

034110

JPRS-UIA-87-041
27 November 1987



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Soviet Union

International Affairs

19980610 014

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

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 6

10
34
A03

Soviet Union

International Affairs

JPRS-UIA-87-041

CONTENTS

27 NOVEMBER 1987

SOCIALIST COMMUNITY, CEMA

CEMA, Gosplan Official on Accelerating Machinebuilding [G. Stroganov; <i>PLANOVOYE KHOZYAYSTVO</i> , No 9, Sep 87]	1
Response to Questionnaire on Direct Ties Within CEMA [PRAVDA, 28 Sep 87]	9

THIRD WORLD ISSUES

Philippine Peace Council Secretary Interviewed [A. Paris interview; <i>AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA</i> , No 8, Aug 87]	11
Mirskiy, Li on Socialist Orientation, New Political Thinking [G.I. Mirskiy, V.F. Li; <i>AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA</i> , No 8, Aug 87]	12
Imprimatur of Nasser on Egyptian Revolution Stressed [I. Belyayev; <i>AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA</i> , No 8, Aug 87]	19
Book on Military Role in National-Democratic Revolution [V. Novikov; <i>AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA</i> , No 8, Aug 87]	22
Book on Islam, Development of Arab States Reviewed [A. Malashenko; <i>AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA</i> , No 8, Aug 87]	23
Handbook on Raw Material Resources of Asia, Australia [V. Isayev; <i>AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA</i> , No 8, Aug 87]	24
Review of the Journal <i>AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA</i> No 8, 1987 [APN DAILY REVIEW, 21 Aug 87]	25
Table of Contents <i>AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA</i> , No 8, 1987 [<i>AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA</i> , No 8, Aug 87]	26

UNITED STATES, CANADA

Moscow Blasts U.S. 'Psychological Warfare,' Radio Marti [V. Lapin; <i>SELSKAYA ZHIZN</i> , 4 Oct 87]	27
--	----

WEST EUROPE

Interview With President of FRG Chambers of Industry, Commerce [O. W. von Amerongen; <i>MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYE OTNOSHENIYA</i> , Apr 87]	29
Turkish Minister Foresees Joint Industrial, Trade Companies [ZA RUBEZHOM, 16, 22 Oct 87]	31

CEMA, Gosplan Official on Accelerating Machinebuilding

18250005 Moscow *PLANOVOYE KHOZYAYSTVO* in Russian No 9, Sep 87 pp 3-15

[Article by G. Stroganov, deputy chairman of USSR Gosplan and bureau chairman of the CEMA Committee for Cooperation in the Field of Machinebuilding: "Development of Cooperation Among CEMA Member Countries in Acceleration of Scientific-Technical Progress"]

[Text] Machinebuilding plays a leading role in the qualitative transformation of the production-technical base of all sectors of the economy on the basis of the most recent advances of science and technology. The means of production manufactured have a profound impact on scientific-technical progress; they determine the technical level, and that in turn determines the level of labor productivity. That is why the problem of seeking new forms of cooperation among CEMA member countries in machinebuilding is now taking on particular acuteness and significance.(1)

Over the period 1981-1985 the output of machinebuilding in the USSR grew 36 percent; progressive manufacturing processes, automation equipment, microprocessors and industrial robots, and metal-cutting machine tools with numeric programmed control were introduced, which to a large extent predetermined the high growth rates of labor productivity in the sector. The development of machinebuilding was furthered to a considerable degree by cooperation with the socialist countries both within the framework of CEMA and also by specialization and sharing of production programs on a bilateral basis. Moreover, specialization and industrial cooperation increased at faster rates than mutual trade in machines and equipment. The share of exports of products resulting from specialization and cooperation in the total volume of mutual exports of the products of machinebuilding of the CEMA member countries exceeded 42.5 percent in 1986.

Last year alone scientific-technical ties made it possible to create more than 210 new products of machinebuilding. They included industrial robots for attending metal-cutting machine tools, forging and stamping equipment, machines for pressure casting and painting, new types of rotary combines for harvesting grain crops, four- and six-row potato planters, and production lines for centralized cutting out of sheets in the woodworking industry. Experimental prototypes were made of diesel engines for trucks and automobiles.

Multilateral cooperation in machinebuilding is now based on more than 100 agreements on specialization and industrial cooperation and more than 80 agreements in the scientific-technical field. Under those agreements the countries have established specialization in production of approximately 20,000 types and sizes of products of machinebuilding. The largest mutual deliveries of

products covered by specialization are in shipbuilding, agricultural machinebuilding, the automotive industry, and a number of other branches.

At the same time, the average annual growth rates of the output of machinebuilding in the European states of the socialist commonwealth (except for Bulgaria and Hungary) dropped during the last 5-year period and amounted to 9.8 percent in Bulgaria, 3.4 percent in Hungary, 6.1 percent in the GDR, 1.3 percent in Poland, 5.5 percent in Romania, 6.2 percent in the USSR, and 4.8 percent in Czechoslovakia. Adverse processes became apparent: product renewal slowed down, the technical level and quality lagged behind the world level, and the level of industrial cooperation among the CEMA countries was low (the share of assemblies and parts in the total volume of specialized deliveries of machines and equipment was only 10-15 percent), and the technological lag behind the advanced capitalist countries persisted with respect to a number of the most important groups of machinebuilding products.

Given those conditions, the party and government leadership of the socialist countries have taken a number of steps. A general strategy was worked out at the Summit Economic Conference of CEMA Member Countries (Moscow, 1985): Achieve a decisive acceleration of the socioeconomic development of the countries by a radical change of direction toward intensification of social production accomplished by means of profound changes in the proportions in machinebuilding and by performing a program of measures to raise the technical level of products and achieve the speediest application to production of the most recent advances of science and technology.

This line has been reflected in the economic policy of all the fraternal countries. For instance, at the 27th CPSU Congress a strategic course was adopted of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development by joining the advances of the scientific-technical revolution to a planned economy, to efficient application of the new economic mechanism, to the transition to economic methods of management and to the development of democracy. It was further elaborated in specific terms at the June (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. The plenum also noted the need to "study the experience of our friends carefully and thoroughly, to make use of everything which can be useful in the interests of the USSR economy."(2)

All of this requires that a rapid transition be made to a new intensive model of the international socialist division of labor that would be based on a more vigorous interaction of the scientific-technical potential and productive potential of the CEMA member countries. The role of cooperation is growing correspondingly in the field of machinebuilding—which is the material vehicle for the results of the scientific-technical revolution.

Machinebuilding—the Pivot of Intensification

Machinebuilders have been given important and complicated tasks in guaranteeing the intensive development both of the national economy as a whole and also of machinebuilding production itself. That is why considerable attention is being paid not only to meeting needs for present-day machines and equipment at a high technical level and quality, but also to improving the qualitative structure of the machinebuilding complex itself: to the faster development of the foundation branches—machine tool building, instrumentmaking, and production of electrical equipment, as well as to retooling and reconstruction, application of advanced technologies and up-to-date organizational forms of production.

In the USSR these directions have been reflected in the state plan for the period 1986-1990. For instance, it calls for increasing the output of the complex by 43 percent while the growth in the volume of industrial output would be 25 percent. A substantial part of the growth of the output of machinebuilding will be achieved by conservation of material-technical resources, by increasing the output of those products which determine the level of social production as a whole—equipment for automation and mechanization, computers, and instruments. A great deal of attention is being paid to increasing the output of qualitatively new consumer goods.

Plans call for a substantial growth (between two- and tenfold) in the production of machining centers, machine tools with numeric programmed control, robots and robotic complexes for flexible production modules and systems, rotary and rotary-conveyor lines, CAD systems and microprocessors. By 1990 between 80 and 95 percent of the principal products of machinebuilding are to meet the world level. Their annual renewal will amount to 13 percent. Replacement of fixed productive capital will rise to 10 percent.

These tasks have been backed up with immense physical resources. Machinebuilding has been allocated 1.8-fold more capital investments than in the previous 5-year period, and this growth is 2.4-fold for machine tool building, 3.5 percent for instrumentmaking, and twofold for electrical equipment production. More than 50 percent of productive capital investments are going into retooling and reconstruction.

The June (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee subjected economic development and the state of affairs in the country's economy to thorough analysis and defined the paramount tasks in the present stage of radical restructuring. A radical reform of economic management based on the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) is today being advanced into the foreground. A great deal needs to be done, and a program of action was clearly defined at the plenum of the Central

Committee and Seventh Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The main thing now is to create an integral, efficient, and flexible system for management of the economy.

It should be noted that beginning in 1988 all enterprises and associations in the branches of the machinebuilding complex will be operating under the conditions of full cost accounting (*khozyaystvennyy raschet*) and self-financing. Under those conditions the role and functions of ministries in management of the sectors of the economy are undergoing substantial change. On the basis of predominant use of economic methods of management they are required to consistently implement the principles of economic activity defined by the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association). The role and responsibility of ministries, which are the scientific-technical and economic command posts of the sectors and branches, will also increase in satisfying the need of the economy for the products produced by the sector and for attaining the world level in production technology and the quality and technical level of the product.

New forms of large organizational structures—state production associations, created as unified production-economic complexes and managed on a democratic basis by a council of directors headed by the general director, will be formed alongside production associations and scientific production associations in the branches of machinebuilding and in regions in order to further raise the level of concentration of production and to improve management. In short, there will be a large-scale restructuring of the activity of centralized guidance of the economy. This effort represents a single whole with the conversion of enterprises to full cost accounting, self-financing, and self-support—the radical reform of management of the economy, including foreign economic relations.

“The restructuring of economic management,” it was noted at a plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, “is opening up broad space for increasing the effectiveness of our **foreign economic relations** and—especially important—for strengthening the pressure exerted by the external market on the operation of sectors and enterprises, on the quality of their products, and on scientific-technical progress.

“It is fundamentally important in this connection to improve the results of cooperation with the socialist countries. Restructuring of the economic mechanism is called upon to create the economic and organizational-legal conditions favorable for intensive integration of our economy with the national economy of the fraternal countries.”(3)

Accelerated development of the most recent science-intensive production operations is envisaged by practically all the European socialist states. This has come

about mainly because of intensification and improvement of cooperation, because new forms of that cooperation have been developed, because direct scientific-production relations have been expanded, because joint enterprises and teams have been created, because efforts have been joined in carrying out the Comprehensive Program for the Scientific-Technical Progress of the CEMA Member Countries up to the Year 2000 (KP NTP SEV), because contract discipline has been tightened, and because the parties are taking greater responsibility for quality performance of obligations assumed.

For instance, while industrial output in Bulgaria rose 25-30 percent during the last 5-year planning period, production of machines and equipment rose 50 percent, including a twofold growth for computers, more than 2.5-fold for microcomputers, and threefold for industrial robots. In the GDR particular emphasis has been put on developing and putting into production flexible automated production systems, modular microelectronic control systems, monitoring and measuring apparatus, and flexible automated transport-storage and loading and unloading complexes. Plans call for manufacturing 75,000-80,000 industrial robots in the period 1986-1990. In Romania they plan to increase the output of machinebuilding 63 percent, while the growth of the marketed output of the industrial sector as a whole would be 43.3-49 percent. In Czechoslovakia the output of machinebuilding products will increase 30 percent; at the same time production of equipment for nuclear power engineering, energy- and resource-saving equipment, robots, and electronics products will develop at accelerated rates.

Structural Improvement

The intensive strategy of development in the context of cooperation within the framework of CEMA requires setting up mutually complementary sectoral structures, eliminating unwarranted parallelism, and collective solution of crucial economic problems. The present conception for shaping the optimum structure of the machinebuilding complexes of the CEMA member countries calls for coordinated development of the individual branches and types of production operations on the basis of joint solution of the problems of technical progress and improvement of the list of products so as to increase the share of those products which are progressive.

Comprehensive automation of production based on extensive application of highly productive precision equipment and microprocessor equipment and computers in management of processes and production operations as a whole needs to be singled out as a separate line of scientific-technical progress in machinebuilding. The creation of up-to-date automation equipment is bound up with organizing the production of many types of machine tools, rotary and rotary-conveyor lines, systems of programmed control and automated design, industrial robots, highly mechanized warehouses managed by means of computer, special hydraulic and pneumatic

equipment, highly productive tools and tool support systems, etc. A target program for cooperation (as an integral part of the KP NTP SEV) has been drafted for performance of this large-scale task.

A broad range of automation equipment and sets and individual pieces of machinery and equipment are being jointly developed, tested, and put into production under a number of general agreements on multilateral cooperation in the development and organization of production under specialization and industrial cooperation and a sizable number of multilateral and bilateral economic agreements and contracts. At the same time, for machinebuilding itself within the framework of cooperation provision is being made for specialization and industrial cooperation to create and put into production 25 models of industrial robots and 22 models of robotic systems to mechanize and automate laborious and monotonous operations, 26 types of flexible production modules for various processes, a number of automated transport-storage systems, 20 types of highly productive automated metal-working equipment, and also automated modules for forging and stamping, robotic and flexible production systems for automating assembly operations, equipment for tool support of production, etc.

Practically all the interrelated branches of the machinebuilding complex of the fraternal countries have entered into direct interaction in order to achieve these goals. The scientific-technical cooperation they have accomplished leads directly to cooperation in the production sphere, which in the new context also includes servicing after the sale is made and a joint approach to the markets of third countries. This approach makes it possible to conduct a coordinated (agreed) scientific-technical policy and to eliminate parallelism in all stages of the process of reproduction.

New Forms of Cooperation

Acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development is inseparably bound up with further intensification of economic and scientific-technical ties with the socialist countries and participation in the international division of labor. The pivot in this entire effort is consistent performance of the Comprehensive Program for Scientific-Technical Progress of CEMA adopted at the 41st (Extraordinary) Session of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance. Its performance will help to at least double labor productivity in the fraternal countries as a whole by the year 2000 and to sharply reduce the consumption of energy and raw materials per unit of national income.

The CEMA Committee for Cooperation in Machinebuilding is providing guidance in the organization of cooperation in one of the priority directions contained in the Program—"Comprehensive Automation," and it is

also taking part in performance of a number of assignments in the priority directions "Electronization of the Economy," "New Materials and Technologies of Their Production and Processing," and "Accelerated Development of Biotechnology."

The joint efforts of machinebuilders extend along a broad front. Under "Comprehensive Automation" alone there are 325 assignments being carried out which have been included in the detailed programs of cooperation and involve participation of more than 750 organizations of the CEMA member countries and Yugoslavia (including 168 organizations and enterprises from the USSR). Provision has been made to create a sizable number of prototypes of new equipment and technology (more than 760 designations). Even within the current 5-year planning period about 670 development projects will be completed and applied to production, including more than 100 in 1987 and more than 220 in 1988.

The intensification of interaction is based on vigorous use of new forms of cooperation: direct production relations and scientific-technical relations of joint enterprises and international associations and organizations. For instance, in carrying out the program to create up-to-date automation equipment they concluded a contract on direct ties in joint design and production: the Lvov Production Association "Konveyer" and the Bulgarian-Hungarian company "Intransmash"—for automated transport-storage systems; the Scientific-Production Association "Astrakhanmashokraska" (USSR) and a combine for protection of metals against corrosion (Bulgaria)—for up-to-date systems and robotic complexes; the Gomel Production Association "Gidroavtomatika" (USSR) and the plant "Danuviya" (Hungary)—for automatic hydraulic equipment. A Soviet-Bulgarian scientific-production association has been formed to create and produce automatic lines and modules for machining parts in the class "rotating bodies," in which the participants are the Moscow Production Association for Manufacture of Automatic Lines and Special Machine Tools imeni 50-Letiye SSSR and the Combine "Pobeda" (Bulgaria). They plan to design and manufacture 202 automatic lines in the period 1987-1990 for machining pistons, cylinder liners, and piston rings, and 570 automatic technological modules.

This effort continues to be vigorously pursued. A contract has been signed on direct ties between VNIIElektromashinostroyeniye (USSR) and the Electric Machine Research Institute (Czechoslovakia) for the development and subsequent industrial cooperation in production of thyatron motors with permanent magnets for machine tools with numeric programmed control and industrial robots. The Scientific-Production Association "ENIMS" (USSR) and the Scientific Research Machine Tool Building Center (GDR) have outlined joint efforts to create new generations of flexible production systems and robotic complexes. The designing and joint manufacturing of machining centers, flexible production systems, and modules will be the subject of direct cooperation

between the Vitebsk Machine Tool Building Plant imeni S.M. Kirov and the Odessa Precision Machine Tool Plant (USSR) and the concern "TOS-Olomouc" (Czechoslovakia).

It can be said that on the basis of interaction between machinebuilding branches of the socialist states an international production-technology complex is being shaped for the creation and production of automatic systems and pieces of equipment. Its operation will make it possible for the individual countries of the commonwealth to free themselves of the need to develop multi-sector production independently; to concentrate efforts, production potential, and scientific-technical potential on creation and production of individual sets and pieces of equipment, and to acquire all the necessary technical means within the limits of the commonwealth.

New forms of direct cooperation are also being actively developed in other branches of machinebuilding. Since January 1986 the Production Association "Ternopol Combine Plant imeni XXV Syezd KPSS" (USSR) and the Plant for Production of Soil-Working Machines (GDR) have been cooperating on the basis of direct ties in the manufacture of beet harvesters. The GDR is supplying the removable digging devices, the cab already assembled, and the elevators, and the USSR the beet-harvesting machines themselves. On the basis of a contract on direct cooperation the Scientific-Production Association "Pribor" (USSR) and the scientific-production enterprise for optics and lasers (Bulgaria) are engaged in the joint development and application of equipment and systems for controlling the operating regimes of agricultural machines.

Experience in developing direct ties between enterprises, scientific research institutes, and design organizations, as well as the experience of the first joint associations shows that these forms of cooperation make it possible to involve the direct participants in the process of integration and to unite their scientific-technical potential and production potential. The possibility arises to influence the rise in the technical and technological level of production to a greater degree, to improve the technical-and-economic indicators of products in a shorter time, to raise the level of cooperation thanks to speedy solution of technical and production problems involved in cooperation, and to take into account the economic interests of both partners in contract prices. At the same time, a number of problems have arisen in connection with the need to optimize the approach to selecting the type and lines of cooperation, to deepen mutual study of each other's scientific-technical and production capabilities, to jointly work out comprehensive recommendations for their utilization, and to strengthen contract discipline in performance of mutual obligations.

Broad development of direct ties and other progressive forms of direct cooperation and their effectiveness depend first of all on timely development of the planned foundations of cooperation at the government and

departmental levels. These goals are to be served by the new program for coordinating the national economic plans of the USSR and the CEMA member countries and the multilateral and bilateral programs for coordinated development of their machinebuilding branches. The purpose is to provide the interrelationship of the specific tasks being performed by economic organizations on the basis of direct ties and the structural, investment, and technical policy in machinebuilding as a whole and in its branches that has been agreed on by the countries.

The CEMA Committee for Cooperation and Machinebuilding has approved (in Havana, March 1987) the draft version of the "Multiannual Program for Development of Multilateral Specialization and Industrial Cooperation on a Selected List of Products in the Field of Machinebuilding up to the Year 2000." It will be submitted for consideration to the Executive Committee and then to a session of the CEMA Council. The draft reflects the transition to the new intensive model of the international socialist division of labor, which requires a more refined mechanism for coordination of plans on the basis of interaction of the scientific-technical potential and production potential of the states of the commonwealth.

In drafting this document the specialists of the fraternal countries relied on the abundant experience in mutual cooperation over many years and took as their point of departure the Comprehensive Program for Scientific-Technical Progress of the CEMA Member Countries up to the Year 2000, within whose framework more than 80 contracts, agreements, and protocols were prepared on international specialization and industrial cooperation and scientific-technical cooperation in the field of machinebuilding. Detailed programs of cooperation, envisaging development of equipment and technologies at the world level, were agreed on concerning each problem. They cover 742 designations of machine tools, machines, equipment, and processes.

The draft of the multiannual program defines the interaction among the CEMA countries in developing and manufacturing 132 products and product groups in 16 fields of machinebuilding. The program's performance is aimed at satisfying the needs of the socialist countries for highly productive machines and equipment both for machinebuilding itself and also for the fuel and raw materials sectors, the agroindustrial complex, transportation, the chemical industry, and construction.

Full Automation of Production

One of the most important lines of scientific-technical progress is the full automation and mechanization of production, which is called upon to radically transform work stations and to make the work of workers, kolkhoz members, and the intelligentsia more productive, creative, and attractive. This is an important social task.

The present stage of automation relies on a revolution in electronics and computers, on electronization of the economy, rapid development of robotics, rotary and rotary-conveyor lines, and flexible automated production systems guaranteeing high productivity of labor. For instance, creation and application in the countries of the socialist commonwealth of fast-readjusting and flexible production systems for various purposes as well as completely automated shops and plants will make it possible to raise labor productivity 2-5-fold and the shift coefficient of the operation of equipment to 2.8. There will be a saving on materials, ferrous and nonferrous metals above all, as well as a reduction of work areas because of integrated placement of equipment at a higher technical level.

Systems for automated design are to be created and applied to sharply increase the productivity of labor in design and mechanical engineering and to shorten the time they take by one-third to one-half.

Considerable attention has been paid to the problems of speeding up efforts in the creation of industrial robots and manipulators, including elements of adaptation and artificial intelligence. Their use will make it possible to raise labor productivity and also to replace human beings in heavy, monotonous, and unhealthy processing operations. In the field of robotics the International Scientific Production Association "Interrobot" has been established and the specialization of the parties participating in this association (Bulgaria, Hungary, Cuba, Poland, USSR, and Czechoslovakia) defined. Its program of projects for the period 1986-1990 calls for cooperation in creating promising standardized designs of industrial robots of the aggregate-module type for the branches of machinebuilding, in production of components for those robots, in pursuit of efforts in the fields of standardization, interchangeability and certification of robotic equipment, in training personnel and improving the qualifications of specialists, and in organizing servicing and repair of industrial robots.

Creation and application of standardized automation equipment for loading and unloading and transport and storage operations will by 1990 guarantee a drop of at least 15-20 percent in the share of manual labor, while up to 15-20 percent of those working in these operations will be made available for other work. Other measures are also planned, including measures in the field of tool support for metal-cutting equipment, components, control units, and diagnostic systems for equipment and devices.

Performance of the tasks contained in the Comprehensive Program for Scientific-Technical Progress of CEMA Countries will have a profound effect on all the spheres of the life and activity of society, will bring about a major rise in labor productivity in the heavy sectors of the economy (above all in machinebuilding) and in the reliability, quality, and competitiveness of the products produced and an increase in the output-capital ratio, it

will sharply reduce manual labor and labor requiring little skill, and it will substantially raise the general technological level and efficiency of production.

A great deal of attention is being paid in the Soviet Union to the question of prompt and quality performance of the assignments of the KP NTP SEV. They have been reflected in state plans; specific measures which are to be carried out by USSR ministries and departments and head organizations for their realization have been defined. The understandings set down in the Comprehensive Program and in the decisions of the 41st Meeting of the CEMA Session have been made the basis of the practical activity of ministries and departments in the acceleration of scientific-technical progress and in carrying on economic, scientific-technical, and industrial cooperation with other members of the commonwealth on the basis of specialization and industrial cooperation.

In order to ensure the necessary resources for the projects, specific sections entitled "Basic Assignments of the KP NTP SEV" have been provided for in state 5-year and annual plans for economic and social development of the USSR. The assignments in the plans embrace the entire cycle of operations—from scientific research up to and including series production, and they are performed separately in the following stages:

- i. R&D projects, creation and testing of experimental prototypes;
- ii. creation (construction, reconstruction) of production capacities, the drafting of standards, development of technologies and manufacture of equipment for production of new products;
- iii. the first full-scale production run.

For instance, the 1987 plan includes assignments for manufacturing the following experimental prototypes: a flexible production module for cutting workpieces from round and square rolled products (diameters up to 80 mm); a flexible production module for spot welding using PR601/60 robots (positioning accuracy—1 mm, degrees of freedom—6); a flexible chuck-center lathe production module (diameter of the workpiece above the bed—320 mm); a system for automated monitoring and control of a single-roll installation for production of amorphous steels and alloys (it reduces the thickness tolerance of strip by 1.5-2-fold); an automatic manipulator for loading and unloading panel-shaped furniture parts with a load capacity of 80 kg (positioning accuracy within 5 mm); transformers of linear and angular displacements or machine tools with numeric programmed control, etc. Assignments have also been included in the plan for putting new industrial products into production and applying progressive technologies, including flexible production modules and machining centers, automatic

production lines for machining and forging and stamping, rotary and rotary-conveyor lines, industrial robots, turret lathes and coordinate boring machines, etc.

The Comprehensive Program for Scientific-Technical Progress of the CEMA Countries states in its basic principles that the partners will develop direct relations among enterprises, associations, and scientific-technical organizations on the basis of the principles adopted in specific bilateral and multilateral agreements and contracts, which is an effective way to develop cooperation.

Provision is also made for creating joint scientific-technical and production associations, international engineering and technology centers, etc. The first international scientific-production associations in machine tool building have now gone into operation using the facilities of the Ivanovo Association imeni 50-Letiye SSSR and the Metal-Cutting Machine Tool Plant in Sofia (Bulgaria); the Moscow Association "Krasny Proletariy" (USSR) and the scientific-production enterprise "Beroye" (Bulgaria). The international Soviet-Czechoslovak Association "Robot" in Presov and an ad hoc Soviet-Czechoslovak scientific-technical team for developing an "artificial kidney," a general-purpose modular apparatus created on the basis of a contract between VNIIMP (USSR) and the concern "Hirana" (Czechoslovakia), are working effectively. Contracts have been concluded between VNIIMP (USSR) and the firm "Medikor" (Hungary) on organization of a jointly owned enterprise for production and sale of up-to-date pieces of medical equipment using "Mikromed" microelectronics and concerning direct scientific-technical relations between the NPO "NIKhimmash" (USSR) and the enterprise "Vedterv" (Hungary).

In all, the intergovernmental agreements in the field of machinebuilding signed during the 42d Meeting of the CEMA Session will create with the participation of Soviet organizations 7 joint enterprises, 17 international associations, 19 international organizations (design offices, scientific research institutes, and laboratories); and they have established direct relations between 196 Soviet organizations and 247 organizations of CEMA member countries. But serious deficiencies in implementing the understandings prevent us from saying that the activity of a number of machinebuilding ministries has been satisfactory.

Efforts to carry out the KP NTP SEV is based on the understanding among the CEMA member countries concerning concerted action to create and use fundamentally new types of equipment and technology by concentrating their efforts and by organizing close comprehensive cooperation. The head organizations (coordinators) and their coexecutors accordingly face the tasks of creating not only individual prototypes, but indeed entire lines and systems of machines, equipment, and instruments. The devices to be created must meet the requirements of energy, information, metrological,

design, and operating compatibility, and they must guarantee the possibility of creating diverse systems on the basis of a limited set of standardized units, modules, assemblies, and parts. This will serve as a prerequisite for industrial cooperation on a larger scale.

Extensive use of recent advances of science and technology (including microelectronics, fiber optics, lasers, etc.) is stimulating an increase in the products list of machinebuilding, while optimization of production demands that certain limits be set on that list. Coordinated efforts of the socialist countries concerning the drafting of standards and product standardization and the fixing of optimum series and promising parameters are becoming very relevant in this connection. One direct consequence is the need for closer interaction not only of the technical and production potential of our countries, but also of their scientific potential.

Successful performance of the assignments contained in the KP NTP SEV will guarantee broad-scale full automation and mechanization of the sectors of the economy and a substantial rise in the level of their electronization, will afford the possibility of completely reequipping the production capability of machinebuilding, will sharply raise labor productivity, and will increase the efficiency of social production.

The Basic Directions for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR over the period 1986-1990 and up to the year 2000 call for specific measures aimed at broad-scale full automation and mechanization of the sectors of the economy. Flexible adjustable production operations and CAD systems, automatic lines, machines, and equipment with built-in microprocessor equipment, multioperation machine tools with numeric programmed control, and robotic, rotary and rotary-conveyor complexes will be widely introduced in the machinebuilding complex.

In the machine tool building and toolmaking industry plans call for faster growth in the output of metal-cutting machine tools with numeric programmed control, machine tools of the "machining center" type, equipment to automate the assembly of the most common products in machinebuilding, and rotary, rotary-conveyor, and other automatic production lines for machinebuilding and metal manufacturing. There will be an increase in the production of automated and robotized complexes and lines, flexible metal-working production systems, including systems for sheet metal stamping and die forging, manufacturing of parts from metal powders, plastics, and other materials, and up-to-date measuring equipment for automatic monitoring.

In heavy and transport machinebuilding the transition is to be made from production of individual machines to the creation of technological lines and complexes. There will be a substantial growth in the output of equipment

to mechanize and automate materials handling, loading and unloading, and warehouse operations in order to substantially reduce the use of manual, semiskilled, and heavy physical labor.

In chemical and petroleum machinebuilding there will be an increase in the output of automated lines for the manufacturing of methanol, carbamide, ethylene and propylene, synthetic rubbers, etc.

In instrumentmaking plans call for a faster than average pace in manufacturing highly reliable systems of industrial automation on the basis of electronics, above all for process control, equipment to automate engineering work, small electronic computers with high productivity, personal computers, systems for numeric programmed control for functional machine tools and flexible production modules, programmable master controllers for various types of equipment, and devices for computers and automatic control systems.

In the electrical equipment industry higher rates will be achieved in development of highly automated production operations in the manufacturing of electric motors, there will be increased output of automated electric drives, storage batteries, electric lift trucks, components for flexible production systems, industrial robots, and other pieces of equipment indispensable to automation and mechanization in the sectors of the economy.

In construction, road, and municipal machinebuilding attention will be concentrated above all on manufacturing machines, machinery, and tools making it possible to sharply reduce the use of manual labor and to achieve full mechanization of construction processes and on expanding the products list and increasing the output of highly mechanized complexes for timbering operations.

In machinebuilding for light industry and the food industry plans call for creating and beginning production of complexes and systems of machines guaranteeing the transition to full mechanization and automation of product manufacturing in light industry and the food industry and also for expanding the output of highly efficient machines and equipment furnished with robotized devices and microprocessors.

Prospects for Cooperation With Foreign Countries in the Field of Machinebuilding

Development of cooperation with foreign countries in the field of machinebuilding is to be raised to a qualitatively new level on the basis of comprehensive solution of problems related to satisfying the needs of the economy for machines, equipment, and instruments and to the development, creation, and production of fundamentally new types of equipment meeting the world technical level.

The structure of foreign trade with the CEMA member countries, which is not optimal for the USSR, is to be revamped. This requires increasing the average annual growth rates of Soviet exports of machines and equipment and sharply increasing the level and quality of machines and equipment involved in mutual deliveries. Imports of machines and equipment will approximately double over that period.

In the context of restructuring the USSR's foreign economic relations with the European socialist states it is indispensable to pursue an effort toward reorientation of their predominant specialization toward manufacturing those types of up-to-date equipment which are scientific-intensive, but not metal-intensive. Imports of machines and equipment from the fraternal countries for retooling and reconstruction of domestic enterprises must be predominantly in the form of complete-unit deliveries (*komplektnyye postavki*). Moreover, in the coming period there will be expanded cooperation of the USSR with the CEMA member countries aimed at reducing or halting imports of certain machines and equipment from the capitalist countries. Attention must be concentrated on organizing the production of up-to-date highly productive equipment previously purchased in the capitalist countries by means of purchases of licenses in agreement with the fraternal countries and the organization of joint enterprises.

There has to be radical improvement in the effort to raise the technical level and quality of products involved in deliveries on the basis of further improvement of scientific-technical cooperation among the CEMA member countries, a strengthening of its interrelationship to production cooperation, and the predominant development of normative-technical support. Plans call for restructuring the system of international specialization and industrial cooperation. There will be purposive development of interaction of Soviet associations, enterprises, and organizations with partners from the CEMA member countries on the basis of cooperation in the field of scientific research and development, coordination of investment projects and production programs, and agreement on matters of sales and technical servicing. There will continue to be coordination of economic and scientific-technical policy in machinebuilding and its branches at the level of ministries and departments.

Particular attention will be paid to developing large-scale forms of collaboration through industrial cooperation by setting up international production and scientific-production complexes in the CEMA member countries related to the organization of large-scale and efficient production and creation of an export potential for going on to the markets of advanced capitalist countries. During the next 5-year planning period there has to be a substantial rise in the efficiency of sectoral cooperation, which must be based on long-range development programs which the countries have agreed on.

The sectoral programs must optimally combine the interests of the USSR with the existing specialized configuration of the countries:

Bulgaria—materials-handling and agricultural machinebuilding, machine tool building, computer equipment, and specialized manufacturing equipment for the electronics industry;

Hungary—production of buses, instrumentmaking, medical technology, computer equipment, production of communications equipment and equipment for the service sector; specialized manufacturing and monitoring and measuring equipment for the electronics industry;

GDR—metallurgical and mining equipment, chemical and printing machinebuilding, machine tool, robot, and shipbuilding, optics and electronic products, computer equipment, light and food machinebuilding, specialized manufacturing equipment for the electronics industry, and the production of temperature-controlled railroad cars and passenger railroad cars;

Poland—mining machinebuilding, production of equipment for the garment and food industries, production of construction and roadbuilding machines, tractors and automobiles, shipbuilding;

Romania—production of equipment for the extraction of petroleum and gas, production of railroad freight cars and mail cars;

Czechoslovakia—machine tool building, production of heavy and light trucks, diesel and electric locomotive building, production of power engineering, nuclear, and metallurgical equipment, equipment for light industry, the food industry, and medicine, electronic products and specialized manufacturing equipment for the electronics industry.

There also has to be a radical change in the commodity structure of exports and imports, the quality and competitiveness of domestic machines and equipment have to be increased, and ministries, departments, associations, and enterprises have to be more responsible for achieving trade and scientific-economic relations with the capitalist countries. It is recommended that these relations be expanded on the principles of industrial cooperation and that joint enterprises be set up in which Soviet and capitalist organizations, firms, and bodies of management would take part. There are plans to give priority to purchases of progressive equipment, installations, one-of-a-kind units and machine tools for finishing operations as well as test-stand equipment and instruments for scientific and laboratory research. Plans call for terminating purchases of technically uncomplicated equipment and for organizing its manufacture both at domestic enterprises and also at enterprises of the CEMA member countries (all of this will be taken into account in the work of coordinating plans).

One of the key directions for intensifying cooperation with the developing countries must be expanding development of relations involving industrial cooperation. The step-by-step realization of coordinated long-range programs of trade, economic, and scientific-technical relations with these countries will continue, and there will be a substantial broadening of the scale of work to import license in close interrelationship with imports of machines and equipment.

Performance of the measures contained in the broad conception of development of foreign economic relations with foreign countries will contribute to the following:

- i. large-scale full automation of the sectors of the economy, complete retooling of the production capability of machinebuilding, and the application of progressive technologies;
- ii. a rise in the productivity of social labor;
- iii. manufacturing of all products of machinebuilding at the world technical level;
- iv. the technical-and-economic independence of the countries of the socialist commonwealth from imports from the capitalist countries will be substantially strengthened;
- v. restructuring of a trade structure that is not optimal for the USSR and a large increase in exports of machines and equipment;
- vi. wide application of new progressive forms of cooperation, expansion and intensification of specialization and industrial cooperation, and a substantial growth of mutual deliveries of components and parts;
- vii. mainly meeting the need of the most important sectors of the economy for the products of machinebuilding.

While priority is being given to economic cooperation with the socialist countries, plans in the coming period also call for broadening trade relations and scientific-technical ties with all interested countries regardless of their socioeconomic system on a stable, mutually advantageous, and strictly balanced basis.

Footnotes

1. The countries of the socialist commonwealth account for 25-30 percent of the world production of machines and equipment. The branches of machinebuilding employ between 30 and 40 percent of the industrial work force.

2. PRAVDA, 26 June 1987.

3. Ibid.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Ekonomika". "Planovoye khozyaystvo". 1987.

07045

Response to Questionnaire on Direct Ties Within CEMA

18250008 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 September 1987 page 5 publishes a follow-up to last year's questionnaire among CEMA country economists, party organizers, and scientific workers on economic cooperation and direct ties. Several of last year's respondents were asked to express their opinions on current direct ties and progress in overcoming problems noted a year ago.

Yuriy Shiryayev, director of the CEMA International Institute of Economic Problems of the World Socialist System, replied as follows:

"The complications which were arising even in the course of selecting cooperating collectives have turned out to be even more serious than in the projections of a year ago. Many of the partners united 'in a schedule of allocations' to this day interact only on paper. Even in those cases where they came into contact on a, let us say, spontaneous-independent basis, their union frequently has proven to be unstable because of a lack of knowledge of each other, a lack of habits of interaction, and an absence of deep interest in cooperation. Overcoming the alienation of the direct product from the foreign economic sphere is an exceptionally important task."

Shiryayev notes further: "Much is being done now in the USSR and a number of other CEMA member countries to expand the scope of producers' rights. Both individual enterprises, as well as whole regions, can now independently enter the foreign market. But it is not a simple matter to learn how to use these rights. In establishing partner pairs one must take into consideration even the personality of the collective director— his enterprising nature, his ability to work in a new way (or his willingness to learn).

"Even today many failures en route to development of direct ties have been caused by a lack of knowledge of the state of one or another industry within the framework of cooperation, the latest achievements of science and technology, production capabilities of potential partners, and competition on the world markets. The USSR Chamber of Commerce, the CEMA International Center of Scientific and Technical Information, and newspapers are trying to improve this state of affairs. But in order for managers not to live on a 'starvation ration,' it is necessary to develop a clear-cut mechanism by which the necessary information can be systematically accumulated and renewed and—especially essential—reach the consumer efficiently. To the point, why not introduce a cost accounting principle here: payment for information services would increase the incentive of its 'suppliers.'"

Now, finally, let us turn to currency and finance problems. They are impeding matters as before. There are small advances though: for example, partners supporting direct ties have received the right to establish, with mutual calculations, contract prices which can deviate from prices within their own countries and from world prices.... We have to take into consideration the fact that beginning in 1988 Soviet enterprises, in accordance with our newly adopted economic mechanism will convert to full cost accounting and self-financing and then the problem will become even more intensified: you see, the level of prices on cooperative deliveries will also begin to be reflected in the wages in the labor collective.

"Obviously, a considered system of crediting and subsidizing is required: a 'technological hitch' deserves state

support. In my opinion it will also be necessary to introduce special measures to encourage export....

"There are grounds for believing that with the introduction of direct ties CEMA member countries can improve the quality of mutual commodity exchange and improve its structure. But it is still early to talk about any real results in this matter. Assessing the situation today, we have to say that the CEMA member countries are still at the very beginning of a complex, not so simple road of becoming involved in foreign economic activity as the direct creators of technical ideas and producers of goods and services."

/12913

Philippine Peace Council Secretary Interviewed
18070001c Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA
in Russian No 8, Aug 87 p 16

[Interview with Antonio Paris, national secretary of the Philippine Peace and Solidarity Council (PPSC) by AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA correspondent D. Kasatkin: "October in Our Hearts"]

[Text] [Question] This year marks the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia—a historical event of worldwide significance. Please tell us what effect October has had on the development of the national liberation movement in your country.

[Answer] The Philippines were a colony of the United States when October took place. Naturally, the foreign enslavers did everything possible so that the penetration of socialist ideas into our country did not occur and to keep us from learning the truth about the events in Russia. But it turned out to be impossible to isolate the Philippines from the outside world and to create an impenetrable wall on the path of the dissemination of the revolutionary ideas of October. News of the events in faraway Russia, that the workers and peasants had taken power there, reached us gradually. And this had a revolutionizing effect on the workers of the Philippines.

October had an especially salutary effect on the trade unions, which had already made themselves known as a serious social force. It was namely in this environment that the first Marxist group appeared, and it did much to familiarize the Filipinos with the life of Soviet Russia and to disseminate socialist ideas in our country. All of this facilitated a more profound awareness of the reasons for their oppressed situation by the Philippine people and engendered aspirations of liberation from the alien yoke. Worker strikes occurred in the 1930s along with outbursts of peasant uprisings.

But history took shape in such a way that during the Second World War the American colonial yoke was replaced with a Japanese occupational regime under which the oppression and exploitation of Filipinos was continued. Only after the rout of fascist Germany and militarist Japan, in which a decisive role was played by the Soviet Union, did the liberation movement take on large dimensions in the Philippines. American colonialism was forced to cede its positions. In 1946 the Philippines won their national independence. And, although this event is separated from October by almost 30 years, all of this time the ideas of October have possessed the minds of the best sons of the Philippine people. They have served as a source of inspiration in their just struggle.

[Question] Please tell us about the work of your Peace and Solidarity Council within the country.

[Answer] As testified to by the very name of our organization, its principal goals are to mobilize the efforts of democratic circles in the struggle for peace and against the threat of nuclear war and to support the liberation and anti-imperialist movements of peoples. It should be emphasized that the activity of the Council is striking a vital chord among broad circles of Philippine society. This is understandable. After all, our country has American military bases at which nuclear arms are kept. The largest of these, Clark Field and Subic Bay, have acquired an unfortunate notoriety. American planes left from there to wreak havoc in Korea and Vietnam during the U.S. aggression against these countries. Even today the Pentagon's bases in the Philippines serve as a tool of U.S. expansionist policies in the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins and create a threat to peace in Southeast Asia.

The U.S. military facilities encroach upon the national sovereignty of the country and are an insult to the dignity of our people. With each passing year more of our countrymen realize what danger their homeland is subjected to as a result of the basing of U.S. nuclear weapons on its territory. They are actively fighting to eliminate these nests of militarism.

Our organization accomplishes its activity through provincial and regional councils. Its activists are exposing the militarist plans of Washington, are demonstrating the danger for the Philippines of keeping U.S. military bases here, and are working at drawing society into the movement of solidarity with the peoples fighting for peace and social progress. We are thankful to the World Peace Council, the Organization of Solidarity with the Peoples of Asia and Africa (OSPAA), and the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with the Countries of Asia and Africa for their support of our just struggle. This gives us strength and confidence that we will reach our goals.

[Question] Tell us about the participation of the PPSC in the Afro-Asian solidarity movement.

[Answer] We are trying to make our contribution to the development of this movement. We fully support its goals and tasks. PPSC representatives take part in large measures conducted within the framework of OSPAA. An international meeting was held in Manila in 1986 at the initiative of OSPAA and PPSC at which issues in ensuring peace in Asia and the Pacific basin were discussed. Its results were set forth in the Manila Declaration.

The PPSC delegation took part in the 13th Session of the OSPAA Presidium that was held last year in Ulan-Bator, the capital of Mongolia. This was an important event in the Afro-Asian solidarity movement. The documents signed in the Mongolian capital have become the action program for the national organizations that are part of the OSPAA. The resolution approved by the OSPAA Presidium in which support for a group of large-scale initiatives advanced by the Soviet Union in Vladivostok,

Reykjavik, and Delhi is expressed, for example, along with the approval of the idea of including the vast Asian-Pacific region in the overall process of creating an all-encompassing system of national security, has especial significance for the countries of Asia, and especially for the Philippines.

It is difficult to overestimate the significance of the other documents of the Ulan-Bator forum for the cause of peace and Afro-Asian solidarity. I have in mind the unanimous approval by the participants at the meeting of the USSR proposals to eliminate nuclear weapons completely by the year 2000, to ban nuclear testing, and to forbid deployment of space weapons.

The Philippine Peace and Solidarity Council is trying to fight for the incarnation of the resolutions of the OSPAA under the specific conditions of our country.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

Mirskiy, Li on Socialist Orientation, New Political Thinking

18070001d Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 8, Aug 87 pp 26-32

[Dialogue between Doctor of Historical Sciences Georgiy Ilich Mirskiy and Doctor of Historical Sciences Vladimir Fedorovich Li under the rubric "Academic Dialogue": "Socialist Orientation in Light of the New Political Thinking"]

[Text] *The problems of moving along the path of socio-economic progress for the enormous mass of humanity in the liberated countries in the era of transition to a new formation on a planetary scale continues to remain at the center of academic discussions of Soviet Oriental studies scholars. This type of discussion has become especially animated in light of the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the materials of the CPSU Central Committee, and other party documents. Soviet scholars are striving to reinterpret critically the experience that has been accumulated and to project the most effective ways of joining theory and methodology with the practice of revolutionary creation from the point of view of the new political thinking and the paramount tasks of restructuring and raising the efficiency of scientific and technical work. In this connection, the editors of the journal invited Soviet Oriental studies and international scholars Doctor of Historical Sciences G.I. Mirskiy and Doctor of Historical Science V.F. Li to take part in a discussion to exchange opinions on the key issues of the development of the contemporary revolutionary process in the countries of Asia and Africa. Their dialogue is published below. G. Mirskiy: In illuminating methodological problems in the*

revolutionary movement in the former colonially dependent periphery, I would like to mention first and foremost that the idea of the transition of backward countries to socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development (in any case, to the full extent), was initially advanced by the classic authors of Marxism. I have in mind herein the "abbreviated development process" (Engel's phrase from the work "The Social Question in Russia"¹) in regard to countries "that have just entered onto the path of capitalist production and in which the ancestral order or traces of it still remain."²

This idea was further developed in the speech of V.I. Lenin at the 2nd Comintern Congress, where the well-known formulation was advanced that "with the aid of the proletariat of the progressive countries, the backward countries can go over to a soviet structure and, after certain stages of development, to communism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development."³ Based on it, the corresponding provisions were formulated in the Comintern Program: the discussion concerned countries "where there are no or almost no hired workers, where the majority of the population lives under conditions of tribal life and where remnants of primitive forms are preserved, where there is almost no national bourgeoisie, and where foreign imperialism plays the primary role of military occupier taking away the land." There, in accordance with the Leninist formula, one can speak of "development toward socialism without completing the stage of capitalism at all, if in fact powerful assistance is rendered by the countries with a dictatorship of the proletariat."⁴

We thus have in mind a country that is first, extremely backward, practically without developed capitalist relations, and second, able to make use of "powerful assistance" from the proletariat of the leading countries.

It is important to emphasize these two points: the point is that later, in the 1950s and 1960s, when the concept of "noncapitalist development" was being developed (for the theoretical substantiation of such political phenomena as the revolutions in Egypt, Burma, Syria, and other countries), there was somewhat of a change in concepts. The discussion was not about the most backward countries ("where the majority of the population lives under conditions of tribal life," "where there is almost no national bourgeoisie," and so forth), but rather about states where capitalist relations had already definitely developed—Egypt, Syria, and so forth. It was already clear by that time that the "powerful assistance" of countries with a dictatorship of the proletariat in the initial sense could not be. After all, the classic authors of Marxism obviously had in mind a situation where the proletarian revolution is victorious in the industrially developed mother countries that lead the colonies after them. But this occurred only in Russia, where the victorious proletariat of the "center" led the outer reaches of the former czarist empire, almost unknown to capitalism. Something else happened with the countries of foreign Asia and Africa: in "their mother countries" a

proletarian revolution did not occur, and Egypt, Syria, Algeria, Ghana, Guinea, Congo, and others were unable to enjoy such support as was received by our Central-Asian republics, as well as Mongolia.

The renewed concept of noncapitalist development consequently from the very beginning has not fully corresponded to the "model" that the founders of scientific socialism had in mind. It was employed for a different type of country and under other historical conditions. Those countries in which capitalism had already been able to put down roots were declared to be countries of "noncapitalist development," even though it had developed quite intensively in some (Egypt, Syria), and they moreover remained in the capitalist world economic system (and not in the socialist system, as Central Asia or Mongolia). In regard to trade, credit, technology, and so forth, these countries were largely dependent up to then on the world capitalist "centers" and continued to remain their "periphery." World socialism, in view of its economic and technical difficulties and the worsening struggle between the two systems, was unable to render "powerful assistance" to a complete extent to the backward countries that had declared their intention to proceed toward socialism—with the exception of the military and technical sphere, important in the most critical moments of the struggle against imperialism, but far from decisive at the stage of creation.

Later the term "noncapitalist path" was replaced in practice by another—"socialist orientation"—that was more apt, first of all because it was devoid of a purely negative definition ("noncapitalist") and rather contains a positive indication and, second, because it permits a broad treatment of the nature of the countries that are taking this route: countries in which capitalism is already quite developed can be "oriented" toward socialism; it is possible to "interrupt" rather than "bypass" it. V. Li: In your opinion, Georgiy Ilich, you have clearly described the consistent phases in the birth of the academic concepts of the noncapitalist development path. Fundamentally new traits have been imparted to the ingenious prediction of F. Engels, which greatly enriched the formational theories of K. Marx, V.I. Lenin and the Comintern that arise from the very nature of the multi-level and at the same time integral nature of the world revolutionary struggle. Fundamentally new herein is first and foremost the fact that a noncapitalist thrust in certain echelons of the world anti-imperialist front is not ruled out even with the incomplete maturity of all of its internal economic and social preconditions. This type of "underdevelopment," similar to the law of the adjoining vessels, assumes unfailing "compensation" on the part of the foreign, international front of the world anti-imperialist movement. The problem of the interaction of the internal and the external (international) accordingly comprises the heart of the concept of the "classical" version of the replacement of socioeconomic formations in the countries of the Orient and sub-Saharan Africa from the very beginning. I would like to note that the positions of today's generation of Soviet Oriental scholars largely coincide on these key issues.

One can hardly agree, however, with the theory that in the 1950s and 1960s "a certain substitution of concepts occurred" in our academics in the further development of the theory of the noncapitalist path, insofar as the model under consideration relates to a society with a higher level of socioeconomic development. This theory was never limited by the problems of "bypassing" capitalism. Its constituent element always was and remains questions associated with the "interruption" or "abbreviation" of the full phase of capitalist formational development. We accordingly have here not a "substitution of concepts," but rather the natural renewal of the specifically historical form of noncapitalist development. There is naturally nothing paradoxical (from the point of view of the general laws of history) in the fact that the striving for a socialist future encompasses the "poorest" countries of Asia and Africa.

It is appropriate here to recall the words of V. I. Lenin that in the contemporary era, social revolutions encompass first and foremost such societies as are not included among the exploiting countries. But an indispensable condition for the maturation of a revolutionary situation is the support of the popular masses. "An absolute majority is not always needed; for victory and holding power, however, not only a majority of the working class, but also a majority of the exploited and laboring rural population is essential."⁵

The theory that world socialism could not give "powerful assistance" to the backward countries is even more contentious, in my opinion. The impression is created that you are proceeding primarily from a series of formal indicators of the amount of foreign assistance to these countries. The very concept of "powerful support," meanwhile, is of a largely comprehensive and multilevel nature. It is manifested most materially in the fact that world socialism objectively represents the determined force of class confrontation to world capitalism and neocolonialism. In diverting the chief strategic resources and potential of imperialism, world socialism creates favorable external conditions for the successful development of national-liberation revolutions.

The subjective factors of "powerful support"—economic, technical, and defensive assistance to the socialist-oriented states—also act in the same direction. In my opinion, it is altogether incorrect to pose the question of real socialism taking on the principal burden of material expenditures in creating the economic and technical potential of the socialist-oriented countries. Assistance from without can only be a supplemental factor of accelerated growth implemented first and foremost through the maximum mobilization of internal resources. Be that as it may, however, we have herein touched on the extremely important and in reality sore subject of raising the effectiveness of our assistance to progressive regimes. G. Mirskiy: It seems to me that we are focusing on different aspects of one and the same problem. If we follow your logic, Vladimir Fedorovich, it is namely unfavorable trends in the development of the external

factor that have led to the serious difficulties and negative phenomena that have been observed in recent years in a number of socialist-oriented countries. But, after all, it is first and foremost factors of an internal sort that are at the heart of these difficulties and phenomena.

We will turn in this regard to the well-known Leninist formulation of "transition" to a Soviet structure with the support of broad segments of the workers. The discussion concerned the fact that it was possible to cite the "initiative of the masses," the creation of popular organs of power—soviets, committees—and the awakening of the lower segments, the workers, and their association with the cause of revolution, a new attitude toward labor, the cultivation of a new man, and the development of anti-ownership, anti-individualist, and collectivist relations. There was in essence none of this in the "first-generation" socialist-oriented states, which we called "national-democratic states." The revolution in them had largely transpired seemingly "from above," and state principles predominated instead of popular ones, paternalism and "fear of the masses" were manifested, and so forth. The leading groups achieved their initial goals—eliminating the domination of feudalists, financiers, and foreign capitalists; establishing a state of "dirigisme" [government economic planning and control]; breaking down estate barriers; and so forth. They created a special model for society, at the foundation of which was state capitalism based on privileged groups—the bureaucracy, the officer corps, the nouveau riche, and petty landowners.

A radical turnaround did not occur at the level of individual consciousness and the individual's hierarchy of values. There was no climate of revolutionary uplifting, enthusiasm, or "building a new world." An anti-ownership, egalitarian, and collectivist ideology was not able to dominate in a society that retained the "ownership umbilical," under a regime that defended the interests of the petty landowner, reserving social inequality and not stopping people from getting wealthy. V. Li: Today, when an intensive search for ways of restructuring academic developments and making them more topical and surmounting the consequences of "paternalism" and unfounded monopoly in science is under way, exceptionally broad possibilities are opening up for the creative study of the complex dialectic of national-liberation revolutions.

Bitter judgments of dangerous relapses into "fear of the masses" in the liberated countries along with stagnant tendencies and the degeneration of progressive regimes deserve attention. And the logic of such judgments and their excessively nihilistic evaluations cannot fail to provoke objections. In touching on the question of forming the foundations of the political system of socialist-oriented states ("national democracies"), you, Georgiy Ilich, for some reason proceed primarily from the categories of social revolution of a proletarian-internationalist type ("a new attitude toward labor," "the development of antiownership relations," "associating with

the revolution," and so forth). There is in essence no well-defined distinction herein between the educational and mobilizing functions of an intrinsically socialist and national-liberation revolution. Would it not be more correct to say that the paramount mobilizing function of national-revolutionary power consists first and foremost of gradually awakening national patriotism, disseminating the first principles of revolutionary political culture, arranging normal mutual relations between the state and the church, and redistributing surplus product created in the sphere of private appropriation in favor of the poor and landless segments through the state budget?

Historical experience shows that the overall lack of cultural and, as a consequence of it, political maturity among the broad masses is an organic trait of proletarian revolutions. But this same trait, in even more hypertrophied form, is also manifested in national-democratic revolutions. The "initiative of the masses" in a national-democratic revolution (especially with the leading role of nonproletarian social forces) is accordingly none other than an illusory hope for devising "a new attitude toward labor." This sort of "initiative," by virtue of the low level of culture, is inevitably of a localized and spontaneous or semispontaneous nature and largely depends on what direction and at what rate the revolutionary vanguard evolves. In other words, under conditions of socialist orientation, especially in the initial stages of it, it is hardly possible to expect seriously the appearance of a "new man."

If we are speaking of new political thinking, the discussion should evidently proceed first and foremost on providing the profound sociopsychological preconditions for the association of the broad lower reaches of the masses to the radical social turnabout. One cannot fail to recall here the words of Lenin: "If a certain cultural level is required for the creation of socialism, why can we not begin at the beginning with the winning of preconditions for this level via revolution, and then, on the basis of workers' and peasants' power and the Soviet structure, move on to overtake other peoples?"⁶

It seems that this general law is unusually prominently manifested in a national-democratic revolution that takes place under conditions of social and colonial backwardness. This should also explain, in my opinion, the lack of dynamism in socialist orientation. The national-democratic revolution largely "impedes" and "deforms" the mutual dependence, well-known to us, between such phenomena as revolutionary power and political culture. It is not just culture that has an enormous, frequently decisive role on the nature of the new power, but power in turn also takes on the functions of generator of all of social development.

I would like to express my disagreement in this regard with the negatively critical treatment of "revolution from above" in countries with capitalist development that is widespread in our literature today, in which primarily "state" and "paternalistic" and even not

entirely "social" levers for managing society are discerned. With such a logic of condemnation, are we not shifting already extant stereotypes of the past to an unsuited sociopolitical reality of national-democratic revolutions? We know that "revolution from above" as a means of qualitative shifts can be used to arm various ruling social class forces. (Here we can recall such well-known historical analogies as the Meiji reforms in Japan, the postwar agrarian reforms in South Korea and Taiwan, the "white revolution" in Iran, and the like.)

As shown in particular by the experience of contemporary national-democratic revolutions, these or those methods of "revolution from above" can also arm revolutionary national democracy. The creative organs of revolutionary-democratic power "from above" represent organs of management for broad nonproletarian segments of the workers at the stage of socialist orientation in a number of countries of the Orient. Such organs can probably find their genuinely democratic functions in higher phases of the advance toward socialist goals if they are not hindered by Thermidorian tendencies. **G. Mirskiy:** It seems to me that, in condemning the constructive potential of "revolution from above," the role of the private sector, which has an extremely material influence on the process of political evolution in societies of the group under consideration, is being underestimated somewhat. It was, of course, apparent from the very beginning that, without the private sector, the countries entering the path of socialist orientation could not manage: the example of the NEP was clear to all. But NEP under conditions of dictatorship of the proletariat as a temporary measure introduced by the authorities, strictly monitoring the private owner, and then liquidating it (what the results were is another issue) is one thing, and the version of NEP in the Third World, within the framework of petty-bourgeois-state regimes, is something else. If a private sector exists in trade and petty industry, while private farming dominates in the village, it is naive to assume the one will be able to get rid of dealers and speculators and the new middleman bourgeoisie that are busy in the state sector. If there is an enormous gap in material status and privileges, it is difficult to count on the fact that the new elite of highly paid officials and officers will not try to get rich "along the way" via various types of machinations, corruption, family ties with operators and landowners, and so forth.

A constant rushing from side to side is typical of the attitude of national-democratic powers toward the private sector (Seku Ture, for example, first eliminated it altogether—and as a result there were empty stores, contraband, and a black market, and then on the contrary abolished the state monopoly on foreign trade—and then even ministries engaged in private business). The point is that such power is in principle against reinforcing private capital, since that would signify the formation of a separate seat of political activity. A strong and economically independent private sector is inevitably oppressed by the "dirigisme" functions of the state,

strives toward independence and the possibility of determining policy for itself, which goes against the grain of the authority of the ruling circles trying to monopolize the political and economic life of the country and not to permit the appearance of uncontrollable social forces within it.

In creating a system of state capitalism based on a mixed economy, the national democrats try to have the best of both worlds. In practice, however, this leads to the fact that the state sector is universally typified by inefficiency, low profitability, the incomplete utilization of productive capacity, low wages, monstrously inflated staffs, bureaucratism, nepotism, corruption, and so forth, while the private sector, trying to "break out," circumvents laws, resorts to illegal practices, "tames" and demoralizes state and party employees, and facilitates the creation of an atmosphere of a "consumerist society" in a caricatured and perverted form. All of this taken together leads to the profound disillusionment of the masses, a fall in faith in revolutionary ideals, social apathy, and mistrust of the leadership. **V. Li:** You have touched on an extremely important issue concerning the evolution of the private-capital sector that is uncontrollable (or poorly controllable) by the state with the social, political, and ideological consequences arising therefrom. In a number of countries of the Orient that I have visited recently (Algeria, Iraq, Syria, and others), not only is there a new middle class, but even a large trade and entrepreneurial bourgeoisie is gathering force and is moreover making claims for key roles in political life. These claims are not all that groundless, since some are already tracing a trend toward the fusion of the new generation of bourgeois elements with part of the bureaucratic apparatus in the bowels of the multi-institutional socioeconomic and political structure. It seems that it is namely capitalism and the new bourgeoisie today that represent the principal social force with restorative tendencies that are directed against socialist orientation.

At the same time, the role of private capital is far from synonymous in all countries where national-democratic revolution has spread. Whereas in one group of states a clear "swelling" of the private sector is observed, in another (the "second-generation" countries) its "underdevelopment" is acutely felt, which makes the creation of the material and technical basis of a new society substantially more difficult. The ruling national-democratic circles of a number of countries (Afghanistan, South Yemen, Ethiopia, Angola, and others) have moreover probably clearly "jumped the gun," in particular, in the matter of expropriating the property of the middle-class bourgeoisie and the cooperatives of petty tradesmen and producers.

People sometimes ask which of the versions of social digressions is most dangerous for national-democratic revolution. It seems that both of them are equally ruinous for progressive revolutionary-democratic power.

One cannot fail to mention an extremely curious detail in the regard: in recent years we have written mountains of paper on the "arbitrary rule of the private trader," but very few sensible opinions on the important role of petty trade and money-exchange relations in resolving the paramount tasks of national-democratic revolution have been expressed. And is this not because some of the radically inclined revolutionary-democratic figures have extremely stubborn convictions that money-exchange relations are supposedly incompatible with socialist doctrines, although the development of such relations is an objective requirement of transitional society.

Under the conditions of socialist orientation, all private traders are not alike. And this, obviously, cannot be ignored by any flexible and realistic socioeconomic strategy. Evidently, the principal regulatory function of revolutionary power in the given instance consists of limiting as much as possible the tendency to transform a simple commodity economy into its higher form—a capitalist one. Such a task is resolved via the intensive involvement of the commodity economy (especially petty and individual) in diverse ties to the state sector (through credit, cooperation, supply, sales, and so forth). Retail trade is called upon to stimulate growth in productive forces, balance public supply and demand, and weaken the disproportions in the multi-institutional socioeconomic structure of the transitional society. The practices of a number of socialist-oriented states, including "second-generation" ones (Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, et al) have shown that a consequence of ignoring the laws of money-exchange relations can be a sharp decline in the productivity of social labor, disproportions in commodity turnover, and the curtailment of production, which in turn threatens the national-democratic revolution. **G. Mirskiy:** In analyzing the principal causes of the difficulties of socialist orientation, I would not put too much emphasis on the miscalculations of progressive authorities in the matter of setting up optimal mutual relations between the revolutionary vanguard and the broad nonproletarian and primarily petty-bourgeois masses. The causes herein are visibly multilevel and integrated, and its would not be an exaggeration to assert that the decline or degeneration of a number of "first-generation" (national-democratic) socialist-oriented regimes with their state-administrative thrust and authoritative-directive system of management, toleration of the process of bourgeoisie, encouragement of social privilege, and inability to create a genuinely revolutionary vanguard party to mobilize the masses and cultivate them in a spirit of collectivism and revolutionary awareness seems quite natural. All have seen the failures of such leaders as Nkruma, Seku Ture, and Modibo Keita. The Algerian Marxists write with alarm of the threat to the whole cause of revolutionary transformations in the country as a result of the strengthening of rightist probourgeois tendencies. The Syrian communists are also inclined to reject the use of the term "noncapitalist path" in relation to the ruling regime in

view of the steady growth of capitalist relations in the cities and villages. Crises in the economic, social, and political spheres are apparent in Burma and Tanzania.

One could draw the conclusion that the idea of "a national-democratic state," the core of which should be a unified front of patriotic and progressive forces, including the working class, the petty bourgeoisie, and some of the national bourgeoisie, is groundless. National democracy of this type has either left the stage, having cleared the way for capitalism on a new branch of the historical spiral (Egypt), has degenerated into a corrupt group and has fallen (Guinea), or has been transformed into the rule of privileged bureaucratic and technocratic bourgeois segments. **V. Li:** While sharing overall your opinion on the crisis and degeneration of some progressive regimes that have sometimes perceived the prospects of the world anti-imperialist movement differently in the past, I still do not think that we are sometimes inclined to rush from one extreme to the other. Can we really call "self-braking," stagnation, and the recoil of certain trends in national-democratic revolution an immanent "general law"? Hardly. After all, it was caused by factors of an objective nature as well as subjective ones. The fated inevitability of degeneration was not implicit in any of the socialist-oriented societies. The logic of revolution demanded advance to new and higher limits of social progress, while the actual disposition and correlation of social and class forces (an uncommonly dynamic factor) had not created the conditions for this advance. The degeneration of national-democratic revolution is accordingly not so much a general law as it is an anomaly that ultimately greatly complicates the unsolved problems in the revolutionary restructuring of society.

There is yet another consideration relating to the objective historical evaluation of the anti-imperialist, antimonarchical, and national-democratic revolutions in Egypt in 1952, Iraq in 1958, and a number of other countries of Asia and Africa. In pointing to the negative instances of the revolution, we are for some reason "forgetting" their important international significance as events that opened up new and shining chapters in the history of the struggle of the Oriental peoples for political independence and social progress. Under today's conditions of a cardinal increase in the efficiency of academic research and the restoration of objective historical truth, it is very important not to go to extremes in evaluating the prospects for revolutionary-liberation renewal in the Oriental countries. This type of extreme has unfortunately been frequently manifested in several academic discussions of late. **G. Mirskiy:** Yes, this is a very material moment, since a new generation of revolutionary democracy is coming into the political arena associated with the appearance of a group of popular-democratic-type states. They have also begun to be called the countries of socialist development (South Yemen, Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, and others). Parties that have adopted a platform of scientific socialism and have officially declared themselves to be Marxist have been confirmed in power in place of petty-bourgeois national or revolutionary democracy in the countries of this type.

Revolution has proceeded "from below" as well as "from above"; the initiative of the masses has been awakened, proletarian-plebeian—peasant organs of power have been created (seemingly a prototype of the "soviet structure" that was mentioned by Lenin at the 2nd Comintern Congress), and a fundamentally antibourgeois, collectivist, and egalitarian ideology has been disseminated. A course of solid union with the USSR has been taken in foreign policy. A quite modest role has been earmarked for the private sector. No appreciable bourgeoisisation of the apparatus has been observed.

All of these pluses, it seems, could have been offset by a substantial minus consisting of the fact that all of the countries in this category were extremely poor and had quite miserly natural resources (aside from Angola, perhaps) and were devoid of prospects for rapid economic ascent, which naturally has decreased their attractiveness as "models" for the Third World overall. From another point of view, however, even this minus contained a certain advantage: the actual absence of a petty bourgeoisie and the insignificant development of local capitalism in essence removed the problem of fighting the owning and exploiting classes. A society that is poor from top to bottom, it seems, could "get over the pass" more quickly, having avoided bourgeois temptations and, making use of communal-collectivist traditions, advance toward socialism—even from a low starting level.

But a number of negative tendencies were also discovered in these countries. It became clear that the effect of backwardness, both cultural and ideological, the inadequate level of social consciousness, the widespread nature of traditional conceptions, tribalism, caste and clan structures, and patron-client relations was underestimated. As for the economy per se, it is now evident that even "national-democratic" countries have not gone far from the "first-generation" socialist-oriented states. Corruption is less there, but such phenomena as mismanagement, bureaucratism, low labor productivity, poor profitability among state enterprises, the ballooning of the administrative apparatus, and poorly arranged supply of the population are appreciable.

If one even assumes that all of these difficulties will be surmounted in one way or another, the problem remains: the need for modern equipment, technology, high-quality consumer goods, and, finally, the need for foreign credit grows to the extent of economic development. The capitalist West remains the principal source for all of this, and it would be naive to hope that its influence will be limited to just the material sphere and will not be reflected in social and ideological life. On an economic plane, the countries under consideration have to be oriented toward the West. The local private sector will thus grow correspondingly as well, and parasitic and neocompradore segments will appear.

Whereas the capitalist development of backward countries could be called a spontaneous process, seemingly a natural continuation of that that was already laid down

in the colonial period, an attempt to tear oneself onto the socialist path, is "a move against the current," the intention to halt, upset, or break up a spontaneous and inertial process. It can be proved that capitalism is not at all genetically programed in the organism of colonial society, as well as the fact that it is "simpler" and more logical to go directly from communal-collectivist forms to socialist ones, "leapfrogging" the stage of private ownership. True, reality is not quite so simple. The failure of the "ujamaa" experiment with the villages in Tanzania was extremely instructive. The peasantry strives to have their own, albeit small, private plot, and the dissemination of petty private entrepreneurship in the cities is quite natural.

The classic authors of Marxism, naturally, were unable to analyze a priori all of these factors, but they evidently understood intuitively that the backward countries, "left to their own devices," would not have adequate internal preconditions—economic, moral, and ideological—for the transition to building socialism. They thus placed emphasis on the foreign factor—assistance and support on the part of the developed states in which proletarian revolution was successful. V. Li: Georgiy Ilich, you justly cite the fundamental distinction between the countries of the "first-" and "second-generation" of non-capitalist development. But a number of your opinions on this issue raise doubts nonetheless. I think that it is perhaps somewhat early to include the regimes of popular democracy and socialist orientation among political systems that have entered the path of socialist transformations first and foremost because in the first case we have a proletarian regime of a revolutionary-democratic type, while in the second instance, it is power through a union of the working class and the peasantry under the guidance of a Marxist-Leninist party. Furthermore, the absence or weakness of the local bourgeoisie has in no way lessened the acuity of the class struggle, since the counterrevolutionary camp is grouped around the feudal-compradore, petty-bourgeois, nationalistic, clerical-traditionalist, separatist, and other conservative social forces.

It is also difficult to assume that the capitalist West will, as you say, play the role of the "principal source" of modern equipment, technology, consumer goods, and credit. On the contrary, the socialist-oriented countries are, in essence, subjected to an economic blockade on the part of the imperialist states and monopolies, anxious at the attempts of the peoples of the former colonial periphery to enter onto the path of social progress. On the agenda is thus finding new forms of integration and making use of the advantages of the social division of labor among the countries of the socialist community and the socialist-oriented countries. After all, it is no accident that they are trying to solidify their business ties to the CEMA member countries on a long-term basis. This integration can bring them many benefits and advantages.

And here you have completely logically and with good reason directed attention toward the priority significance of the external, international factor in the development of national-democratic revolution. Of course, the establishment of the power of the working class in the mother countries, as forecast by Marx and Engels, would be stimulated to a great extent and would ease the whole process of noncapitalist transition for earlier backward peoples toward socialism. But world history has made yet another "desynchronization" this time too: it has brought the oppressed peoples to the victory of socialism in the principal centers of the imperialist powers of the West along the path of national liberation and social progress. This type of historical paradox greatly complicates the revolutionary process in the Afro-Asian world, but does not close off a truly socialist future to them. In a certain sense, one can say herein that the basic international conditions for the success of contemporary national-democratic revolutions and, accordingly, their actual achievement today depend first and foremost on the degree of organization, cohesion, and determination of the national-democratic forces themselves in the liberated countries. **G. Mirskiy:** That which you were discussing above is chiefly a general theoretical concept that is not so easy to transform into living reality. The appearance of new progressive regimes is, of course, fully possible and even probable, especially in Africa, whose leaders are taking a course toward socialism. This is natural, insofar as in the backward countries, and first of all the least developed and poorest ones, the attempt to solve the most difficult problems of the development of capitalist methods are associated with enormous difficulties. The process cannot help but be exceedingly painful, and the disillusionment of the masses and dead-end situations create preconditions for a search for alternative paths. The appearance of a progressive regime in Burkina Faso, in particular, is evidently not the last example of this type. But, most likely, the general laws noted above will begin to be manifested in such new socialist-oriented countries in time. As for the more developed countries that have already taken the capitalist path, the prospects for a rift with capitalism (but this would not even be a "noncapitalist path" but a socialist revolution) seem quite unclear. This is a topic for special discussion. **V. Li:** Your opinion on the profound chronic crisis of the capitalist development model in Asia and Africa deserves attention. The efforts of many bourgeois researchers to conceal this crisis with the phenomenon of neoinustrialism are groundless. On the contrary, they are testimony to the increasingly jumpy and uneven nature of the development of the former colonially dependent periphery, which is ultimately stratifying into several subgroups—from subimperialist to popular-democratic.

I also agree that the nature of the social revolution in the capitalist-type Afro-Asian societies is a topic for "special discussion." It nonetheless seems to me that the attempt to tie the prospects for a "rift" in these societies to capitalism through a socialist revolution is excessively hasty. The medium-developed countries of Asia and

Africa in a capitalist sense are more and more entangled in a heavy burden of precapitalist relations that represent a most extensive "subsoil" for capitalism.

Contemporary capitalist institutions in the nonsocialist part of the Afro-Asian world are just the "tip of the iceberg." They rest on an enormous foundation of archaic socioeconomic structures. Hence the unusual vitality of the distinctive conglomerate that includes fragments of semicapitalist, semifeudal, neocolonial, and other relations that paralyze the advance along the path of social progress. The overthrow of such a conglomerate and its class agents (especially the bureaucratic and compradore bourgeoisie) requires a whole series of preparatory, intermediate, and transitional stages in the revolutionary struggle, including national-democratic, anti-imperialist, and popular-democratic ones, and only on this basis will the soil gradually be cleansed for a directly socialist revolution.

It should be noted that socialist orientation as a form of noncapitalist development path has greatly enriched the world revolutionary process. And our duty as researchers—Oriental scholars and Africanists—is to take active and energetic participation in further developing such little-studied crucial problems of national-democratic revolution as the dialectic of the contradictions of the transitional stage of socialist-oriented society, the dynamics of its political culture, the specific features of political leadership, and, finally, the role of the former colonial periphery in resolving the global problems of modern times.

I would like to add to this that a certain "fade" in the rising wave of national-democratic revolution in postcolonial societies is obviously a temporary and relative phenomenon. The inevitability of a sharp worsening of the sociopolitical battle in such societies is conditioned not only by the deep antagonisms engendered by the vitality of conservative traditionalism, but also by the growing expansion of neocolonialism and the rapid growth of the local neobourgeoisie.

The excessively linear notions of the paths to forming a new socioeconomic base, accelerated growth in the state sector, and rapid cooperation that predominated in the past without regard for many other factors, especially sociopsychological ones, has also played more than a minor role in the failures of socialist orientation, in my opinion. And it seems important here to recall the statements of F. Engels: "Marx and I are partly guilty of the fact that youth sometimes imparts greater significance to the economic aspect than it should. We should, in objecting to our adversaries, have emphasized the main principle, which they spurned, and there not always the time, place, or opportunity to give other factors that are part of the interaction their due."⁷

It seems that the "other factors" cited by F. Engels are today acquiring priority significance for the Orient in creating the economic, social, political, and cultural

foundations for a new society and developing new concepts for predicting social progress in postcolonial societies. It can be assumed that in the harsh realities of the nuclear age, their transition to a new formation will be accomplished on a considerably broader social and class base than before, with the increasing role of new political thinking.

From the Editors: This dialogue between V. Li and G. Mirskiy reflects their views on the crucial issues of national-democratic revolution and the specific features of the replacement of socioeconomic formations in the Afro-Asian region. The editors, in supporting the attempts of the dialogue participants to reinterpret the experience of socialist orientation and the prospects for the liberation process in postcolonial societies, invite Soviet and foreign scholars that are working on these problems to continue the discussion that has been begun in the pages of the journal.

Footnotes

1. K. Marx and F. Engels. Works, Vol 22, pp 445-446. 2. Ibid. 3. V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works, Vol 41, pp 245-246. 4. "The Communist International in Documents (1919-1932)." Moscow, 1933, p 30. 5. V.I. Lenin. Complete Collected Works, Vol 44, p 32. 6. Ibid., Vol 45, p 381. 7. K. Marx and F. Engels. Works, Vol 37, p 396.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

Imprimatur of Nasser on Egyptian Revolution Stressed

18070001b Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 8, Aug 87 pp 6-9

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences I. Belyayev: "A Revolution and a President"; second part of a 2-part article]

[Text] When the Muslim Brotherhood association tried to kill Nasser in 1954, the attempt became an overall rout for the Egyptian brotherhood. By 1956 the British did not have enough forces in Egypt that they could have used to repeat the effort to remove Nasser. The United States joined England in thinking about how to get rid of the "disobedient" president. In this case, the interests of the British and the Americans coincided. When U.S. Secretary of State J.F. Dulles proposed the declaration of an economic boycott against Egypt and rejecting loans for the construction of the Aswan Dam, England and France tacitly joined the Americans.

Nasser answered the imperialist demarche with the nationalization of the Suez Canal, declared on 26 Jul 56 from the balcony of the cotton exchange in Alexandria. It

brought the whole Arab world into an extraordinary state of excitement. In London, Prime Minister Eden recklessly charged that "they have stolen the canal!"

The restraint of the English was pushed to the limit. They decided to stake everything and, secretly, began with France to prepare for war against Egypt. By the hand of Israel. The Israeli Army attacked Egypt on 29 Oct 56. England and France used the Israeli attack as a pretext for military intervention. The cynicism of London and Paris knew no bounds.

The events that transpired in the Near East could not pass without Soviet attention. They came forward with a determined warning to the aggressors that worked instantly. The war was halted. Nasser was convinced that the Soviet Union was a reliable friend that will help out in a moment of need. And not only help out, but protect.

The second half of the 1960s brought much that was interesting and, once again, unexpected. Egypt concluded a number of agreements with the Soviet Union on economic collaboration and the construction of the Aswan hydrocenter and other economic facilities. Much has been written about this. I would only like to point out the main thing: Nasser, as the leader of the country, was well aware that only the Soviet Union could realistically help Egypt create its industry and an independent national economy.

We will turn to the present. The United States is today rendering sizable economic assistance to Egypt totaling billions of dollars. But the Americans have not built a single large or even medium-sized industrial enterprise here. And they do not intend to do so. It suits them if Egypt is always extending a hand to Washington for assistance. We wanted to see Egypt economically powerful and independent.

For Nasser the 1950s was a time for discovering the role of the large and middle bourgeoisie. He came more and more to the conclusion that they were not with him on the path of revolution. Personal profits were the only thing that occupied them when the discussion touched on plans for the future. The Egyptian bourgeoisie strove to have more and more of an influence on the domestic policies of the state. Nasser understood more and more that Egypt would sooner have a powerful counterrevolutionary force in "its" bourgeoisie. And he made a decision.

On 21 May 1962 the president of Egypt proclaimed a Charter of National Action (it was approved by the National Congress on June 30). The authorities conducted another round of nationalization of large industrial enterprises and banks. Somewhat earlier (in May of 1962) a new maximum large land ownership had been announced (100 feddans, but for a family). Nasser said that the goal of the social revolution that had begun was socialism.

Here I am omitting the details concerning some of the specific steps of the state in implementing the provisions of the Charter. I want to speak of something else—the seriousness of Nasser as a politician and state leader in implementing what was projected. One will object, perhaps, that the “Arab socialism” he had proclaimed was hardly well-grounded. Sadat was thus able to turn the development of Egypt with impunity “away from revolution” and, more precisely, begin a regular counterrevolution that has had colossal costs for the country.

In recent years we have heard more than once assertions that Nasser himself, like the Egyptian revolution, had suffered a crushing defeat and had been repudiated by the broad popular masses both in Egypt and in the other Arab countries. Such assertions seem to me not to correspond to the political realities that exist on the banks of the Nile and in the whole Arab world. Although I cannot fail to agree with the fact that, after the death of President Nasser, when Sadat became the head of state, a regular counterrevolution occurred in the country. By the way, they usually say that, since Sadat succeeded so easily, it means that the revolutionary transformations in Nasser’s day were superficial, had been unable to put down roots and so on and so forth. Only part of the truth is contained in such assertions.

The fact is that none of the opponents of Nasser, Nasserism, and the Egyptian revolution took the time factor into account. As a matter of fact, let us consider a very simple question: how many years did history allow President Nasser to implement far-reaching anticapitalist measures that ultimately, he assumed, would lead to socialism? I note once again that the postulation of the question itself of socialism in Egypt or, if you prefer, “Arab socialism,” was for Nasser an extremely well-defined, albeit distinctive, one. I once asked Nasser his views on socialism. My question was formulated quite specifically: how much time is required for the construction of socialism in Egypt? Nasser answered thus: “The construction of socialism in Egypt is a process that cannot be separated from the analogous process in the whole Arab world.” Recall that at that time socialist slogans had been advanced in Syria and several other Arab states. Nasser thus linked the victory of socialism in Egypt to its triumph in all Arab countries. And, in his opinion, this victory would require, with all other circumstances being favorable, no less than 40 to 50 years. Is this a sober view of things? I think it is exceedingly sober. It should also be taken into account that Egypt was a backward country on the eve of the 1952 revolution, and the major portion of its population was illiterate, which left its impression on the rate and the results of revolutionary transformations. Nasser had to look over his shoulder at Islam, at religion in his home. But returning to the main issue, how much time was given to President Nasser to implement the economic and social reforms that could in reality have led to the victory of socialism? Five years in all. From 1962 to 1967. Is that so many? I think it is very few. The question somehow came up in conversation with the president himself:

wasn’t he dragging his feet, as the head of state and the chief reformer in the country, with the cardinal transformations in the villages? He answered this with another question:

“When was the October Revolution completed and victorious?”

“In 1917.”

“And when did the radical transformations begin in the Soviet Union?”

“In 1927-29.”

“This means that 10 years passed after the victory of the revolution. And that was in your country, which wasn’t as backward as Egypt on the eve of revolution. Egypt consequently needs considerably more time to get to truly far-reaching cardinal transformations in the villages. Material and political preconditions are needed for this, as are human preconditions, which do not now exist on the banks of the Nile.”

In our determinations regarding Egypt we forget that Nasser and his progressive circle had another circle that was vehemently conservative and vehemently nationalistic. History did not give him enough time to achieve decisive successes in implementing what had been thought up.

In June of 1967 Israel attacked Egypt, Jordan, and Syria, and, as a result of the defeat suffered by the Arabs in this war, the revolutionary process in Egypt was materially deformed, which naturally had an effect on everything that was in one way or another associated with the victory and then the retreat of the revolution in the largest of the Arab countries. Something else must also be taken into account. Nasser began in 1952 with people who shared his patriotic impulses and his nationalism. When the discussion touched on socialist slogans, however, some of his innermost circle backed off. They were afraid of socialist slogans. Vice President Abdal Latif Bagdadi, Minister Kemal ad-din Hussein, and some others, for example, openly expressed their disagreement with the president and “left the circle” overall, which also made Nasser’s activity more difficult.

There was, of course, another very important circumstance. It consisted of the fact that Egypt was a constituent element of the Arab world, where there were more than 20 countries, each of which was unlike the others. In Nasser’s time everything that happened in Cairo immediately resonated in all of the Arab capitals. And Nasser had to look over his shoulder at the backward Arab world. After all, he was counting on the fact that if things went badly for him in, say, finances, he would be able to appeal for assistance to the wealthy Arab states. In order for him to do this, he could not spoil his relations with such countries as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and so forth.

I have already mentioned that the war of 1967 deformed the revolutionary process in Egypt in most serious fashion. A mass of questions arises in this regard. How did it happen that Egypt was drawn into that war with Israel?

The fact is—and this is no secret to anyone today—that this Israeli war against the Arabs was conceived and prepared by the United States of America along with the Israeli military. I would like to emphasize that, for the Americans, the turn of President Nasser toward socialism was like a bolt out of the blue. They understood perfectly that to allow Nasser to create the material, political, and other preconditions for the real victory of socialist orientation in Egypt was to say goodbye to the hopes that someday this country would be obedient to Washington. There was another fear on the part of both the United States and Israel. The victory of socialist orientation in Egypt could have led to the closer collaboration of the largest Arab state with the Soviet Union. Speaking candidly, we do not have an adequate picture of what Nasser did for us in the Near East.

It was namely Nasser, the head of the Egyptian revolution, who in 1955 gave his de facto consent to the delivery of weapons from the socialist countries, to do what the Western states did not want to permit under any circumstances. The Soviet Union became an extremely important, if you wish, economic as well as political factor in the Near East. Our country has taken on a greater and greater attraction in the eyes of the Arabs, which, naturally, is perceived the same way in London, Washington, and Paris. The West cannot forgive Nasser for this.

The whole anti-Nasser, so to speak, policy of the three major powers of the capitalist world (the United States, England, and France) was aimed at striking a blow not only against Nasser, not only against the revolutionary regime in Egypt, but against the Soviet Union as well. In contemplating war against the Nasser regime, the United States and Israel wanted to resolve a whole set of military and political tasks. A scenario for an Israeli-Egyptian war had been developed in the recesses of the Central Intelligence Agency as early as 1966. The Israelis, joining the preparations for the aggression, had their own goals. In particular, they did not want to be limited just to war with Egypt. They had planned in advance to annex the West Bank of the Jordan River along with East Jerusalem and to seize the Golan Heights, that is, to go to war against Jordan and Syria.

Imagine the state of mind in Egypt when the Arabs suffered the crushing defeat in the June war of 1967. It was a terrible catastrophe. Some in Cairo, it is true, rubbed their hands with glee. I have in mind the "fat cats" who supposed that now Nasser would renounce both socialist orientation and the socialist slogans and that the revolution could now be put to rest without any particular difficulty.

Nasser spent the last three years of his life in what I would call very great anxiety. On the one hand, he had made the revolution even more radical. His famous March Declarations of 1968 testified to the fact that he had decided to rely on the popular masses of the country, on its workers, and especially on the working class. On the other hand, he was nonetheless forced to make concessions to the local moneybags, which were reflected, for example, in his slogans of "nationwide needs," "nationwide efforts," and the "nationwide contribution" to the fight against Israeli aggression and American imperialism. Such a "duality" was very difficult for Nasser, you will agree. The development trend of Egypt, however, remained a "tendency toward the left" rather than "toward the right."

I will not touch now on the concrete achievements of Egypt and its affairs. They are well known. I would only like to emphasize that President Nasser concentrated all of his activity within the country after the June 1967 war on creating the conditions for a further deepening of the social revolution. And he felt that one of the most important means of reaching this goal was fraternal, partnership, economic, and other relations and ties to the Soviet Union.

Of course, the last years of the life of Nasser were very, very interesting, especially from this point of view. He continued to devote enormous attention to everything that went on around the Arabs and in the rest of the world. Egypt's role in the nonaligned movement and in further efforts aimed at celebrating the liberation of Africa and combining the peoples of three continents—Asia, Africa, and Latin America—in the fight against imperialism were widely recognized as being enormous. And for this, of course, the country is indebted to the vested interest of Nasser that the Egypt revolution continue and its influence on the rest of the Arab world continue to be felt. Nasser supported the Libyan revolution in 1969.

The only question that perhaps remained in the shadows in those last years of Nasser's life was the question of Arab unity. He made ever greater efforts in striving for solutions that in one way or another facilitated the fact that this unity was preserved as much as possible.

I emphasized in the first part of the article that Nasser was a recognized Arab leader. In reality, over his whole life he was true to the principle of keeping a hand, so to speak, on the pulse of everything associated with the Arabs. And, if Arab unity existed in those years—sometimes stronger, sometimes weaker—the merit of the Egyptian president in this is enormous. I am not exaggerating his role. It seems to me that after the nationalization of the Suez Canal and several other outstanding victories of Egypt in the fight against imperialism, the reputation of Nasser was not in need of any commentary. The leaders of such Arab countries as Kuwait and several others who sought protection from "great Egypt" against the pretensions of their neighbors maintained

very close relations with the president of Egypt. The Arabs brought many troubles to Cairo, appealing to Nasser to solve this or that problem in one way or another for the sake of Arab well-being and in the interests of all Arabs. It seems that in this sense the role of Nasser was invaluable. To have such an authoritative politician and arbitrator was perhaps a great historical success for all Arabs and all Arab countries.

In my opinion, looking at the Egyptian revolution through the prism of all that was going on around Nasser and what happened with him personally is natural. Nasser gave everything of himself in his day-to-day activity, connected both with well-being within the country and with the victories of the Arabs in the anti-imperialist fight and the successes in eliminating the consequences of Israeli aggression. The Arab defeat in the 1967 war was painful for him. It could be said today that he was not guilty of what happened. This is first and foremost a matter for the hands of the "new Egyptian bourgeoisie," including the bourgeois in military uniforms. I mentioned one of them above. And, in general, almost the entire guilt for what happened falls on the military minister. Nasser, as commander in chief, could do nothing because the generals, including the people from the old formations among the military, followed Marshal Amer. This man, as you well know, came to a sad end. After the defeat in the 1967 war, he tried to cut himself off, so to speak, from the very fact of the catastrophe and to lump the blame for what transpired on President Nasser. In point of fact, everything was quite otherwise.

Nasser, being a serious politician and wise statesman, understood that the principal condition for the success of the Egyptian revolution after the June 1967 war was uniting the people in resisting aggression and accumulating power. And in the remaining years of his life he gave all of himself to this task. Thanks to his flexibility and knowledge of where to act decisively and where to take a step back when it was not a question of principle, he was what he was for the Arabs. The Egyptian revolution in any case continued even after the defeat in the June war.

President Nasser was a surprising man. One day an American correspondent put to him the question:

"Tell me, Mr. President, do you regret anything?"

"Yes, I do. I regret that I have had no personal life."

A sad observation, isn't it? Although Nasser had a wonderful family. A wife and five children. He maintained most active relations with his relatives wherever they lived.

I think that Nasser, leading the revolution, in essence gave his life to it, and, therefore, speaking of the "miracle of the 20th century on the banks of the Nile"—as it was

expressed by Zachary Mokhi ed-Din, former vice president of Egypt—and the July revolution that began in 1952, I cannot resist the temptation to tell someone about it, recounting President Nasser.

Today we, in recalling this glorious anniversary of the Egyptian revolution, think again and again about our great friend Nasser. Notwithstanding the government of Sadat, the fact that some of the "fat cats" in Egypt today are trying to continue Sadat's policies, it seems to me that the revolution has not died. It lives in the state sector of the Egyptian economy, and it lives in the thoughts of those who today make up the patriotic forces in the country. And I would like to conclude my article with the wish that we in the Soviet Union never forget all that was good that existed in Soviet-Egyptian relations under Nasser. In the person of President Nasser we had not only a great friend of our country, but also a man who did everything so that the relations of all the Arab countries, as well as Egypt, with the USSR flourished and became even more solid.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

Book on Military Role in National-Democratic Revolution

18070001e Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA
in Russian No 8, Aug 87 p 62

[Review by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences V. Novikov titled "A Revolution Should Be Able To Defend Itself" of the book "Natsionalno-demokraticheskaya revolyutsiya: zashchita zavoyevaniy" [National-Democratic Revolution: Defending the Conquests] by Z.Sh. Gafurov. Moscow, Oriental Literature Section of Nauka Publishing House, 1987, 304 pp]

[Text] Gafurov's monograph summarizes the experience accumulated by revolutionary-democratic parties in resolving military issues of national-democratic revolution. The author devotes principal attention to the creation and functioning of the military organization of revolution at various stages of its development. The work analyzes the military philosophical views of revolutionary democracy, its military programs, and the conditions for the creation of armed formations during the preparation for and conducting of the revolution.

The author prefaces his consideration of military problems with a special chapter devoted to the essence of national-democratic revolution and ways of developing it. The effort that was undertaken to set forth the fundamental tenets of Marxist-Leninist concepts for this revolution in systematic form can be deemed successful overall. The theoretical level of the chapter nonetheless is somewhat inferior to the subsequent ones that discuss exclusively military issues.

With certain caveats, it is possible to agree with the definition proposed by Gafurov of the essence of national-democratic revolution as being an anti-imperialist and antifeudal democratic revolution in the contemporary era in Asia and Africa. Revolutionary democracy implemented under its guidance with the hegemony of non-proletarian intermediate and middle-class segments opens the way for socialist orientation. This evaluation is of a certain interest compared to the definitions of national-democratic revolution that prevail in the literature. The author's contribution, however, is limited chiefly to making this concept more concrete and not to enriching it via researching little-studied aspects of this phenomenon or a deeper penetration into the sociopolitical nature of its known aspects.

One cannot fail to agree with the author's theory that the substance of the military programs of each individual revolutionary-democratic party and organization is defined first of all by the stage of the revolutionary process, its specific features in this or that country, the military experience of its popular masses, and the specific nature of the military-political and strategic military situations in the region. The author poses and successfully resolves on a broad theoretical plane broad issues of the military preparation of a national-democratic revolution, the organization of the defense of its gains after victory, the extension of general principles of revolutionary democracy to military construction, and the manifestation of all of the advantages of the new social and state structure in the national military organization.

Notwithstanding the extremely diverse and structurally complex research material, Gafurov has elaborated on several fundamental issues in the formation of the military organization of a revolution, substantiated the objective need for creating an army, and revealed its tasks during the period of preparing for and carrying out a revolution.

The book gives a comprehensive analysis of the sociopolitical nature of the armed forces of the socialist-oriented state and reveals its class essence. The main general laws of military construction in the developing countries are uncovered.

The book gives a quite reasoned critique of bourgeois concepts, neocolonial in essence, of the role of the army in former colonies and semicolonies.

The author was not, of course, able to do everything to an equal extent. But the very summarization of an impressive volume of empirical material and the effort to combine it with the postulation of theoretical and political problems, an analysis of the military program of revolution, methods of reinforcing the defense capability of progressive regimes, and the position of the revolutionary wing of the officer corps, and so forth merits a positive overall evaluation.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

Book on Islam, Development of Arab States Reviewed

18070001f Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA in Russian No 8, Aug 87 pp 63-64

[Review by Candidate of Historical Sciences A. Malashenko titled "Science, Society, Islam" of book "Islam i problemy sotsialno-kulturnogo razvitiya arabskikh stran (na materiale ARYe)" [Islam and Problems of Sociocultural Development in the Arab Countries (Based on the Example of Egypt)] by A. M. Mamedov. Baku, Elm Publishing House, 1986, 134 pp]

[Text] This book was prepared at the Baku Oriental Studies Institute of the AzSSR Academy of Sciences, which is working on Islamic studies topics. Putting forth an extremely broad range of problems in the title, Mamedov makes it concrete with the logic of their exposition and concentrates attention on the key questions. Among these he includes the effect of scientific and technical revolution on the ideology of Islam and the Arab cultural legacy, the modernization of Islam and the correlation of Islam and science, as well as an evaluation of the place and role of the Muslim religion in the contemporary world of Arab Marxists.

"Facing the peoples of the Arab world, including Egypt, is the difficult task of surmounting the contradictions and disparities between scientific thinking as the foundation of modern technical development and scientific thought based on a world view that was formed under the direct influence of centuries-old traditions" (p 16). The difficulty of resolving this most complex problem is caused, in the author's opinion, to a considerable extent by the consumerist attitude toward science in Arab society, in essence borrowing the achievements of scientific and technical progress from the outside. This "consumerist nature" of accommodating progress objectively slows internal scientific and theoretical inquiry and often leads to the mechanical combination of leading scientific experience with the achievements of traditional Arab-Islamic culture. One can speak of a distinctive sort of parallel existence of traditional culture and scientific progress that in turn impedes the secularization of society.

The author has an extremely dialectical approach to illuminating this issue, showing, on the one hand, the objectively inevitable onslaught of scientific progress, and, on the other, the limited nature of its influence on the traditional consciousness and way of thinking. In commenting on this situation, the scholar cites the statements of the leading Egyptian philosopher Z. Mahmud, who notes the substantive trend in contemporary Arab society of "accepting the science and technology of

the modern era without a world view to substantiate it." In the words of Z. Mahmud, "the contemporary Arab feels that such typical features of the 20th century as rationalism and scientific and technical progress are a part of his own cultural legacy, but the need for the secularization of society arising from science does not sit well with him" (p 25).

The detailed exposition of the intrinsic positions of ideologists and philosophers themselves imparts a particular convincingness to the book. The reader is acquainted with the views of such major theoreticians as M. Amin al-Alim, H. Hanafi, M. Bakhi, and others. At the same time, in sometimes diverting us with quotations, the author in a number of instances does not always express his own opinion clearly.

"The evolution of Islam," notes the conclusion, "and its reorientation in accordance with the economic and social changes in the life of its followers, obligates the researcher of a religion to take into account any manifestations of religious modernism and to consider the religion proceeding from its contemporary substance and forms in connection with those problems at whose resolution the modernized religion is aimed" (p 129). This opinion is a reflection of the structure of the work, in which principal attention is devoted to bourgeois-modernist as well as progressive concepts. And whereas the theories of the modernists are researched quite carefully, the description of the traditionalists that is given is fragmentary.

The successes of the book include the author's analysis of the views of Islamic tradition of the Arab Marxists, who "for the purpose of uniting all patriotic forces, including the faithful masses, in the fight for democracy and socialism, are striving to find such trends in the history of Islam that would make it possible to make the Islamic factor contiguous with the national-liberation factor" (p 59). From this point of view, Mamedov analyzes the positions of such leading Marxist theoreticians as H. Mrue, M. Dakhru, and others. At the same time, the positions of the Marxists and the views of those Egyptian progressivists that in striving "to subordinate religion to the tasks of socioeconomic and political development" are trying to adapt Marxism to the cultural level of the masses are systematically delimited.

The scholar devotes great attention to the Egyptian ideologists' postulation of the question of the correlation of science and religion and the place of the religious and cultural legacy in the life of Egyptian society. The book will undoubtedly be of interest to Oriental and Islamic scholars and specialists on the Arab countries.

I would like to express an observation rarely made by reviewers. Mamedov's work deserves a more respectful attitude on the part of publishing employees. The book has many proofreading errors, proper names are not always indicated correctly, and the printing and quality

of the stitching leave something to be desired. These shortcomings, "petty" at first glance, make the reading of an interesting and useful work by the Baku researcher more difficult.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

Handbook on Raw Material Resources of Asia, Australia
18070001g Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA
in Russian No 8, Aug 87 p 64

[Review by Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Isayev titled "Riches Hidden in the Depths of the Earth" of book "Syryevyye resursy Azii, Avstralii i Okeanii" [Raw-Material Resources of Asia, Australia and Oceania] by S. B. Bagdasarov and A. N. Chavushyan. Moscow, Oriental Literature Section of Nauka Publishing House, 1987, 154 pp]

[Text] This handbook of the raw-material resources of Asia, Australia, and Oceania is an attempt to systematize enormous and often extremely contradictory statistical material relating to the reserves, production, export, consumption, and prospects for the supply of these or those types of raw materials for a vast region that includes over 30 countries.

The statistical material contained in the handbook proves convincingly that there are no grounds today to forecast the absolute depletion of mineral reserves in the foreseeable future. At the same time, the relatively limited nature of the natural resources of the region is apparent, caused by a number of factors, including the exhaustion of the most accessible and rich deposits in traditional production regions, the inconsistency of the disposition of mineral accumulations in the region, and so forth. As a result, the problem of being supplied with certain types of nonrenewable raw materials could worsen as soon as the end of the century in a number of states.

The interconnection of acute disproportions in the production and consumption of the majority of types of raw materials can be seen from the composite tables. The geography of exports of raw-material commodities, in particular, reflects a clearly expressed trend toward supplying the needs of the developed capitalist countries first and foremost as the chief consumers of the raw materials produced in the region.

The year 1970 is quite correctly taken as the measuring period in the handbook, since it was namely at the beginning of the 1970s that the significance of a whole set of problems increased sharply—raw materials, power, food, ecology, and so forth. These issues, differing in scale and form in their effect on the economies and

policies of individual countries, have a common basis: they are all associated with the use of natural resources and, first and foremost, raw materials.

I note that the publication would gain from the inclusion of data for 1973-74, when the fuel and raw-materials problem first arose before the world capitalist economy.

COPYRIGHT: "Aziya i Afrika segodnya", 1987. Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatelstva "Nauka"

12821

**Review of the Journal AZIYA I AFRIKA
SEGODNYA No 8, 1987**

18070001a Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English
21 Aug 87 pp 1-4

[Text] In the rubric "27th CPSU Congress and Liberated Countries" the journal publishes an article by Y. Ivanov. The socialist revolution in Russia in October 1917 ushered in a new era in mankind's development, points out the author. Its world historic importance primarily lies in the fact that it confirmed the universal nature of the basic laws of the class struggle, established by the founders of Marxism-Leninism. In the East these laws were first manifested by the national and social liberation movement in Central Asia with its specific conditions. The revolutionary process born in Russia spread to Central Asia, then one of the most backward outskirts of the czarist empire.

At present the global transfer from capitalism to socialism is gathering momentum. The world socialist community is successfully developing and imperialism's colonial system has been almost completely eliminated. The toiling elements not belonging to the working class can, without changing their social essence, much more effectively participate in the struggle against imperialism which is growing into a drive against capitalist rule. The advent to power of these elements has given birth to socialist-oriented countries carrying out anticapitalist and antifeudal reforms.

The appearance of these toiling elements on the political scene as an independent political force testifies to the continued revolutionary process in the East. These elements effectively combat capitalism and feudalism now that industrial workers in a number of Eastern countries are yet unable to guide the antiimperialist struggle while the local ruling capitalist quarters can no longer head the national liberation revolution. Such actions create important socio-economic and political conditions for transferring to socialism. The national liberation struggle is actually growing into a drive against exploitation even if the revolutions are not led by the working class. As a result, broader prospects open up for long-term cooperation between the communists and the revolutionary democrats.

V. Shurygin has contributed an article, "Ever Young India," on the 40th anniversary of India's independence. The road of India to economic progress, the author of the article writes, is inseparably linked with Soviet-Indian economic cooperation. Projects of this cooperation between the two nations can be seen all over the territory of the great Asian country, from the foothills of the Himalayas to the southern extremity of the Indian subcontinent. In all, about 60 industrial and other projects have been built in India with Soviet economic and technical assistance, and another 30 are under construction or being designed. Economic relations between the two countries are now based on the Long-Term Programme for Economic, Trade, Scientific and Technical Cooperation, in which special attention is given to the development of power, and also such sectors of the Indian economy as metal making, oil and coal production. Manufacturing cooperation between Soviet organisations and the machine-building plants built in India with Soviet assistance has become an important area of collaboration. Those plants supply equipment for building projects with Soviet assistance in third countries.

In one of the UNCTAD resolutions, relations between the Soviet Union and India are described as a model to be emulated by other states. One cannot help agreeing with this. By the force of their example, our countries help affirm peaceful coexistence, pave the way to international security, work to prevent nuclear catastrophe, and demonstrate the realistic possibility of countering imperial claims and ambitions and the arbitrariness of "neoglobalist" designs. The high degree of cooperation between the USSR and India means that the potential of the peace forces is growing and that the world's future is becoming more secure.

"British Economic Positions in Africa: the Heyday is Well Past" is the heading of an article by S. Belenchuk. Due to perpetual crisis in the key branches of the British economy, the country was gradually losing its positions in the emerging states, including the African ones. The dwindling competitiveness of British goods, financial upheavals that made it increasingly difficult for the state to support private banks and companies, the falling pound and the disintegration of the sterling zone that had traditionally ensured the inflow of capital from former colonies—these and other factors seriously undermined the ability of British corporations to compete in Africa with their rivals from the United States, Japan and the leading members of the European Economic Community (France, West Germany and Italy). All of them are ousting Britain even from the markets traditionally controlled by it.

Britain's chief trade partner on the continent is still South Africa that accounts for nearly 30 per cent of the value of British export and import deals with Africa. The racist state's priority status in trade with Britain is based on traditional close ties between the companies of both countries. Many of these merged decades ago to grow

into trans-national corporations. And yet in South Africa's foreign trade, Great Britain is increasingly falling behind the United States, West Germany and Japan who are pushing hard to promote their economic ties with Pretoria.

A desire to ensure their corporations further access to the African raw materials, fuel and manpower markets, S. Belenchuk writes, prompts the Western governments to employ a variety of means and methods, including government-backed expansion of private capital. Under such conditions, Britain's chances, in spite of its vast experience in colonial and neo-colonial exploitation of scores of overseas nations, appear slimmer and slimmer in the face of growing competition with its partners from the EEC, the United States and Japan. It is very much doubtful that Britain will ever manage to rehabilitate its once strong positions in Africa.

The magazine also carries the following pieces: "Lenin and the Korean Revolutionaries" by B. Pak; the concluding part of I. Belyaev's article "Egypt. The Revolution and the President"; "Mahatmah Gandhi as Described by Soviet Researchers" by O. Martyshin; travel notes by V. Baikov under the title "Afghanistan. Reconciliation in Darabad," etc.

**Table of Contents AZIYA I AFRIKA
SEGODNYA, No 8, 1987**
*18070001h Moscow AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA
in Russian No 8, Aug 87 p 1*

The 27th CPSU Congress and the Liberated Countries

Yu. Ivanov. Tested in Practice (p 2)

I. Belyaev. Egypt. A Revolution and a President. Conclusion (p 6)

S. Belenchuk. The Economic Positions of Great Britain in Africa: The Better Times Have Passed (p 10)

Toward the 70th Anniversary of Great October

B. Pak. Lenin and the Korean Revolutionaries (p 13)

Antonio Paris. The Philippines. October in Our Hearts (p 16)

India: 40 Years of Independence

V. Shurygin. Centuries and Youth (p 17)

O. Martyshin. Mahatmah Gandhi in the Evaluations of Soviet Researchers (p 22)

Problems and Opinions

VI. Li, G. Mirskiy. Socialist Orientation in Light of the New Political Thinking. Academic Dialogue (p 26)

Our Interviews

Nageshvar P. Singh. Nepal. Peace—Our Hope (p 33)

Events... Facts... Figures... (p 34)

Travels, Meetings, Impressions

V. Baykov. Afghanistan. Reconciliation in Darabad (p 38)

Reader Discussion

They Write to Us (p 43)

Scientific Life

V. Rozhkov. A Forum for Mongolian Scholars (p 44)

Culture, Literature, Art

V. Ozhogin. Lev Tolstoy and Japanese Culture (p 46)

N. Krivtsov. In the Magic World of Andersen (p 49)

Sujuko Natsuki (Japan). Fish in Troubled Waters. Story (p 52)

The Pages of History

P. Perminov. From the History of Russian-Arab Ties. Second Episode (p 56)

Traditions, Customs, Mores

G. Shishkina. Japan. Ikebana: Nature, Man, Art (p 58)

A. Sitnikova. The Sunday Dinner of the African (p 61)

The World of Books

V. Novikov. A Revolution Should Be Able To Defend Itself (p 62)

A. Sergunin. The Near-East Problem Should Be Resolved (p 62)

A. Malashenko. Science, Society, Islam (p 63)

V. Isayev. Riches Hidden in the Depths of the Earth (p 64)

12821

**Moscow Blasts U.S. 'Psychological Warfare,'
Radio Marti**

18070016 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
4 Oct 87 p 3

[Article by V. Lapin: "Aggression in the Ether"]

[Text] "We should compel the world to listen to us in a great campaign of truth. This task is no different from other elements of our foreign policy and is indivisible from it," one of the initiators of the Cold war "against the socialist states, U.S. President H. Truman, proclaimed back in 1950. And the centers of U.S. foreign propaganda, in close connection with the American special services have not spared any efforts in implementing this "order" of the president. They have released into the ether a truly great campaign of lies and insinuations directed against the countries of socialism. It is not without reason that their actions have received the precise definition of "psychological warfare."

It is doubtful that the current master of the White House, an admirer of President Truman, remembered the words of his predecessor when he signed, 4 years ago, a bill on the creation of the next "voice of truth"—propaganda-subversive anti-Cuban radio "Radio Marti." This was not necessary for him. And that very event which took place on that October day in 1983 completely fits in the concept of "cold war."

Subversion in the ether against the Island of Freedom began immediately after the overthrow of the pro-American dictator Batista. In Florida one subversive radio station after another appeared. Formally their proprietors were considered private citizens from among the supporters of the former dictator. In fact the U.S. CIA was the boss. But abuse and threats and instruction for American hirelings, which these "sources of truth" spewed forth for 17-18 hours a day, were not able to help their popularity among the Cubans building a new life.

The White House was concerned for a long time about the "vacuum" in the Cuban ether. For years in Washington they nurtured the idea of doing much good for the Cubans with some sort of "mouthpiece" like the scandalously well known radio stations "liberty" and "Free Europe." And furthermore, they would be "independent" organs (under the complete control of the CIA), which did not depend on the federal budget, but derived their funds from private "philanthropic" organizations. (Under such conditions it is easier to defend oneself when caught in a lie). But it didn't work out. The senators rejected the project. Some of them feared answering measures from Cuba from which the interests of private radio stations would suffer; others, like Senator C. Dodd, directly called this a "criminal foreign policy venture."

When the White House embarked on its "crusade" against communism and began to implement "Project Democracy" (originally "Project for Democracy and

Public Diplomacy") the project rejected by the senators went along. The reasoning was simple: The new radio station was supposed to present the same counterrevolutionary propaganda, but in a "proper" wrapping. Its status of a U.S. Government institution was supposed to give "respectability" to this provocative offspring. Thus, it became a branch of "Voice of America," the radio station of the United States Information Agency (USIA).

The appearance on the air of the first broadcast of the new radio center was carried out in the cheap tradition of spy novels: quietly, under the cover of night, suddenly. Even the U.S. public and press did not know that at 5:20 AM on 20 May 1985, from the territory of Florida, transmissions with a power of 50 thousand watts carried out a volley of slander against Cuba. This was the opening of a new front in the psychological war.

Advertising in Congress the idea of creating the station, experts stated that its functions would include "dissemination of objective and balanced information about the United States, conditions in Cuba and international events." The UPI agency expressed it more definitively, not hiding the fact that the main task was to "propagandize the 'views' of the Reagan administration on the policy of the Cuban Government." Then the American press noted that the broadcasts of the new "radio voice" were called upon to further "a gradual evolution of the Cuban system." For 2-plus years of the existence of the radio station the stream of "information about the United States" was nothing but an unrestrained advertisement of consumerism and the American way of life. Regarding information "on the situation in Cuba," one of the listeners unequivocally characterized it this way: "It seemed to me that all of these people (creators of the broadcasts—authors note) had the ideology and the world view of the 50's and that these programs were written 25 years ago." The American newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST, carried this statement.

This, evidently, was to be expected. The organizers of the provocation are in a difficult position. It is possible to tell the truth but the cock-and-bull stories are stupid. Gossip and disinformation remain, and these are almost around-the-clock. The creation of "respectability" for the radio voice was unsuccessful, nor did it give rise to trust. And the scandalous disclosures have started.

Several days ago the Cuban GRANMA reported a press-conference given in the United States by former director of a department of the radio station (H. Inkian). She left her position as a sign of protest against the demands of the chiefs to compel the reporters to collect information of an intelligence character among people having left Cuba. The journalist pointed out that gathering such information was intended not for radio broadcasts, but for "internal use by the Washington government." She emphasized that the so-called "department of research and policy" of the radio station numbers more employees than the news department.

Her testimony is only an additional touch, without which the role of the spy radio center, blasphemously bearing the name of the Cuban patriot Jose Marti, is clear. Recently Congressman H. Gonzalez compared the startup of "Radio Marti" with the "electronic equivalent of the armed invasion of the United States in the Bay of

Pigs." It is well known how that ended. The same end has been prepared for all the ideological aggression of the White House against socialism.

12232

Interview With President of FRG Chambers of Industry, Commerce

18250003 Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I
MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian
No 4, Apr 87 pp 118-120

[“Conversation with Otto Wolf von Amerongen, president of the FRG Association of Chambers of Industry and Commerce”, conducted by Yu. Yudanov, MEMO staff correspondent]

[Text] Otto Wolf von Amerongen is the chairman of the Supervisory Council of one of the largest West German metal-working companies “Otto Wolf.” Since 1969 he has been president of the FRG Association of Chambers of Industry and Commerce. It represents the interests of various unions of all branches of the economy and is the authoritative spokesman for the main ideas of the country's business circles.

For several decades now O. Wolf von Amerongen has supported the development of mutually advantageous economic relations between East and West. His father, who was recognized as a far-sighted entrepreneur, was actively involved in economic cooperation with the Soviet Union as early as the 1920's. At the beginning of the 1960's O. Wolf von Amerongen (who occupied the post of chairman of the FRG Eastern & Economics Committee in 1956) prepared the first trade agreements with CEMA countries on behalf of the federal government. He decisively opposed the attempt to torpedo the large-scale gas pipeline agreement between the Soviet Union and a number of West European states and has been a continuous opponent of any sanctions and trade embargo against socialist countries and a proponent of strengthening stable and long-term economic ties between East and West. Otto Wolf von Amerongen has been in our country repeatedly.

Yu. Yudanov, a correspondent of this journal, asked this prominent representative of FRG business circles to respond to a number of questions.

[Question] What in your opinion are the objective prerequisites at the basis of bilateral economic relations between our countries? What do you see as difficulties preventing more active economic cooperation?

[Answer] In 1986 the objective prerequisites for mutual economic cooperation of our countries appeared most clear-cut. The considerable growth rates of Soviet-West German foreign trade turnover characteristic of the 1970's and beginning of the 1980's declined in 1985. A substantial drop in basic indicators even took place in the year 1986 just past: West German export fell by 10 percent and imports by almost 30 percent. For the first time in the 1980's a deficit in the trade balance was not registered on the West German side.

Well-known causes were at the basis of the development of this process: the sharp drop in oil prices on the world market (almost half since November 1985). Inasmuch as oil and natural gas prices are interrelated, this had an effect on practically all types of Soviet exports of energy raw materials. Moreover, there was a decline of the American dollar vis a vis the West German mark (almost 40 percent in comparison with the spring of 1985). Natural gas, oil, and petroleum products comprise about 80 percent of Soviet exports to the FRG. During the period of high oil prices the Soviet Union had an opportunity to take advantage of the structure of its exports. Now reverse factors have begun to operate.

But there are no bases for a pessimistic evaluation of prospects. First of all the Soviet Union, which is generally recognized as being highly influential internationally, can in part compensate for the reducing volume of currency receipts via credits. Such an opportunity was also employed in 1986. FRG banks played a positive role here. Moreover, in 1986 the Soviet Union harvested a record grain crop for the 10-year period; this will substantially reduce the import demand and ease currency accounts. Finally, it has been a year and a half since the Soviet economy set out on a course of decisive modernization.

In my estimation, economic cooperation between our countries rests on mutual incentive for favorable prospects for growth. On the one hand, the export potential of Soviet industry becomes stronger as the export trade structure improves. On the other hand, it is the economy of the FRG, especially small and mid-size enterprises, which can offer high quality equipment (and also train production personnel and provide technical services) necessary for more rational utilization of resources and increase labor productivity and provide intensive economic growth. This applies to the agro-industrial complex and equipment for environmental protection, as well as numerous areas of machine-building and chemistry.

[Question] What, in your view, are the possibilities for improving the structure of mutual foreign trade exchange?

[Answer] Improvement in the export structure means primarily a diversification in commodity groups intended for foreign markets. This requires that Soviet industry persistently increase the output of high quality ready-made goods, which are competitive on world markets. However, not just strictly technical characteristics should be relevant to product quality, but reliability, possibility for flexible use, etc., as well. This is important from the viewpoint of effectiveness. Serious efforts are required to achieve such structural changes, and, as your Council of Ministers chairman has pointed out, “a radical reform of the entire economic mechanism.”

This is not a new problem. I remember my conversation with a former Council of Ministers chairman more than 15 years ago. But now, it seems to me, the first prerequisites for success have already been designated: basic directions of efforts and the main methods of reaching decisions have been realistically defined. The foreign trade reform being implemented in 1987 obviously will create a greater incentive for enterprises to develop export.

Specific problems in increasing export activity are best solved by economic cooperation with the countries at whose markets it is directed. Industrial cooperation precisely between Soviet and West German enterprises are a hopeful means for a way out at the international level. Its various forms have already proved their reliability, inasmuch as they meet the interests of both countries.

[Question] What is your opinion of the creation of joint ventures and associations with the participation of Soviet and West German firms on USSR territory?

[Answer] First of all, we welcome the Soviet initiative. Many times during conversations in Moscow I have stressed the importance of establishing direct contacts, especially between technical specialists in enterprises. West German experience in setting up joint ventures in many countries of the world, including Hungary and the Chinese Peoples Republic, has prompted us to begin with small projects. "Joint ventures" [where joint ventures appears in quotation marks the text has transliterated the English words "dzhoynt venchurs"] (as joint ventures are called) represent a high and at this time very complex form of cooperation. Both sides should realize that a period of several years is necessary between negotiations to found an association, its first practical steps, and successful production of a product.

The problem of marketing the product of joint ventures is one of the central questions. "Joint ventures" should be oriented mainly toward constant deliveries to the domestic market. This will make it possible to partially give up imports of certain types of items from Western countries; this will promote the saving of currency reserves. Moreover, deliveries of such products to other branches of Soviet industry can become useful in implementing the necessary diversification of their export structure.

Of course, there are many particular, but quite important problems which must be solved. Every adept foreign investor of capital pays attention to guaranteeing adherence to the validity and legal protection of foreign investments, but then this is of mutual interest. Therefore, I welcome the readiness of the Federal Government to conclude an agreement with the Soviet Union on protection of foreign investments. Questions of establishing the currency balance, conversion of profits, and especially the exchange of earnings in rubles to another

currency remain open. Working conditions and possibilities for travel to the Soviet Union should be appropriate to the requirements of enterprises, and deliveries of subcontractor enterprises for "joint ventures" must be reliable in regards to both product quality and current price.

Equal administration of the enterprise, protection of the interests of the foreign company, personnel selection, and wages appropriate to productivity indicators—all these problems are subject to resolution. The list of them is quite extensive, and careful study of them is of mutual interest. Joint ventures provide a chance for success, but at the same time are a challenge to both sides.

[Question] What is your attitude toward the USSR Council of Ministers decree of 13 January 1987 on "The Procedure for Establishing on USSR Territory and Operating Joint Ventures, International Associations, and Organizations of the USSR and Other CEMA Member Countries"?

[Answer] The published decree on regulating the activity of Soviet "joint ventures" has been attentively studied by the FRG Eastern Economics Committee. I welcome this decision. It provides an opportunity within the framework of the economic modernization which is underway to establish on USSR territory joint ventures with foreign participation. FRG firms have considerable experience in organizing such "joint ventures" in many countries of the world. However, in my opinion, the practice of their functioning which has already been established can be transferred to cooperation with Soviet enterprises only within definite limits.

Moreover, experience acquired in other states testifies to the fact that significant practical success in the work of joint ventures can be guaranteed only when there is great flexibility in legal regulation and overall favorable conditions are created for the functioning of the enterprise in the country. In my opinion the possibilities for the successful operation of such "joint ventures" will continuously increase as the basic goals of Soviet economic reform are realized.

We should consider a most important step in this direction the USSR decree on measures for improving the conduct of foreign economic relations which provides for the establishing of foreign trade firms in associations and enterprises which received rights to conduct export-import operations. Such firms, whose operation will be based on principles of cost accounting, currency self-paying and self-financing, receive the possibility of accumulating practical experience in the framework of the new system of economic management, which will be of great benefit to joint ventures as well. In the very near future such joint ventures can be established in the area of services and engineering. Coproduction can begin in the second stage.

I think that under conditions where specific limits of the growth of traditional forms of economic relations between the Soviet Union and the FRG have been designated, the recently adopted measures for stimulating intensification of economic cooperation opens up new prospects.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1987.

/09599

Turkish Minister Foresees Joint Industrial, Trade Companies

18250009 [Editorial Report] Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 42, 16, 22 October 1987 carries on pages 12 and 13 a review of the Turkish political and economic situation on the eve of the 1 November elections. The author, PRAVDA correspondent in Ankara Andrey Anatolyevich Stepanov, enumerates the economic problems of the country as a whole and of individual Turks (budget deficit, high prices, rising unemployment and inflation), but notes that "on the whole Soviet, Turkish trade and economic relations are developing favorably."

On the future of such relations Stepanov quotes as follows from an interview with Turkish Minister of Finance and Customs A. Alptemocin: "Our neighboring countries possess great economic potential and no mean resources. Each has accumulated experience in some particular branches of production, therefore the economic structures of the two countries can supplement each other. The Soviet Union possesses a powerful industrial base—produces machines and equipment to create an infrastructure—power engineering, a transportation system, and heavy machine building. Turkey has great experience in contract construction work. If we can form joint consortiums, then, I hope, we can win without difficulty markets in the construction of such projects in the Near and Middle East, as well as Africa. In the future

such mutual action can lead to the formation of joint industrial and trade companies. We must develop border trade, using the beautiful climate conditions of this zone and build joint projects in the agro, industrial complex. Unfortunately, at the moment our trade and economic relations are at a level which is significantly below their potential. We want to sell more to you and naturally buy more from you; we plan to continue cooperation in the field of industry too. With the arrival of Soviet gas in Turkey the agenda will include such questions as the construction by Turkish companies of hotels, hospitals, and cultural and sports complexes in the Soviet Union as payment for its deliveries and the export of Turkish goods to your country."

Additional comments on the future of Turkish, Soviet economic relations were quoted from Stepanov's interview with an official of ENKA, a Turkish holding company. Board chairman (Sharik Tara) had this to say about new opportunities for Soviet trade with the private sector: "The holding company is interested in establishing close cooperation with the Soviet Union, therefore we are opening our own office in Moscow. We would like to borrow the rich Soviet experience in housing construction. From our side we could provide service in such a field, let us say, as expanding the network of large hotel complexes in your country. We already have experience in business partnership in forming the (Iskendera) Combine. ENKA now belongs to an international consortium for constructing on Turkish territory pipelines through which Soviet gas will flow."

Stepanov concludes his article as follows: "Trade and economic cooperation draw peoples together and in relations create between them a durable fabric of mutual understanding and trust, and this is especially important at this time for the two neighboring states the USSR and Turkey."

/12913

END

10

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.