thought that for those Americans, who are used to have dinner in the restaurants on Fifth Avenue or on Broadway in New York, such a dinner, possibly, would seem modest, for people suffering from hunger for weeks on end, digging in garbage cans and trash containers in the search for foodstuffs, standing in lines for hours for a bowl of soup--for these people to receive, on a daily basis, three meals a day of free, high-calory food, would undoubtedly be a great blessing. Not only the leadership of the commune, but also the physician kept an attentive eye on the menu and the quality of the food.

After dinner they showed us two films. One was about Martin Luther King. The other film told about a speech by Angela Davis on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the United States. She thanked the members of the "People's Temple" for the moral and material support they gave her when the American authorities threw her behind bars. The words of Angela are remembered: "I was born in America, which is celebrating its 200th anniversary. But millions

of negroes do not sense this holiday--they are without rights. They can ask me whether I am happy. I will answer: "Yes! Because now millions of my brothers and sisters--negroes, chicanos, Puerto Ricans--are uniting to put an end to racial oppression."

At 11 pm, Jones invited the Soviet consul to talk with the leadership of the "People's Temple" about the possibility of emigration of the members of the organization to the Soviet Union. Above all, they talked about sending the children. Jones was also interested in the possibility of transferring the monetary assets of the commune to a Soviet foreign trade bank. He said that the leadership of the "Temple" had over 1 million American dollars in cash and was ready to transfer them to any of the divisions of the USSR Foreign Trade Bank. And the remaining funds, which constitute approximately 10 million dollars and are deposited in Swiss banks, they would like to transfer to a Soviet bank at the beginning of the following year, 1979, when the interest payment period on the time deposit will be completed. To meet with the representatives of this bank, they would like to make a trip to the Soviet Union at the end of November or the beginning of December of 1978.

Jones also expressed some observations concerning possible practical ways of effecting the emigration of the members of the "People's Temple" to the USSR, if agreement will be obtained. As one of the variants, he proposed, for example, to make use of the two ships which the "Temple" had and which were registered to the port in Georgetown. In one trip, they could transfer a thousand people from Guyana to the Soviet Union--together with their personal property and the most valuable equipment.

The Intrigues of the CIA

On 7 November 1978, a reception in honor of the anniversary of the Great October took place in the Soviet consulate. Among the 300 guests there were 6 persons from the leadership of the "People's Temple". Their presence at the reception called forth excitement among the American diplomats. They tried to sound out questions about the intention of the leadership of the commune to emigrate to the Soviet Union. The tone in which the diplomats discussed these questions indicated their evident concern with this prospect. Well, how can one link the policy of "the defense" of human rights, which the American administration is conducting, and the Final Act signed in Helsinki, with the obstacles raised for those who wish to leave the United States for political reasons? This question took Dwyer, the temporary charge d'affaires of the United States, by surprise. He mumbled something about supposedly not political, but religious motives in the actions of the members of the "People's Temple" and avoided a direct answer.

After 4 days, in the evening of 11 November, Sharon Amos (the official representative of the "People's Temple" to the government of Guyana) came to the Soviet consulate in a dark-green "Lancer" automobile, which the "People's Temple" rented for travel through the Guyanese capital. Her voice choking with emotion, she reported that the Congress of the United States had sent a member of the House of Representatives, Leo Ryan, to Jonestown to investigate the numerous accusations which the American press had published in the course of a campaign against the "People's Temple" organized by the CIA and the FBI.

The thing is that, on 22 June 1978, one of the residents of San Francisco, James Cobb Jr., turned to the Supreme Court of the United States with an accusation of the "People's Temple" and Jim Jones of criminal actions on the grounds that this organization, on 14 March of the same year, allegedly published an open letter with the threat of mass suicide. Cobb also asserted that supposedly on 18 April 1978 the "People's Temple", in its declaration for the press, reported about the unanimous decision of the members of the commune in Guyana to die. This information was reported to the State Department, all members of the American Senate, the House of Representatives, and the information agencies. In actual fact, no open letter or report, as announced by Cobb, existed.

Naturally, this very much put Jones and the members of his organization on their guard, confirming their fear about the reality of the fabrications of the American special services to exterminate the inhabitants of Jonestown to a man and to pass this off as suicide.

Soon still more alarming signals were received from the United States. The attorney Timothy Stone accused Jones of preventing members of the commune in Guyana by force from leaving it and of applying various forms of physical and moral pressure on them.

Who is this Stone? For a number of years, this person closely collaborated with Jones, accompanied him to Guyana, and served as the legal counsel of the commune. When it became clear that Stone, already since his student days, was an agent of the CIA, he was expelled from Jonestown. And here this agent provocateur, carrying out the task of his masters, organized and headed up an "association of concerned relatives" of persons supposedly being forcefully held back in Jonestown. This association demanded the liquidation of the settlement in Guyana. Together with its representatives and journalists, Ryan now came to Jonestown to investigate the affair.

Sharon Amos was very agitated. She asked whether their request concerning emigration to the USSR had been sent to Moscow. This was done at once after the receipt of the document. To expedite the matter, Sharon Amos took a batch of questionnaires for the registration of visa and individual applications for the granting of Soviet citizenship, since according to Soviet laws there is no collective acceptance for USSR citizenship. It is effected in an individual procedure.

Through agents of the CIA in Jonestown, the American consulate learned about the plans of the "People's Temple", as well as about the fact that the members of this organization were studying the Russian language and were watching Soviet films, which they received through official channels from the consulate of the USSR in Georgetown. Dick Dwyer and the consul Richard McCoy informed the U.S. State Department about this, but more detailed information and corresponding recommendations were sent by the resident [agent] of the CIA in Georgetown.

In Agee's book on the activity of the CIA in Latin America, among the names which figure are those of the vice-consul Daniel Weber and Dennis Reece, who

played an unseemly role in the tragic events in Jonestown. The activity of these people is closely connected with the introduction of CIA agents in the "People's Temple".

It must be said that Ryan was by no means a "CIA man". On the contrary, the CIA was displeased with Ryan because of the fact that, in December 1974, together with Senator Hughes, he proposed an amendment to the law on foreign aid, whose purpose it was to limit the operations of the CIA abroad. Moreover, Ryan had won for himself the reputation of a principled, objective, and incorruptible investigator, "a knight of truth."

In Jonestown, neither Ryan nor the persons accompanying him, found any confirmation of the slanders against the "People's Temple" which were spread in the United States. And he intended to report about this to the Congress with all the straightforwardness characteristic of him. So that with the return of Ryan to Washington, full exposure awaited the organizers of the campaign against the "People's Temple". The opponents of the "Temple" could not permit that the meticulous congressman should bring to nought all the attempts to discredit Jonestown and its leaders. And they found nothing better than to kill Ryan and those who, together with him, could unmask the slanders aimed at the "Temple". This murder was carried out at the air field of Port Kaituma, on Saturday, 18 November 1978.

"They Do Not Spare Anyone!"

In the evening of the same day, the consul F. Timofeyev received an urgent visit in the club of the consulate of the USSR from members of the "People's Temple", Deborah Touchette and Paula Adams. They were extremely agitated. Deborah said that she had received a report from Jonestown through radio communication. "Something terrible is happening there. The settlement is surrounded by armed people. Something has befallen Ryan. He was attacked when he returned to Jonestown. I am asking you to take this for safe-keeping."

Deborah handed the Soviet consul a heavy case. He asked what was in it. "Here are very important documents of our "Temple", money, and recordings on cassette tapes," she answered. To the question, how much money, Deborah replied that she did not know exactly, for there were both cash in Guyanese dollars and also other monetary documents. In view of the extraordinary circumstances, they asked that the case be accepted for safe-keeping, since it was entirely possible that the staff-headquarters in Georgetown would also be attacked, and perhaps it had already been destroyed.

Later the case with its entire contents was handed over to the Guyanese government in the interest of the investigation which it intended to conduct. Among the documents a testament was found, according to which all the deposits of the "Temple" in the branches of the Swiss Bank in Panama, as well as in the Venezuelan Bank in Caracas (7.8 million U.S. dollars), should be turned over to the Soviet Union through the Soviet consul in Guyana "for the cause of the struggle of peace and the assistance of oppressed peoples." At the present time, this testament is at the disposal of the authorities of Guyana.

Deborah said that on Sunday or Monday she will report all the details about what took place in Jonestown. Then they left.

At approximately the same time when Paula and Deborah were in the Soviet club, Sharon Amos called the apartment of the Soviet consul from the staff-headquarter of the "Temple." She was crying and said that Jonestown was surrounded by armed people. In spite of interference, she received a radio-telegram to the effect that military helicopters were circling above the settlement. "Help. Jonestown is perishing!" she shouted. "They do not spare anyone! Somebody is breaking into my room. Do everything to save us." The telephone was disconnected. This telephone call was reported to the Guyanese police, which answered that a reinforced duty detail had already been sent to the house of Amos. But Amos and her three children died. They were killed by the CIA agent (the former naval infantryman Blakey), who had been introduced in the organization of Jones. Later they declared him to be mentally ill, and he disappeared. Thus, during this terrible night of 18 to 19 November, a monstrous slaughter took place in Jonestown. The agents of the United States perpetrated one of their most terrible crimes--they shot, killed and poisoned 914 American citizens.

The Guyanese authorities by no means received access to Jonestown at once. During the first two 24-hour periods they were compelled to be satisfied with confused and contradictory reports of the command of a sub-unit of the U.S. Army, which had been conveyed to Guyana in C-141 military transport planes. Without any permission of the Guyana authorities, they landed at the Timehri airport.

The landing of the special purpose forces of the United States began in the evening of 18 November. From the airport they transferred the American soldiers to Port-Kaituma and the settlement of Jonestown in helicopters. For 48 hours the Americans did not admit the Guyanese authorities or journalists to Jonestown, covering the traces of their crime.

The CIA and other special services of the United States carried out two terrorist operations on 18 November: The killing of Congressman Leo Ryan and a number of his companions and journalists, and then the en masse extermination of the members of the commune in Jonestown. Here the group of CIA agents introduced into this organization was located, who constantly kept Langley informed about the events taking place in the "People's Temple".

The intention of the members of the commune to collectively move to the Soviet Union to live called forth serious concern on the part of the Washington administration, which feared the political consequences of such a step. The denouement was also accelerated by the fact that at the beginning of October 1978 the "People's Temple" organization, through its attorney Mark Lane, announced that within 90 days it would bring suit for many millions of dollars against state organs of the United States--the CIA, the FBI, the U.S. Postal Service, and other departments, accusing them of subversive activity against the "People's Temple". This suit, undoubtedly, would have put the government and the "intelligence community" of the United States in an extremely difficult position. Through the en masse killing of the members of the "People's Temple" (which took place one and half months after the declaration of Lane) and the compromise of this organization as a "sect of suicides" the very possibility of the formulation of the question about such a suit was eliminated.

All of the bodies in plastic bags were conveyed from Guyana in planes of the U.S. Air Force to the military base at Dover, where they were cremated in an atmosphere of the strictest secrecy.

The Opinion of Soviet Experts

Soviet specialists in the sphere of forensic medicine believe that the version of the death of the population in Jonestown disseminated by American propaganda does not correspond to the truth. The chief of the Bureau of Forensic Expertise of the Main Administration of the RSFSR Ministry of Health, L. S. Velisheva, asserts that a massive extermination of people in cold blood took place in Jonestown. This is confirmed by the research conducted by the chief pathological anatomist of Guyana, doctor Leslie Mutu. He discovered on many bodies traces of bullets and injections of poison in places inaccessible for injections by a person's own hand.

Forensic medicine practice does not know of cases of the simultaneous "voluntary suicide" of such a large number of sensible people, different in terms of age (among those who died there were about 200 children under 15 years of age), in terms of character, origin, etc.

What is striking is the identical position of the majority of bodies--face down, the identical arrangement of the bodies in rows, which is impossible in the presence of auto-intoxication with cyanide after the taking of which death comes practically instantly.

If one takes as point of departure the official version of auto-intoxication with potassium cyanide, the dishes from which the poison was allegedly taken voluntarily, should be found in the immediate vicinity of the bodies. At the same time, they are not visible in the photographs. The poses of the bodies and their arrangement were changed by someone after the death of the people. It should be noted that imparting a desired pose to a body is possible only during the first 2-4 hours after death has come (i. e., before the onset of rigor mortis).

"What is lacking is information about the forensic medicine research on the corpses of people who died from firearm injuries. There are not even photographs of them," the chief of the physical and technical department of the Bureau of Forensic Medicine Expertise of the RSFSR Ministry of Health, M. V. Rozinov, emphasizes. "The absence of expert examinations of these dead by specialists in forensic medicine can only be regarded as the unwillingness to obtain objective evidence making it possible to reestablish a true picture of the tragedy that happened.

Operation "Death" was conducted in accordance with a scenario which has already been encountered more than once in American history: Villainous killing, destruction of evidence, physical elimination of witnesses, massive misinformation of public opinion, writes I. Grigulevich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and professor. The massacre in Jonestown was a part of a large complex of measures of the punitive organs of the United States, whose aim consisted in the elimination of the movements of political protest--such as the "Black Panthers," the "Weathermen," the "New Left," etc. As a result, tens

of thousands of people were deprived of life. The intention of the leadership of the "People's Temple" to institute a multi-million [dollar] legal action against the government of the United States and the beginning of its negotiations about the resettlement of the commune to the Soviet Union impelled the American authorities to carry out the previously developed plan for the monstrous crime.

The "People's Temple" was declared disbanded. After the terrible newspaper articles about the "insane fanatics" in the jungles of Guyana, many thousands of its followers living in California were forced to leave their native places to conceal their previous connection with this organization declared to be outside the law. You see, the mention of sympathies for it or membership in it alone were now fraught with violence without delay.

Political murders in the United States, as a rule, are investigated, even if with a different degree of thoroughness, by the organs of justice, and moreover by private persons. However, the killing of 918 American citizens in Guyana was practically not at all investigated by the authorities of the United States, the perpetrators of the crime were not named and were not subjected to just punishment.

8970

CSO: 1807/260

CHINESE AGRICULTURAL REFORMS, ARISING PROBLEMS ASSESSED

Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 Apr 87 p 3

[Special article for SELSKAYA ZHIZN by TASS correspondent G. Arslanov: "In Search of New Ways: Current Problems in Chinese Agriculture"]

[Text] Beijing--The economic reforms in rural China, which began to be carried out more than 8 years ago, have doubtless led to a fundamental change in the structure of production and to an increase in the efficiency of this base sector of the national economy of the PRC. There was a notable improvement in the population's food supply and the standard of living of peasants increased. Thanks to the elimination of the "common pot" principle--this is how they characterize the egalitarianism that has existed for many years not only in the countryside but also in industry--the labor activity of the peasants increased. Today the Chinese peasant not only produces agricultural output but is also becoming a builder, a transport worker, and a worker in the industrial enterprises that are being established in large numbers in the Chinese countryside. In the rural regions of the PRC, a stratum of many millions of peasants has arisen who, according to the local press, "have not become separated from the land but from farming, and have not migrated to the cities but are occupied in industry."

But the new situation, favorable in comparison with the past, has also created new and no less complex social and economic problems that are evoking concern among the country's leadership as well as among economists. A symposium organized by the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO was devoted to a discussion of questions being faced by the Chinese countryside today and to the search for ways to resolve them. It was stressed that providing for the stable development of agriculture will remain the primary goal of the economic policy of the PRC for many years, since this sector is the basis of the Chinese economy. Despite the perceptible achievements, as the participants in the forum noted, there is still no basis for the conclusion that everything is going smoothly after the reform in the countryside. In recent years, as the participants in the symposium said, the rise of a whole series of complex problems is becoming obvious. Among them is the reduction in the size of sown areas as a result of the advance of deserts, soil erosion, and the large-scale construction of rural industrial enterprises. For this reason, 2.67 million hectares of fertile land were lost from 1978 through 1985 and 40,000 square kilometers of cultivable land turned into desert within a quarter of a

century. The participants in the symposium pointed with particular concern to the decline in the production of grain. In 1984, according to the data of the state statistical administration, the country produced a record quantity of grain--407.12 million tons--as a result of the reform of the economic mechanism in agriculture. This figure declined to 378.98 million tons the following year, even though the weather conditions were approximately the same. Despite the tremendous efforts that were undertaken last year on a national scale with the goal of returning to the level of 1984, the goal was not reached. The gross volume of grain production amounted to 391.98 million tons.

After the transition to the contract system of land use, there was a substantial reduction of public funds allocated to irrigation purposes. Thus, state investments in irrigation construction amounted to 2.1 billion yuan in 1980 but were only 1.1 billion yuan in 1984. Along with the worsening quality of the management of irrigation systems, the reduction in state appropriations led to a decline in reclaimed lands by 930,000 hectares over the past 5 years. There was a simultaneous reduction by 6 million hectares in areas cultivated with various agricultural machines. Provisioning of rural areas with fuel and chemical fertilizers declined. The transfer of thousands of small enterprises from the cities to rural regions led to a significant contamination of the environment, which creates unfavorable conditions for subsidiary industry. The increase in the prices for grain, the weakness of veterinary services, etc., slowed the development of animal husbandry.

In the Chinese countryside, we see an unwillingness of peasants to invest their means in production. In the province of Shanxi, for example, their expenditures for consumption last year increased by 14.7 yuan, or 5.4 percent, over 1985, whereas in production they declined by 12.1 yuan, or 11.2 percent.

It was emphasized at the symposium that the further development of Chinese agriculture basically depends upon increasing the labor activity of peasants and upon their conviction and certainty that the country's current agrarian policy will not change. At the present time, for example, the peasants use the land on the basis of a 15-year contract and they themselves decide what to sow. Most of them, however, are having doubts about what will happen after the expiration of the term of the contract.

Upon this also depends their position in relation to capital investments in production, reclamation and improvement of the quality of the land. Many prefer to utilize the land on a "temporary basis," that is, on the basis of the situation at the moment when the contract was signed, not wanting to invest resources in expanding the scale of production.

The peasant must know that as long as he uses the land rationally, operates his farm sensibly and does not express a desire to turn the contract over to another farm the contract can be extended after the expiration of its term, writes the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO. It is categorically prohibited to violate the rights of peasants to sell grain at market prices after fulfilling the conditions for the sale of grain to the state at a fixed price. It is inadmissible for local authorities to sign a so-called "second contract" with

peasants for the supplemental sale of grain at a fixed price after their fulfillment of the conditions of the basic contract.

In a number of places, writes the newspaper, the authorities are arbitrarily cancelling the contract signed with the peasants and violating their legal rights. For these and other reasons, declared Wang Shufeng, the deputy from Jiangxi of the National People's Congress at its session in Beijing, for example, the following situation was established: on the one hand, there is an acute shortage of funds for capital investments in agriculture and, on the other hand, the peasants have tremendous sums that are either going unused or are being utilized for the construction of houses rather than for the expansion of agricultural production. The deputy to the National People's Congress also noted that because of various requisitions by local authorities the peasants are losing interest in the development of animal husbandry, in particular in raising pigs on their own farms, which led "to the rise of a strained situation in the supply to the market with meat."

Grain purchase prices unfavorable for peasants in the region of the city of Zhangzhou in the province of Fujian alone led to a reduction of 350,000 mu (1 mu = one-fifteenth of a hectare) in the amount of land planted in grain. As a result, last year this region went from being a producer of grain for sale to being an "importer" of grain to satisfy the population's requirements for bread. By the way, the size of individually managed lands indicates the possibilities for individual farms to influence the volume of production and the market situation. In Nanchang District in the province of Jiangxi, for example, the peasant Liu Chuanxin has 10 hectares of land at the disposal of his specialized farm and he produces an average of 85 tons of grain annually, of which 50 tons are commodity grain sold to the state under contract. As RENMIN RIBAO writes, this farm's annual income amounts to 1,500 yuan per family member.

At the symposium, the necessity of making market conditions correspond to the interests of grain producers was stressed, and, on the other hand, of establishing conditions under which the market situation would suggest to the peasants what they should produce. But this can evoke a further chain reaction of price increases.

The reduction of capital investments in agriculture cannot fail to give rise to serious concern in the government of the country. Therefore, the Chinese Gosplan [State Planning Commission] decided to increase investments in agriculture this year by 40 percent over 1986, even though the overall amount of capital construction in the country is declining. The allocated funds will be directed to the construction of large-scale irrigation systems and the establishment of special bases for the production of grain. At a press conference in the National People's Congress, in which members of the CCP Central Committee Politburo and vice premiers of the Chinese State Council Yao Yilin, Li Peng and Tian Jiyun participated, it was declared that the government will take all measures to produce 405 million tons of grain this year.

9746

CSO: 1807/261

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

TASS REVIEWS SOVIET-ETHIOPIAN COOPERATION ON ANNIVERSARY

LD051338 Moscow TASS in English 1234 GMT 5 May 87

[Text] Addis Ababa, 5 May (TASS)--TASS correspondent Gennadiy Gabrielyan reporting:

The declaration on the fundamentals of friendly relations and cooperation between the USSR and Ethiopia was signed in Moscow 10 years ago.

In 1974 the Ethiopian people toppled the feudal regime and chose the road of development and social progress. People in that country have not forgotten that the Soviet Union came to their aid as Ethiopia was fighting to repel an aggression from abroad at the time when imperialist forces tried to strangle the Ethiopian revolution.

Later the Soviet Union helped Ethiopia effect radical social and economic reforms by granting credits and sending specialists to help with the development of those sectors of the economy which the Ethiopian leadership considered to be most important for the country.

In 1978 the two countries signed the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation which laid down a solid foundation for a steady and planned development of bilateral relations.

Pursuant to its provisions, the Soviet Union began land improvement operations on 10,000 hectares of arid land in Gambela Region. A tractor assembly plant was built in Ethiopia with the Soviet Union's assistance. Both projects were crucial for the progress of the agrarian sector.

The construction of the Melka-Wakane hydroelectric station, the country's largest, is in its final stage. When the station goes into service power output in Ethiopia will grow by one-third.

Last year Soviet geologists working in Ethiopia discovered a commercial deposit of gas in Harerge Province in the eastern region.

Relief aid given by the Soviet Government to Ethiopia during the 1984-1985 drought occupies a special place in the history of Soviet-Ethiopian relations. The USSR was one of the first nations to respond to the plea for help

and sent high-duty trucks and aircraft to Ethiopia and later dispatched the staff of a mobile field hospital there.

In the past ten years Ethiopia and the Soviet Union demonstrated the unanimity of views on major international problems and proceeded from the same positions in the battle against imperialism, colonialism and racism.

The founding of the vanguard party guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism--the Ethiopian Workers' Party--in 1984 promoted ideological unity of the two countries. Contacts between the Ethiopian Workers' Party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are developing successfully.

/12858

CSO: 1812/194

- END -

47

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate

command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.