

BI-WEEKLY

# PROPAGANDA GUIDANCE

NUMBER: 110      DATE: 25 February 1963

Central Propaganda Directive  
Briefly Noted

*Record  
Copy*

- 626.      Soviet Disarmament Proposals and  
            Their Aim
- 627 NE,b    Iran: Referendum on Redistribution  
            of Land
- 628 AF,FE    Third Afro-Asian Solidarity  
            NE,WH    Organization Conference
- 629 FE,NE    The Malaysia Federation
- 630 EE,      Further Dissension in Communist  
            WEe      Ranks--The French Comrades do a  
                    Switch
- 631 EE,WE    United States and a Unified Europe

List of  
25X1C Attachments (unclassified)

**25X1C10b**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

**Next 4 Page(s) In Document Exempt**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

- 17 April Birthday of N.S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee (born 1894)
- 17 April National Organizations of Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO) to observe 17 April (Bay of Pigs) anniversary as Day of Solidarity of AAPSO with the peoples of Latin America
- 20 April 1889: Hitler's Birthday (possible anti-German moves by Communists)
- 24 April World Youth Day Against Colonialism and for Peaceful Coexistence (Communist)
- April Twentieth Anniversary of German's discovery of the Communist KATYN massacre
- April Afro-Asian Journalists' Conference, currently scheduled for Indonesia in April 1963 (see DIR 12399 dated 22 January 1963 to Stations of participating nations at preparatory conference held in Djakarta in February)
- 1 May World Holiday of Labor (celebrated by Communists, Socialists, certain other Labor groups)
- 8 May VE Day, 1945
- 12 May End of 328 days of successful US airlift over the Berlin land blockade, 1949

25 February 1963

- 14 May Warsaw Pact, 20-year mutual defense treaty signed at Warsaw by USSR, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and East Germany, in 1955.
- 30 May Communist coup d'etat in Hungary, 1947.

626. Soviet Disarmament Proposals, and Their Aim

25X1C10b

BACKGROUND: In 1913 Lenin wrote:

"Applied to wars, the main thesis of dialectics... is that 'war is simply the continuation of politics by other (i.e. violent) means.' This formula belongs to Clausewitz, one of the greatest writers on the history of war, whose ideas were fertilised by Hegel. And this was always the standpoint of Marx and Engels, who regarded every war as the continuation of the politics of the given interested powers--and the various classes within these countries--at a given time." (SELECTED WORKS Vol. V, pp. 179-180. Emphasis in original.)

The corollary to the dictum of Clausewitz and Lenin is that peaceful policies are a continuation of the struggle by other means; if war is politics, politics is war. As Lenin said in 1916:

"Every 'peace program' is a deception of the people and a piece of hypocrisy unless its principal object is to explain to the masses the need for a revolution, and to support, aid and develop the revolutionary struggle of the masses that is starting everywhere...." (Ibid., p. 237.)

Khrushchev agrees:

" The policy of peaceful coexistence is, then, as far as its social content is concerned, a form of intense economic, political and ideological struggle between the proletariat, and the aggressive forces of imperialism in the world arena." (Speech, 6 January 1961.)

Thus the object of Soviet policy is not agreement or compromise, but defeat of the opponent by any means, political or military.

In the field of disarmament, the USSR is able to make tactical moves of the "heads I win, tails you lose" variety. These moves tend to compel the US either (1) to appear opposed to disarmament or (2) to accept a lower degree of security. But although the Soviets would no doubt prefer a one-sided weakening of US defenses to any propaganda gain, the US places security first, and refuses to accept proposals which are inconsistent with security, even though such a refusal may assist Soviet propaganda. Actually, US disarmament policy serves the

interest of non-Communist peoples and Soviet policy does not. Unfortunately, we are probably unable to convince a good many individuals that the security guaranteed by US strength is their own primary interest, and that no disarmament arrangements will guarantee peace unless they provide a substitute for US strength. But we may be able to convince some of these people that the Soviets have shown no interest in reaching an equitable agreement.

Unless one side has overwhelming power, an agreement between opposing interests can only be based on compromise, with each side giving in to a certain degree. In 1958, the US and the USSR agreed to work out a ban on nuclear weapon tests under effective policing arrangements. Yet the Soviets refused to accept measures which would make policing effective; they insisted on a disproportionate influence in the control apparatus, and they refused to accept more than three inspections not subject to veto. In the spring of 1961, the US and UK offered concessions on the control apparatus organization, and on the number of inspections and control stations (a flexible 12 to 20 inspections, depending on the number of seismic disturbances, instead of a fixed number of 20; 19 control posts instead of 21). The Soviets responded by reneging on an earlier agreement in principle that there be a single administrator to supervise the control system, demanding instead the application of the troika principle to the administration of the system. In effect this would block proper operation of the system since all three representatives would have to agree on each and every matter. In June 1961 the Soviets proposed merging test ban negotiations with general disarmament negotiations (in effect, this would mean postponing them indefinitely), and on 1 September 1961 they resumed testing, ending the truce begun in 1958. In November 1961, the Soviets officially repudiated the idea of three on-site inspections and thereafter, until December 1962, they insisted that existing national detection systems could detect any tests, and that any inspection could only aid American espionage.

Similarly, in the field of general disarmament the Soviets advanced a proposal in the spring of 1960 which would in practice have eliminated Western nuclear forces within 18 months, without any effective check on Soviet disarmament. When the US was about to present a counter-proposal to the 10 Nation Disarmament Committee on 27 June 1960, the Polish chairman declared that the work of the Committee was closed, and refused to recognize Western speakers. All of the Soviet Bloc delegates then walked out. On 23 September 1960, the Soviets presented a new plan, which provided for the early reduction of conventional as well as nuclear forces, but although lip service was given to the inspection concept, the Soviet plan did not advance toward effective inspection, an essential element in any disarmament program. In September 1961, Valerian Zorin and John J. McCloy worked out a joint statement of agreed principles which now serves as the guideline for

present disarmament negotiations. But even though the Soviets have accepted the concept of effective inspection, they still seem reluctant to deal with its practical execution. This has become clear in deliberation within the so-called 18 Nation Disarmament Conference (actually 17-nation, since France refused to take its seat) which began in March 1962.

In the crucial issue of inspection, which has been a big stumbling-block all along, the burden of justifying their position lies with the Soviets, especially since they demonstrated their willingness to conceal arms in Cuba. (See

Yet the history of test ban and general disarmament negotiations shows on the Soviet side no reasoned explanations, no willingness to discuss scientific data, no readiness to compromise, a long succession of meaningless pseudo-concessions, retractions of offers previously made, and political acts designed to hinder negotiation, including the sudden rupture of negotiation itself. To the Soviets, "disarmament" seems to mean either propaganda or the surrender of the opponent, not any negotiated settlement.

We have lately witnessed two further Soviet moves of the same nature. On 19 December, Khrushchev sent President Kennedy a letter offering once again three on-site inspections in the USSR. President Kennedy's reply (28 December) stated his own hope that the US reduction from 12-20 to 8-10 would be matched by an equivalent Soviet rise from their 1960 figure of three. This Kennedy letter and a second Khrushchev letter of 7 January 1963 arranged for direct negotiations, which began on 14 January and were carried on in both New York and Washington. The exchange of letters was published on 20 January.

The Soviets sent "negotiators" who refused to negotiate, rigidly clinging to their original number--a number which President Kennedy had noted in his letter was not enough. The Soviets also refused to discuss crucial problems of the inspection machinery, such as the role of the international scientific commission, the making of the decision to inspect, the composition and operation of the inspection teams, and the area to be inspected. To improve the negotiating atmosphere, President Kennedy announced on 26 January that underground tests in Nevada would be halted for the duration of the New York-Washington talks. But to no avail. The Soviets stated later that on 29 January, the chief US negotiator, William C. Foster, asked the Soviet diplomats why they had come all the way across the ocean if they had nothing further to offer. They chose to consider this alleged statement an affront, but the fact remains that the Soviets adopted a "take it or leave it" position, and when the US refused to accept their terms unamended, the Soviets broke off negotiations on 31 January. In a 15 February speech in Geneva, Kuznetsov firmly maintained the Soviet position on inspection, saying: "Now it is the turn

25X1C10b

25 February 1963

of the United States." Soviet propaganda claims that the Soviet Union has met the US halfway--as though three was halfway between three and 20, the respective figures in 1960. And despite the clarification in Kennedy's letter, they continue to maintain that the US is withdrawing from previous assurances that 2-3 inspections would be enough.

The other recent move in Soviet disarmament diplomacy was the proposal, made at the reopening of the 18-Nation meetings in Geneva on 12 February, to liquidate all foreign bases for nuclear rocket submarines, aircraft carriers, strategic rockets, and strategic bombers. This suggestion has long been a staple item in Soviet Bloc disarmament plans, and while the US believes that within a general and complete disarmament program all bases--foreign and domestic--should eventually be disbanded, it is firmly opposed to this Soviet proposal which would swiftly upset the present military balance between East and West in favor of the USSR. The proposal adds new fuel to the growing Soviet campaign against Polaris submarine bases. Actually, these bases are not so much a military necessity for the US (the subs could function quite well from US territory), as a political guarantee of the continuing US commitment to NATO. And it is such NATO ties as these that this Soviet propaganda really aims at. No doubt the moment seemed propitious for the Soviet proposal, since there have lately been frictions between NATO countries. But proposals like this, so far as they have any influence on governments, will only help to mend NATO differences. The blatant propaganda nature of this unnegotiable draft declaration indicates once again that the Soviets are not seeking any agreement, but are only continuing the struggle against the US by other (i.e., non-military) means.

25X1C10b





**25X1C10b**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

25X1C10b 627 NE, b. IRAN: Referendum on Redistribution of Land

**BACKGROUND:** The enormously favorable vote obtained in the referendum in Iran held by Shah Reza Pahlavi on 26 January may well be expected to lessen, if not to nullify, the impact of Iranian opposition to land redistribution, for example, in the Iranian Majlis, among mullahs and landholders generally and in the opposition National Front. Although the regime had succeeded in intimidating the opposition to some extent, the affirmative vote was startling: 99.9 per cent. For the first time in the history of Iran, women were allowed to vote -- a matter of considerable significance despite religious objections; these votes, however, were not counted. Approval was sought (and overwhelmingly obtained) on six proposals:

1. Redistribution of large landholdings to peasants.
2. Sharing by workers of 20 per cent of the profits of industry.
3. Nationalization of forests.
4. Distribution of shares in government-owned industry to reimburse dispossessed landlords.
5. Broadening of the franchise.
6. Use of military draftees to assist in teaching reading and writing in backward areas.

Actions of the regime to ensure the affirmative vote took several forms: certain selected opponents of the reform were jailed before the balloting began; secrecy of the ballot was made difficult, to say the least, by having the negative ballots colored blue; protest demonstrations were overwhelmed by government-staged pro-reform crowds cruising about in busloads; there were intensive displays of military force during the balloting to keep order and ensure calm. The opposition, plainly, was temporarily demoralized, yet this should not be expected to continue indefinitely. The Shah, who started land redistribution some years ago, may be regarded, nevertheless, as having won a great victory. The National Front (which favors land reform but not under the Shah's auspices), the landlords, the Moslem mullahs, the parliament (Majlis) when it meets, et al., may be expected to return to the attack. The National Front led by the moderate Allahyer Saleh, for

instance, may be expected to claim that the referendum was not valid because it was done without Majlis approval; it will no doubt charge that the Shah personally has profited from land sold to the peasants and will demand that such profits be returned to the peasant-landowners; the National Front may compete with the Shah's reforms by offering more to workers and peasants than the Shah can deliver.

The reforms proposed by the Shah in the referendum and promises of further reforms have raised high hopes among the needy in Iran. These could well turn to disappointment and disillusionment in a few months, should the government find itself unable to carry out its program. Two of the difficulties the government is sure to encounter, for example, are the complexity of its own administration and the enormous financial difficulties with which it will have to wrestle.

A curious factor in all this situation has been the differences in attitude toward the referendum by two of the Soviet Persian-language broadcasting stations, the Caucasus-based clandestine "Voice of Iran," and the Voice of the Iranian (Communist) Tudeh Party from Leipzig, East Germany. The National Voice of Iran (in the USSR) urged Iranians to participate in the referendum; the Tudeh Party (in East Europe) just as strongly recommended that it be boycotted. Said the National Voice on 21 January:

"The peasants of Iran...will participate in the referendum and will in a body vote for the elimination of the peasant-landlord system and the death of the feudal system...By their united and wide participation in the referendum, the peasants will be able to make sure of the success of the results of the referendum and get to know the feudals and their agents and prevent them from rigging the ballot boxes."

On the other hand, the Tudeh Party (from East Germany) said three days later (on 24 January):

"On 26 January the Shah will implement his conspiracy in the name of national approval....His real aim is to gain support for the illegal actions of his bloody tyranny....Recent events and the frank opposition of national forces against this referendum reflect the public's opinion of the Shah's conspiracy. Intelligent Iranian people are opposed to the illegal and tricky referendum....It is the duty of every patriot to expose the Shah's aims in the referendum, to boycott it, and to refrain from participating in it."

**25X1C10b**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

628 AF, FE, NE, WH. Third Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization  
25X1C10b Conference

**BACKGROUND:** (Unclassified background is contained in Attachments) The Third Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organization (AAPSO) Conference held in Moshi, Tanganyika, from 4 to 11 February has displayed to the world, more clearly perhaps than ever before, that the Afro-Asian concept is being manipulated by the Communist "bloc" with Indonesia playing a strong supporting role. The UAR's influence in AAPSO has definitely faded into the background, although its role on the Secretariat level is still strong. While lip service was paid to the "Spirit of Bandung," the Conference trembled on its principles where the national interests of the main forces behind AAPSO were involved, i.e. in connection with the Indian-Chinese border conflict and the proposed Federation of Malaysia, etc. The Conference has also provided an insight into the strong stresses and growing antagonisms within the Communist bloc and between nations of Asia and Africa. Asian interests prevailed over African ones and "solidarity" was more of an enforced, artificial concept than a live reality. The Conference lambasted United States "imperialism" and Western "colonialism."

Chicom Propaganda. Predictably, Peking utilized the Conference as a platform to press its views against Moscow's on the best way to cope with imperialism and as a forum for conveying to the Asian and African states that the CPR, not the Soviet Union, is the champion of their interests. Peking seems to be convinced that there are significant numbers of Communists and revolutionists in the underdeveloped countries to whom its forceful position ("armed struggle") has more appeal than Moscow's line of peaceful coexistence as an anti-colonial weapon. The Chinese chief delegate, Liu-Ning-yi derided as "deceitful nonsense" the Soviet claim that disarmament would result in significantly increased amounts of aid for the underdeveloped countries. The majority of the delegations showed that they favored the Chinese view by issuing declarations and appeals which placed far greater emphasis on "active" and "armed struggle" ("moral and material support to freedom fighters"; Afro-Asian States to provide military and financial assistance to achieve the liberation of dependent territories of Africa during 1963) than on a need for disarmament and peace.

Soviet Propaganda. The Soviet Union used the meeting to charge inter alia that the European Common Market and American financiers hope to enslave underdeveloped nations in economic

colonialism. Soviet delegates distributed a 12-page pamphlet under the heading "The Common Market--a Threat to the Economy of Afro-Asian Countries." The document calls the Common Market's proposed associate status for African countries "group colonialism" and says "Wall Street" dreams of an integrated Europe incorporated in a "United Atlantic States" which would serve as a tool for recolonizing Africa in the interests of American monopolies. The economic committee declared the Common Market was another expression of "neo-colonialism" and was aimed at splitting Afro-Asian solidarity and increasing the economic difficulties facing these countries. To counter it, the committee called for increased Afro-Asian economic ties and ties with the socialist countries.

"Three-Continent" Conference. The Conference accepted Castro's invitation to convene a People's Solidarity Conference of Asia, Africa, and Latin America in Cuba and it set up a preparatory committee composed, as the announcement said, of six "representative" countries from Africa (Algeria, Guinea, Morocco, the UAR, Tanganyika, and South Africa) and six from Asia (China, India, Indonesia, Japan, the USSR, and Vietnam), which will be joined by six Latin American countries, not yet named. Thus, a proposition long advocated by the Chinese and pro-Chinese elements in AAPSO but once resisted by Soviet elements, moves closer to realization. Indicative of the increased Chicom voice in AAPSO is that no role appears to have been allotted to the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council (WPC) in any planning or preparations for the three continent linkup; heretofore, the Soviets had insisted that the WPC act as co-sponsor. Since such a conference will undoubtedly push a hard, anti-US line of violence, resistance may yet develop within the ranks of some Soviet-oriented Latin American Communists who will resent being pressured by Castro and Chinese Communists. Nevertheless, they will find it difficult not to go along with the proposal. The Conference designated April 17 as a "Day of Solidarity of Afro-Asian Peoples with Peoples of Latin America."

**25X1C10b**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

**Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

629 FE, NE. The Malaysia Federation

25X1C10b

**BACKGROUND:** The Malaysia Federation is basically a British and Malay plan to make a single state out of five Southeast Asian political entities which currently have different statuses within the British Commonwealth. The Federation of Malaya is a fully independent member; Singapore is internally self-governing but its foreign affairs and defense ministries are still under British control; British North Borneo and Sarawak are British colonies, and Brunei, an enclave in Sarawak, is a British protectorate. The proposed Federation, scheduled to become effective 31 August 1963, would permit Britain to retain as much influence as possible in Southeast Asia, would give Britain continued access to Singapore and in general would permit continued Western military presence in this vital area.

The following is a summary of some of the issues involved in the Malaysian Federation proposal:

Indonesia. Indonesia's objective is to block the formation of the Malaysia Federation and to install in the Borneo Territories a government sympathetic to Indonesian aspirations. Ultimately it seeks to incorporate the Borneo Territories as part of Indonesia. Indonesia, with a population nearing 100 million (the fifth or sixth most populous country in the world), regards the proposed federation as a potential rival capable of thwarting Indonesia's expansionist ambitions in Southeast Asia. Sukarno has adopted a course of action vis-a-vis the Federation which is designed to enlist the sympathy and support of the non-aligned states of Africa and Asia for Indonesia's claims, and has denounced Malaya as the accomplice of "neo-imperialists" and for hostility to Indonesia. While eschewing--at this stage--the use of direct force, Indonesia would probably like to goad Malaya into action which would justify Indonesian retaliation. Meanwhile, Indonesia has intensified diplomatic and covert military efforts to support the Brunei rebels and others in the North Borneo territories who for one reason or another oppose the Federation scheme, and is availing itself of every opportunity to foment discord in Singapore. In the process, Indonesian relations with Malaya and Singapore have become badly strained. By way of improving Indonesia's over-all military position in Borneo (the world's third largest island, the southern portion of which--two-thirds of the total--belongs to Indonesia), Indonesia is training "volunteers" to help the insurrectionary groups to forcefully establish "Kalimantan Utara"--an independent state to be composed of



25 February 1963

Sarawak, British North Borneo and Brunei. It should be noted in connection with its attitude toward Malaya and the proposed Malaysia Federation, that many Indonesians regard Malaya itself as a strayed province of Indonesia which has fallen prey to the foreign influence of Indians, Englishmen and Chinese. In addition to his claims based on geographic proximity, ethnic and cultural ties, military considerations, etc., Sukarno is also motivated by political considerations, i.e., the need for yet another anti-colonialist foreign adventure to distract the attention of his people from serious internal shortcomings, especially from economic and social stagnation.

The Philippines: The Philippines are using the crisis over the Malaysia Federation as a means of asserting their independence and of compelling the Western Powers (Britain and the US) to take Philippine interests more seriously. Thus, the government is maintaining a historically tendentious, but none-the-less uncompromising claim to North Borneo. The Philippines not only resent British handling of their claims to North Borneo, but more basically--and perhaps realistically--fear that if Malaysia is established, incorporating as it would several million Mainland-oriented Chinese, that the area of potential Chinese Communist expansion would be extended to the shores of the Philippine Islands. For these reasons, and although its interests are basically different from those of Indonesia, the Philippines government is cooperating with Indonesia on the basis of a common hostility to the proposed Federation.

Malaya: Malaya's chief concern is to prevent its own overseas Chinese minority from becoming numerically dominant in the Federation (which would be the case if Singapore--without the counterbalance of the Borneo Territories--were added to Malaya); and to assert greater independence from Britain while at the same time attempting to involve the Western powers (i.e. Britain or preferably the US) in guaranteeing its security from encroachments by Indonesians or Mainland Chinese. The population of Malaya stands at approximately 7 million of which over 2½ million (or 37.5%) are ethnic Chinese. Malaya is governed by a coalition representing three ethnic groups, Malayan, Chinese and Indian, which was formed by the present Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman, who is the unquestioned leader of the Malayan people. The Chinese minority groups in Malaya--as elsewhere in Southeast Asia--are largely unassimilated with the local population and maintain strong historic, cultural, economic and religious ties with the Mainland. Because of their industry and commercial acumen, the overseas Chinese generally have an influence far exceeding their numbers. Moreover, historic circumstances have created conditions among these overseas Chinese communities which make them a vulnerable target for exploitation by Mainland China.

Singapore: The present government of Singapore sees in the proposed Federation an opportunity to enhance Singapore's economic viability and an opportunity to contain local Communist political strength. In Singapore, where the predominance of ethnic Chinese is perhaps the paramount factor in the political situation (80% of the population are ethnic Chinese) and where the local Communists constitute the strongest political party, over 100 Communist leaders were arrested on 2 February by Prime Minister Lee, with British concurrence. Lee was forced to take this action--which he had hoped to postpone until after the Malaysia Federation became a reality--because of the sympathy of the local Communists for the anti-Malaysia rebels in Brunei, because of Indonesian pressure and because of Malaya Prime Minister Rahman's threat to form Malaysia without Singapore unless Lee followed his example in dealing with Communist subversives.

Sarawak, Brunei and the North Borneo Territories: British Borneo, the northern third of the island, rich in oil, rubber, timber and various tropical products, came under British control in 1841. The territories became British protectorates in the 1860's remaining as such until after World War II when Sarawak and North Borneo became crown colonies--only Brunei retaining its protectorate status. The attitude of British Borneo to the Malaysia Federation is mixed. The Chinese minorities in North Borneo and Sarawak have tended to modify their opposition to the Federation when they realized that the alternative might well be Sukarno's Indonesia. Of a total population of 1,300,000 in British Borneo 300,000 (24%) are Chinese.

Australia and New Zealand: Concerned basically about current Indonesian expansion and potential Chinese expansion; insist that Britain continue to retain responsibility for the security of the area after the formation of the Federation; and evidentially entertain some doubts as to the wisdom, over the long run, of the Federation concept.

India: As part of the British Commonwealth, India will, wherever possible, support the Commonwealth view, particularly if the local populace (in this case having a considerable ethnic Hindu minority) also is in favor. Thus, despite Nehru's opposition to military bases (Singapore), he has supported the concept of the Malaysian Federation.

Britain: Britain would like to make as painless as possible an exit from the area while maintaining--at a minimal cost to itself--the maximum amount of economic and political advantage. Faced with increasing Indonesian and Philippine hostility, Britain will do well to hold to the date set for the inception of the Malaysian Federation (31 August 1963).

China: Because of the large, active and generally unassimilated Chinese minority groups in Southeast Asia (and

particularly within the proposed Malaysia Federation), plus the obvious factors of geographical proximity, Chinese aspirations in Southeast Asia are those which in the long run are apt to cause us the greatest concern. Mainland China's potential for exploiting the overseas Chinese minority groups in order to bring the entire area under its control is probably the greatest danger to Western interests in this part of the world.

CONCLUSIONS:

a. The confrontation of various interests in the Southeast Asia area has produced a complex and highly volatile situation.

b. The Malaysia Federation can succeed only if it is actively supported by the people in the areas which the Federation includes.

c. Any lasting solution to the problems which afflict the Southeast Asia area must take into account the legitimate aspirations of all the principals concerned, including Indonesia.

d. While the prospect of increased Soviet influence is disquieting at the present time, in the long run the paramount consideration is the potential for Chinese expansion.

e. While the Malaysian Federation is obviously an artificial concept which satisfies none of the principals completely, such a Federation or some modification thereof may be the best of a number of unpalatable alternatives.

**25X1C10b**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

630 EE,WE,e. Further Dissension in Communist Ranks - The French Comrades Do a Switch  
25X1C10b

BACKGROUND: In mid-January, Avanti, the Italian Socialist daily, reported from Paris that the Confederation Generale de Travail (CGT), the Communist dominated French trade union federation, had applied for representation on the Economic and Social Committee of the European Economic Council (EEC), a report subsequently confirmed from Paris. This is indeed a surprising development in the light of Communist attacks upon the Common Market in recent months. Ever since the close of the 22nd CPSU Congress in Moscow, the Italian Communist Party (PCI) and Italy's largest labor federation (CGIL), which it dominates, have been insisting that, at least in Western Europe, domestic problems must take precedence over international ones; that if Communist Parties of Western Europe are to gain political power they must recognize political realities. Specifically, they point to the Common Market, arguing that its successes have attracted the support of workers and peasants to the point that Communist attacks on the Common Market are, in Western parliamentary democracies, hurting the Communists. In virtually every country of Western Europe, Communist membership is on the decline and Communist parliamentary representation has been weakened. Up until the close of 1962, the PCI has appeared to be a minority of one, with the French Communist Party (PCF), chiefly represented by WFTU Secretary-General Louis Saillant, taking the lead in attacking the Common Market. This notwithstanding Khrushchev's favorable comments on Western economic integration and the generally moderate tones of the Moscow Conference on Modern Capitalism meeting in the late summer of 1962.

In December 1962, at the Leipzig (East Germany) meeting of the World Federation of Trade Unions to discuss the Common Market, Saillant again strongly denounced the Market and was supported by most of the delegations present. However, Poland and Hungary both indicated support for the Italians who outspokenly attacked Saillant for his negative and unrealistic approach to the problem.

It is against this background that we must view the sudden volte-face of the French CP-dominated trade union confederation (CGT). The Belgian Communist Party is known to have been leaning toward the Italian position, the most recent indication being an editorial in the 15 January issue of Drapeau Rouge. At this date, it is not known what the position of the French Government will be toward CGT's application, nor has there

Whatever the reasons or excuses the French Communists give for their actions, the basic facts would appear to be clear. On the one hand, the French worker and the French farmer are, generally speaking, solidly behind the Common Market for obvious and practical reasons--meaning, chiefly their pocketbooks. On the other hand, doctrine-wise, the Communists' dream of universal social integration through communism has been based upon the fundamental assumption that Capitalism was self-destructive, that the clash and conflict of capitalist economic interests, exacerbated by capitalist ultranationalism, would bring about the collapse of the whole structure and thus open the door to communism. The realities of the situation are far different, as Togliatti, Novella, Pajetta and others have been saying in Italy, and as even Khrushchev is beginning to realize.

"The CGIL delegation (to the Leipzig WFTU meeting) indicated a precise, positive alternative to the kind of integration being effected in the Common Market under the aegis of the monopolies. The alternative is to overcome the 'closed area' which the Common Market represents vis-a-vis the non-EEC countries, via a struggle within the Common Market--the struggle being coordinated on the Western Europe level and at the same time articulated in each of the six countries--to achieve not only strictly trade union goals (wage increase, shorter working hours, substantial modification of labor contracts, etc.) but also structural reforms and a greater role of the working classes in all centers of economic power." Diamante Limite, Rinascita, Rome, No. 34, December 1962, p. 13.

Here is clear evidence of a non-doctrinaire approach--a realization that the "strictly trade union goals" are important (as well as being distinct from Communist goals), but also a recognition that the economic integration of the EEC--and probably all of Western Europe--is a fact that must be contended with on Western terms and not on Communist terms.

25X1C10b

**25X1C10b**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

**Next 4 Page(s) In Document Exempt**

**Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000200010004-6**

Press Roundup on African Student Exodus  
From Bulgaria

[Articles and Statements from European and African  
newspapers and International News Services]

Vienna. Feb. 15, 1963. "Ghanaian Students Accuse Communists"

An angry group of African students Friday accused Bulgaria of racial discrimination against Negroes and said they had left there "because studying in Communist countries is a waste of time."

"We have been called black monkeys and jungle people and we were treated like dirt," a spokesman for 17 Ghanaian students said as the Africans arrived in Vienna after leaving Bulgaria in protest against their treatment by Communist authorities.

The Ghanaians were the first group of a contingent of some hundreds of Africans who had decided to stage a mass exodus after Bulgarian authorities banned the All-African Student's Union in Sofia.

Seven Africans -- the entire executive committee of the union -- were arrested last Monday and their whereabouts are still unknown, the Ghanaians said.

The arrests set off a violent protest demonstration in downtown Sofia Tuesday.

"Bulgarian police and militia beat us like pigs and threw all of us into jail," one of the Ghanaians told reporters.

A Royal Dutch airlines plane took off from Sofia airport after a 24-hour delay caused by heavy snowfalls which forced outgoing planes to be grounded.

A Ghanaian embassy spokesman in Sofia, reached by telephone from Vienna, said the students, who were accompanied by Ghanaian Ambassador Appan-Samong, were headed for Bonn where they would receive further instructions for the embassy there.

The ambassador told Reuter seven leaders of the newly formed All-African Students Union were under arrest, it was a Bulgarian ban on formation of the union which led to the demonstrations.

Those arrested included the unions Ghanaian President, Tatah Tawia, and the Vice-President, an Ethiopian named Amlak.

All the students, who include two girls, bitterly complained of conditions in Bulgaria and said they were subjected to racial discrimination which seemed to have been backed by the Bulgarian authorities.

One student, Robert Cotey said; "Our Bulgarian colleagues did not even want to sit beside us. They called us Black monkeys."

Miss Betsy Addo, 24, one of six Africans arrested for several hours after the demonstrations in Sofia last Tuesday, said the police beat her up.

Miss Addo, who had a swollen forehead said that during her 10-hour detention she was taken from one room to another in the police headquarters but was not interrogated.

Kofi Buckle, a design student, said the "peaceful" students demonstration last Tuesday was ruthlessly broken up by heavily armed police who arrived in about 50 jeeps and 10 buses.

"They attacked us with their fists and several of us were injured. The police, drawing their pistols, then forced us into buses and we were all taken to police headquarters."



Robert Kotey, a 25-year-old agricultural student of Accra, told reporters during the stopover at Vienna airport:

"There was more racial discrimination in this Communist country than there could be in any so-called capitalist country. We are absolutely certain that this discrimination was not incidental, but backed from above -- by the communist authorities.

"Most of us spent about one year in Bulgaria -- and we are fed up.

"Whoever among us had leftist leanings has been cured during that year.

"We have been insulted in every possible way. We were molested in the streets, called 'black monkeys' and 'jungle peoples', and people used to spit out before us on buses and trains."

Kotey and Edmond Assibi, 26, of Tamale, said that Bulgarian authorities ignored complaints from the students.

"The government would tell us that these people were hooligans. But nothing was done to protect us," he said.

Other students reported that the youth hostel where they were living was searched by police on Tuesday night. Some fellow students were arrested and held in custody in separate rooms on top of the building.

They told their colleagues of their whereabouts by letting down a bottle containing a message to one of the lower stories.

Mr. Sampong told Reuter that he rejected a verbal note from the Bulgarian Foreign Minister, Mr. Ivan Beshev, last Wednesday, and in turn protested against the Bulgarian authorities attitude towards the African students.

The ambassador was also officially informed that Mr. Tawia, the unions president, had been "deported." But the foreign minister was unable to disclose Mr. Tawias whereabouts.

"Tawia must still be somewhere in Bulgaria as I still have his passport," the ambassador said.

The students also complained that they had been ordered to pass "Political Indoctrination Courses" of two hours each week.

When walking in the streets or riding in a tram Bulgarians often spat in front of the African students. "You see, they certainly did not like us."

The Ghanaian ambassador said seven more Ghanaian students were still trying to leave Bulgaria.

One Ghanaian medical student told a Vienna correspondent that after his arrest he had been forced to strip because the Bulgarian police thought that he was carrying a knife.

He said that the official reason given for the expulsion of the Ghanaian head of the students' union was that he had not taken some examinations. "They also thought that he had been instigating the formation of the union, of course," the student said.

"We marched to the ministry to ask them to consider letting him return to the University. The following morning two of his colleagues were arrested.

"We marched with our boxes towards the ministry where we were met by police who started driving us back to the hostel. It turned into a fight and some of us including myself were arrested.

"We were asked so many questions why we were forming a union and why we were demonstrating since we knew that demonstrations were illegal.

"I was asked to undress because they thought I had a knife on me.

"I was held from 0845 until 1930.

"We are very happy because most of us have been planning to leave Bulgaria for another country to study. I have wanted to study in Holland or in Germany."

Another Ghanaian student told a correspondent that it was "A bloody waste of time" to study in Bulgaria.

"I reached Bulgaria on January 3, 1963 and I am very happy to be in Austria and I thank my stars.

Appah-Sampong, according to OPI, said that none of the students will return to Sofia to resume their studies "unless the whole atmosphere changes."

He said the 300 still in Bulgaria have decided to leave the country "as a demonstration of African solidarity."

"Race discrimination in Bulgaria is growing," Appah-Sampong charges.

"My government was not happy about the whole affair and decided to bring the Ghanaian students out by plane immediately," he added.

The African students charged that their complaints over their treatment by the Bulgarian population fell on deaf government ears.

Written complaints by the African student leaders over the unfair treatments were at first accepted by ministry of education officials, then denied.

"After the fifth time they simply turned us down flat", said one of the students. "We can't accept this, its completely unjustified as a complaint," was the only answer they gave.

Kofi Buckle, 32, lost two teeth as he was knocked down by a Bulgarian policeman in Tuesdays rioting.

"We were marching peacefully along and had no fight in mind," he said, "when suddenly the Bulgarian police turned up.

"Completely without warning they started using their clubs,

"One of them hit me smack in the mouth with his fist," he said, displaying the gap in his upper plate.

Pretty 23-year old girl from Togo, Betsy Addo, said that she was repeatedly slapped in the face by Bulgarian policemen.

They stopped only after she started screaming from pain.

They then twisted her arms and pushed her roughly into a police van where she was taken to police headquarters and questioned for several hours, she said.

"It was a common occurrence," one of them said, "that Bulgarians spat at us as we walked by, taunting us to go back to the trees, black monkeys".

Asked what they used to reply to the Bulgarians pretty Betsy Addo smiled sadly.

"We told them even monkeys have feelings," she said.

"Once I asked for potatoes in a grocery store", another said. "Unfortunately, I had no shopping bag with me and the salesman got angry. 'Why don't you stick to your bananas?' he asked me."

"We came to Bulgaria and thought they would teach us and help us, but how wrong we were", she said bitterly.

"Many people made jokes at us and asked us why we weren't naked here like we go around in the jungle."

Another student recounted that many students even gave up going to restaurants because the waiters "let us wait for one or two hours before they would seat us."

The Ghanians said that Communist Political Indoctrination was "a must".

Kofi Buckle, a student of economy, said:

"Our educational program called for one year of studies of the history of the Russian and the Bulgarian Communist Parties apart from our regular studies. In the beginning we were forced to take political courses -- Marxism, Leninism, etc. When we refused, we were told that we would not be allowed to continue our regular studies unless we accepted political lessons. Finally the Bulgarians gave in and skipped political exams. But we still had to take indoctrination classes.

"We soon realized that to study in a communist country is a bloody waste of time."

Miss Betsy Addo, 24, who went to Bulgaria to become a dentist, said the racial discrimination seemed to partly stem from "jealousy."

"We had the impression that the Bulgarian people have been told by their government that we were living in the trees in Africa and that it was up to Communism to civilize us.

"Under our scholarships we received a monthly allowance equivalent to about 24 pounds (69 dollars). Bulgarian students get much less. That caused jealousy among them.

The students then told how they were beaten up by armed Communist police and militia during their protest demonstration on Sofia's Lenin Boulevard last Tuesday.

"We had decided to stage a demonstration to protest the treatment, the government ban on our union, and the arrest of our leaders on Monday," Kotey said.

"About 200 Africans marched on Lenin Boulevard. The communists met us -- 600 strong, on about 60 jeeps and ten buses. They were armed with pistols and clubs. They did not shoot, but they showered us with their clubs. Three of them would jump on one African and hold him down while another militiaman would hit him over the head. Many of us were injured, but not seriously. We were all forced into the buses and driven to a prison. We were released on the same day upon request from our ambassador, Appan-Samong.

"Our leaders were arrested on the night before. Militia encircled our hostel, and the concierge came up to our room and told us "the doctor" was here to see us. When the seven men went downstairs they were grabbed and hauled away."

Ambassador Appan-Samong, who accompanied the Ghanians on their way out of Bulgaria, said the fate of those arrested was unknown.

He also said that he believed Tatch Tawia, the Union's Ghanaian chairman, to be still in Bulgaria.

"The foreign ministry notified me that Tawia had been deported. But I do not believe that he was taken out of the country, because we still have his passport. He could not possibly be sent abroad without his passport."

The other arrested members of the union's executive committee were: Vice-Chairman Amlak, Ethiopia, Secretary General Amadtdgguinea, Treasurer Daniel, Nigeria, two students from Togo and one from Somali.

The ambassador said that following the demonstration he was summoned to the foreign ministry and given a verbal note of complaint about the incident.

"I rejected the note because it was incorrect. Our people behaved peacefully, but they were beaten up."

The ambassador did not know about the travel plans of the other African national groups.

He said the Ghanaian government would try to find universities in West Germany where the students could continue their studies.

\* \* \* \* \*

Amsterdam, Feb. 15, 1963. "Students Arrive in Holland"

The African students who left Bulgaria following clashes with Bulgarian police arrived in Amsterdam this evening.

A crowd of newsmen was awaiting the arrival of the KLM plane from Vienna, which finally touched down with over an hour's delay.

From the plane emerged the group of 20 Ghanaian students who left Sofia.

On landing, the Ghana Ambassador to Bulgaria Mr. Sampong, rushed to a telephone and called a number in Bonn. Questioned by reporters, he said that he would hold a press conference after he had made enquiries regarding the further movements of the group this evening.

It is still uncertain whether all of the group will manage to get seats in the night KLM flight for Accra via Zurich and Casablanca. KLM officials said that the group have alternative open tickets either for Accra or for Cologne.

\* \* \* \* \*

Brussels/Amsterdam, Feb. 16, 1963. "Students Expect More to Leave Bulgaria"

The 20 Ghanaian students who left Bulgaria on Friday morning expect to be followed by several dozens of their African compatriots during the next few days. If they fail to obtain exit permits, then they are being detained against their will, said a Ghanaian student-group leader who arrived in Amsterdam on Friday evening.

Ghanaian Ambassador to Bulgaria, Appan Sampong, who accompanied the 20 students as far as Amsterdam, was asked whether he thought that the BTA (Bulgarian Press Agency) communique of Friday evening could be called a true presentation of the facts. This communique alleged that only 11 Ghanaian students (out of 23) had arrived at the Sofia airport, and that the vast majority of other African students in Bulgaria had not associated themselves with their wishes to leave the country. That is inaccurate, he said, because you see yourself that I have arrived here with 20 students. He added that he believed that more African students in Bulgaria would follow the example of the Ghanaians.

Ambassador Sampong did not deny that he was looking for alternative placings for his 20 students in West European universities. His hopes are that the Dutch and West German authorities will be ready to provide opportunities for "my boys to continue their studies before returning to Africa". The Dutch Government has already reacted positively to his idea, and Sampong has an interview scheduled with Dr. Jaquet (Head of the Department for African Affairs of the Dutch Government) for the coming weekend. He will also be speaking with high officials of the West German Government.

When the text of the BTA Friday evening communique was read to the Ghanaian students in the Hotel Krasnopolski in Amsterdam, it was greeted with loud jeers. Fantastically untrue was an opinion which gained unanimous support. All the rest will follow us in due course said a student spokesman.

\* \* \* \* \*

Vienna, Feb. 14, 1963. "Ethiopian Student Explains Why He Left Czechoslovakia"

Compulsory indoctrination in Marxism-Leninism, racial prejudice, labor on a state farm instead of a promised course in scientific farming, constant interruption of studies for participation in anti-Western demonstrations.

These were the experiences in Czechoslovakia of Makonnen Fentaw of Ethiopia, one of the many African students who have gone to Communist Eastern Europe for university or technical training and one of the disillusioned many who subsequently fled to the West or returned to their homes.

Disillusion is widespread among Africans in East European schools and the ratio of "defectors" probably much greater than generally known, as indicated by Makonnen's own experience. Of the 10 African students in his 1961-62 class at the Brno Agricultural School, six have already given up their studies and left Czechoslovakia.

Makonnen, a neatly dressed, candidly soft-spoken young man who speaks excellent English and Czech at present is a worker in a Vienna textile plant. This is to be only a temporary interruption of his studies in veterinary medicine, however. He is awaiting completion of arrangements for continuation of his studies in the West, preferably in the United States.

The first portion of his training outside Ethiopia came to an abrupt end last November when, after two years of increasing disillusion, Makonnen fled Czechoslovakia. Although a foreigner and supposedly a guest of the Czechoslovak Government, he was unable to leave Czechoslovakia freely but was compelled to resort to a ruse, almost as if he himself had been a citizen of an iron curtain country.

Makonnen's unhappy experience with Communist "education" began in 1960 when he was a student at an agricultural school in Ethiopia. He was one of three outstanding graduates of his school to be chosen for further training in Czechoslovakia offered by the Prague Government.

The first stop for Makonnen was the Czechoslovak Embassy in Addis Ababa for "orientation". Makonnen and other Prague-bound students were told in general terms that an intensive course in the Czech language would be necessary before they could take the technical work in which they were interested. But there was no mention that the preliminary course would emphasize Marxist ideology as much as it did language, nor that they would be expected to devote attention and time to political activity as well as to their studies.

Makonnen and his group of Ethiopian students were flown to Prague in October 1960. They had been told they would be met at the airport and that they would be the guests of the Czechoslovak Government for an initial two-week familiarization visit in Prague.

The arrival turned out to be something other than promised. They were not met and had to make their own way to Prague's international hotel, where initially they were refused accommodation on grounds that the hotel was too expensive for students. Nothing more was heard of the two week period as guests in Prague. Instead, the Ethiopians were sent immediately to Marienbad for a language course in which the only texts employed were works of Marx and Lenin and "Rude Bravo" and other party newspapers.

The language-ideology course continued seven months, after which the African students had understood they would be enrolled in a course in scientific farming. The "course" turned out to be labor on a state farm. At this point, the first serious complaints began to be voiced openly by the bewildered Africans, according to Makonnen. Their protests succeeded in effecting a curtailment of the compulsory farm labor period from a month to three weeks.

Then came enrollment at the Brno Agricultural School, but indoctrination did not end with the beginning of technical training. In the case of Makonnen, four hours a week of Marxist-Leninism -- two hours of lectures and two hours of "practice" -- were required in addition to a heavy study load in Czech and Latin, biology, botany, chemistry and anatomy.

The importance attached by his Czechoslovak hosts to the indoctrination courses is revealed by a small class schedule book still in Makonnen's possession. His presence at the Marxist lecture and "practice" periods is attested by signatures of the instructors. The signatures were of vital importance, reports Makonnen, for without the proof of participation in Marxist studies he would have been barred from taking examinations in his academic courses.

Frequently in political demonstrations supporting the Communist position on world issues, as Makonnen put it, "It was not compulsory to demonstrate, but it was made clear to us that it would be unwise to

JPRS Social Science Serial ReportsSelective List

| <u>Title</u>   | <u>Estimated Semi-annual Cost</u> |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| <u>General:</u>  |                                   |
| Translations on International Communist Developments (Includes all pertinent materials on subject from Communist and left-wing publications throughout the world, inside the Communist Bloc countries and in the non-Communist world.) | \$75.00                           |
| <u>USSR Area:</u>  |                                   |
| Translations from <u>Kommunist</u>   | 6.50                              |
| " of the <u>Pravda</u> Editorial   | 3.00                              |
| " on Religion in the USSR  | 15.60                             |
| " on Labor in the USSR   | 16.00                             |
| " on Soviet Agriculture  | 3.70                              |
| " on Soviet Construction and Building Materials  | 3.00                              |
| " on USSR Communications   | 1.00                              |
| " on USSR Consumer Goods and Domestic Trade  | 7.00                              |
| Soviet Economic System: Structure and Policy   | 17.80                             |
| USSR Territorial-Administrative Changes  | .30                               |
| <u>Eastern Europe Area:</u>  |                                   |
| Abstracts from East European Legal Journals  | 6.20                              |
| Political Translations on Eastern Europe   | 12.70                             |
| Sociological Translations on Eastern Europe  | 8.50                              |
| Summary of the Bulgarian Provincial Press  | 2.30                              |
| " Czechoslovak " "   | 6.50                              |
| " Hungarian " "  | 8.60                              |
| " Polish " "   | 16.40                             |
| " Rumanian " "   | 5.20                              |
| Translations on East European Foreign Trade  | 10.00                             |
| " on Economic Organizations and Management in Eastern Europe   | 32.00                             |
| " on East European Agriculture, Forestry and Food Industries   | 22.00                             |
| <u>Communist China</u>   |                                   |
| Activities of Prominent Chinese Communist Personalities  | 6.20                              |
| Communist China Digest   | 15.80                             |
| Translations of Communist China's:   |                                   |
| a) Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Materials   | 7.50                              |
| b) Industry, Mining, Fuels and Power   | 5.30                              |
| c) Trade, Finance, Transportation and Communications   | 14.50                             |
| Translations of Political and Sociological Information on Communist China  | 16.90                             |
| Translations from <u>Hung Ch'i</u> (Red Flag)  |                                   |
| <u>Asia</u>  |                                   |
| Economic Report on North Korea   | 4.50                              |
| Indonesian Press Survey  | 4.00                              |
| Translations of Political and Sociological Information   |                                   |
| 1) on North Korea  | 4.50                              |
| 2) on North Vietnam  | 4.80                              |
| Translations on North Vietnam's Economy  | 13.20                             |
| Translations from <u>Hoc Tap</u> (North Vietnam)   | 5.50                              |
| Translations on <u>Mongolia</u>  | 6.30                              |
| Translations on South and East Asia  | 3.20                              |

| Title | Estimated Semi-annual Cost |
|-------|----------------------------|
|-------|----------------------------|

Miscellaneous:

|                                       |         |
|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Index of Le Monde                     | \$ 1.90 |
| Index of La Stampa and La Stampa Sera | 2.30    |
| Translations on Africa                | 2.70    |
| Translations on Cuba                  | 6.00    |
| Translations on the Middle East       | 6.20    |

NOTE: Send subscriptions and payment directly to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D.C., or to Joint Publications Research Services, Building T-30, Ohio Drive and Independence Avenue, Washington 25, D.C. (making check out to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce).



Developments at the Third Afro-Asian  
Solidarity Organization (AAPSO) Conference.

Time, place and delegations. After repeated postponements the AAPSO Conference took place in Moshi, Tanganyika from 4 to 11 February, attended by 60-member and 40-observer delegations, the latter representing countries (such as Latin American) and/or front organizations. According to one report 300 of the 400 delegates were Communists, representing either Communist regimes or Communist movements or fronts in non-Communist countries. The Soviet and Chinese delegations were the largest by far, composed of about 30 members each. The Conference attracted few outstanding international figures. No African leader of first rank participated, except for Jomo Kenyatta who headed the Kenya delegation at the final plenary session and Tanganyika President Nyerere who delivered an opening address. Many African states were represented by emigré opposition or refugee leaders, domiciled outside the countries which they claimed to represent. Observer delegations were present from Cuba and from several other Latin American countries (Brazil, British Guiana, Mexico, etc.).

Agenda. In closed committee sessions, the Conference debated an agenda which included: Residual colonialism and neo-colonialism; economic emancipation -- development of national economies, the effect of the European Common Market on Afro-Asian countries; development of national cultures and cultural exchanges; and the liquidation of remnants of colonialism in the cultural field; social problems -- youth and women's organizations, trade unions; the consolidation of AAPSO and its expansion into Latin America.

Chinese Influence Prevails. The direction taken by the Conference indicates that the Chinese are now dominant in AAPSO. The Conference favored little the Soviet concepts of "peaceful coexistence" and disarmament as means of dealing with imperialism, but rather adopted a militant line of "armed struggle" in most Conference speeches, appeals and resolutions. It attacked in the strongest terms U.S. "imperialism" and Western "colonialism".

Peking's success is reflected by the voluminous advance publicity it gave to the Conference as well as by the extensive coverage of its proceedings compared with Moscow's limited reporting. The Conference did pass a resolution supporting Chicom admission to the U.N. and condemning U.S. imperialist aggression against China and the occupation of Taiwan. (Another resolution charged that the U.N. is now a vehicle of U.S. imperialism, asking for the overhaul of all U.N. organs to reflect the true aspirations of the Afro-Asian peoples).

Some Problems Encountered. By and large, the Conference seems to have taken the course predetermined by its Communist manipulators, despite the thinly-veiled attack launched against the Communist regimes on the opening day by the President of the host country, Nyerere. He warned of an impending "second scramble" for the two continents. Nyerere charged Communist countries with the "same crime that was committed by the capitalists before," and said that they were now beginning to use wealth for the capitalistic purpose of acquiring "power and prestige." He warned against thinking of imperialism solely in terms of the old colonial powers, against a fixation about imperialism, and against slogans as substitutes for thought. He concluded his address:

"An undeniable success of socialist teaching is that today social justice is an almost universally accepted objective. Even capitalist governments are today doing

in their own countries and for their own peoples what a generation, or even a decade ago was regarded by the same people to be too revolutionary.

"Internationally, however, the picture is very different. Even between socialist countries the class divisions are getting greater. There are not only rich capitalist countries and poor socialist countries. Further, I believe, that the socialist countries themselves, considered as 'individuals' in the larger society of nations, are now committing the same crime as was committed by the capitalists before. On the international level they are now beginning to use wealth for capitalist purposes -- that is, for the acquisition of power and prestige... Karl Marx's doctrine that there is an inevitable clash between the rich and the poor is just as applicable internationally as it is within nation states...."

Besides the differing views or lack of solidarity between the Soviet and Chicom delegations -- with their conflicts, however, never in the open -- there were other areas of tension, which not only received considerable publicity but are more papered over than resolved. The most noteworthy instances are:

a. The Indian delegation walked out of the Conference on 7 February in protest against the refusal to discuss a resolution they had put forward concerning the Sino-Indian border conflict. On exiting, the Indian delegation leader Lall declared India was no longer a member of AAPSO and that AAPSO was "killed, destroyed and ended. Without India there is no organization..." The resolution had called on the Conference to support the proposals for settling the border dispute drawn up at the recent Colombo conference of six African and Asian countries. It was the chairman of the Conference, Tanganyika Home Minister Kambona, who reportedly persuaded the Indians to return to the Conference, although the Conference failed to pass the Indian-proposed resolution -- it merely stated a concern of the whole world about the dispute and welcomed the efforts of the Colombo countries to resolve it.

b. The Singapore-Malaya joint delegation was excluded from the Conference, on Chicom-Indonesian insistence. The joint delegation wanted to speak in behalf of the planned Federation and retort to the Conference's plan to attack its formation. The Malaysian question remained sufficiently precarious to prevent an all-out attack on the formation of the Federation.

Anti-Western Bias. The Conference ended with an anti-Western barrage. Addressing the closing session, Kenyatta accused the developed countries of the Western world of betraying everything they pretend to stand for, including the U.N. charter. He said there is no reason to hope that these developed nations of the West will put "our interests" above their own selfish designs. Resolutions condemned, as did the preceding speeches, imperialists and neo-colonialists, particularly the U.S., as endangering the sovereignty and integrity of Asian, African and Latin American countries. They condemned "aggressive military blocs and treaties" -- SEATO, NATO, CENTO, ANZUS and the projected Northeast Asian Treaty Organization ("NEATO") -- stating they are headed by U.S. imperialism. Resolutions urged military and material support for political movements seeking their countries' independence, pledging full support inter alia to the Brunei rebels against "neo-colonialists" and the proposed "imperialist-imposed" Federation of Malaysia.

"General Declaration"

On the closing day, 11 February, the Conference passed a "General Declaration". The full text reads as follows:

We, the Afro-Asian peoples, who met in Moshi from 4 to 11 February 1963, discussed the development of the Afro-Asian solidarity movement, problems that confront our people, and the international situation in the world at large.

We have been impressed with the Genuine desire of our peoples to strengthen Afro-Asian solidarity and cooperation on the basis of equality and in the noble spirit of Bandung and in the interests of the struggle for national liberation against imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism. We have every reason to believe that our great movement of solidarity is soaring from success to success and from victory to victory.

However, at the same time, we are of the firm opinion that more than ever before we need to be vigilant and alert to maneuvers of the imperialists and colonialists who seek to sow seeds of discord among us and to be on our guard against neocolonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

Having reviewed the political, economic, social, and cultural problems of our peoples, we are convinced that the most urgent tasks for all our peoples in the coming year are:

- A. Intensification of the struggle against colonialism, imperialism, and neocolonialism.
- B. Maximum contribution toward the speedy liberation of the unliberated areas in Africa and Asia.
- C. Formation of a united national front in each country that has not yet been liberated and coordination of action among these different national fronts to make their struggle for independence more effective.

Since the convocation of the Second Afro-Asian People's Conference in Conakry a great many events have taken place in the Afro-Asian countries and in the world. The Afro-Asian and Latin American peoples have scored many victories, both at home and on the international field. Independent countries have gained their freedom.

Imperialism is being defeated in all parts of the world, and thanks to the continuous struggle of the peoples of Africa and Asia and all peace and freedom-loving peoples in the world, its end is now in sight. The battle for national liberation and sovereignty has gained momentum and reached such a stage that the imperialists have been forced into fighting last-ditch battles.

We declare that we regard it as the duty of our governments, our peoples, and liberation movements to render all possible moral and material support to the heroic peoples of those countries which are assailing the bastion of colonialism and imperialism and struggling for the liquidation of white domination and racial discrimination. We call upon these freedom fighters and all peace-loving people of the world to see to it that the year 1963 will witness the final and complete collapse of colonialism which has afflicted Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

We unanimously declare that opposition to imperialists and colonialists does not lie only in the political field. Political independence is not an end in itself but a beginning.

It is the beginning of a further and more difficult battle, namely, the battle for economic emancipation and construction. Great wealth lies at the disposal of our people, riches that have so far been exploited by the imperialists, not for our benefit but for their own purposes. We are now becoming the masters of our own house, and we must see to it that it is put in order.

We must also see to it that wealth, instead of being used to satisfy desire for power and prestige, should be directed toward the banishment of poverty. In this respect, we call on the peoples of Africa and Asia to cooperate and to put into practice many resolutions passed by Afro-Asian conferences for economic cooperation and exchange.

We, the peoples of Africa and Asia, deeply believe in peace and are struggling against the imperialist policies of war and aggression and for independence and peace among nations. The struggle for national liberation and national sovereignty is the mighty force for the realization of peace and disarmament. We are for the banning of testing, manufacturing, stockpiling, and using the nuclear weapons and for the total destruction of existing nuclear arms.

For the sake of reducing the present dangerous international tension and avoiding a general war, we support the principle of general and controlled disarmament and peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems.

We are convinced that within the family of the Afro-Asian peoples all disputes and differences can be resolved by fraternal discussion on the basis of the principles and spirit of the Bandung Declaration. We, therefore, support the Bandung principles and urge the Afro-Asian countries which have boundary differences to solve these issues through peaceful negotiations, inspired by these principles.

In the firm belief that there is not such a thing as a friendly base in foreign land, we call upon all countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America to strengthen the fight against foreign military bases for we believe that no country is really free with foreign bases on its soil.

We salute the development of friendship and solidarity between the people of Africa, Asia, and Latin America who are fighting for common objectives. We believe strongly that this development is an important factor in the struggle for the liquidation of imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism and the establishment of true world peace.

The Afro-Asian peoples desire freedom, unity, and peace. We will devote our efforts to the achievements of these noble goals. Our era will go down in history as the age of Africa and Asia, and we have every reason to look to the future with hope and confidence.

to take part. And participation was necessary if we hoped to get visits to factories and other places in which we were interested".

Makonnen was called upon to join demonstrations so frequently that he began to forget what he was demonstrating for or against. But he recalls in particular being called out to condemn the West at the time of the Bay of Pigs incident in Cuba, and there was an unrelenting effort to stir up anti-Western feelings among the Africans during the Cuban crisis of last October. Makonnen reports that at that time study in the Brno foreign student hostel became all but impossible. Announcements carried on loudspeakers in the building throughout the day demanded the presence of the Africans at mass protests against the United States.

"There always were adequate preparations for demonstrations" Makonnen recalls. "Buses were always on hand to transport students to wherever a demonstration was to take place and food was provided. But the visits to nearby industrial cities such as Pilsen and to other points in which we were interested never could be arranged. We were usually told arrangements would be too difficult".

Prevalent racial antagonism in the supposedly prejudice-free Communist society is a major factor in disillusioning African students. Makonnen first became acutely aware of hostility to Africans during social evenings at his hostel when Czech girls refused to dance with Africans. He subsequently was slighted on many occasions and recalls youths and small children jeering at African students on the streets of Brno, telling the Africans to go home and "accusing us of bringing diseases to their country".

For Makonnen, reports of Africans being repressed and even physically abused in Communist countries came as no surprise. He was in Bulgaria last year at the time of incidents between African and Bulgarian students which led to the return home of a number of Ghanaian students. And from his own experience he says he knows that "it is not safe for an African to be on the streets at night in Czechoslovakia".

Last autumn, Makonnen decided he had had enough of education in Communist Czechoslovakia. He applied for permission to visit Yugoslavia, ostensibly to attend a meeting of African students. Authorities at Brno at first were reluctant to permit him to leave the school. There had been two recent cases of African students fleeing to the West, according to Makonnen. But the trip eventually was permitted following his assurances that he would be absent only two or three days.

Makonnen's route by train to Belgrade would take him through Vienna, and this was as far as he planned to go. He succeeded in reaching his goal on November 2.

\* \* \* \* \*

Munich, Feb. 15, 1963. "BTA Announcement on African Students"

The following announcement was carried by the Russian and English-language service of the official Bulgarian news agency BTA Friday night

Grossly tendentious and ill intentioned rumours about the general feeling of the students from the African countries in Bulgaria, which are being spread by some of the major news agencies, are still reaching a number of Western newspapers. In this connection the Bulgarian news agency makes known the following details:

There are 370 African students now studying in Bulgaria, 300 of them in the universities and 70 in the technical schools. In keeping with the democratic order established in this country, they are organized in national organizations of their own, the aims and purposes of these organizations being to carry out cultural, educational and other activities among their members and to facilitate them in their studies. A short while ago, however, a small group of students took the initiative of forming a new organization -- an All-African Union of the Students in the Peoples Republic of Bulgaria, without having the consent of the great majority of the African students in Bulgaria and without having asked the authorities for permission.

The active supporters of such a union are only a part of the African youths, mainly among those from Ghana, Guinea and Nigeria, totalling some 50 people. The active opponents to such an organization are nearly 220 students from Algeria, Kenya, The Sudan and other countries. The remaining African students regard this idea with indifference.

Instead of keeping with the established order in this country, the supporters of the idea of forming an All-African Political Union tried to make a demonstration on February 12 of this year. No repressive measures had been taken, and there were no incidents and ill-treatment on this occasion. The only thing that had been undertaken on the part of the state authorities, and which had been justified from every point of view, had been the expulsion of 7 students who had violated the law and order established in this country.

There is also no truth in the reports that all or a greater part of the African students had expressed the desire to leave the country. The truth is as follows: A small group of students, mainly from Ghana, have asked for exit visas, but some of them are already refusing to avail themselves of these visas. For example, the Embassy of Ghana in Sofia had made reservations yesterday for 23 students for the KLM plane. When the cars were to start for the airport, only 11 people had appeared. The rest had refused to depart. A part of those who had asked for exit visas declared this morning that they would like to excuse themselves for their inconsiderate act and are asking to remain in Bulgaria in order to go on with their studies.

All other students are continuing regularly and quietly with their training in the educational institutions.

The news agency then carried an item under the headline "Foreign Students in Bulgaria enjoy best conditions for Studying." Text of the report follows:

1,100 young men and women from almost every part of the world are studying, along with the Bulgarian students, in the higher educational institutions in this country this schoolyear. The number of students from the underdeveloped countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America has particularly grown in the past several years. They are now totalling around 650, almost 300 of them having come from Africa alone. At the same time, 130 young people from the underdeveloped countries, more than 70 Africans included, are studying in the secondary technical schools.

All the necessary conditions for studying have been created for the foreign students by the Bulgarian Government. Almost all of them have a scholarship of 60 to 80 leva a month, which is completely sufficient for them to meet their needs. The majority of the students from the underdeveloped countries are being given the maximum scholarship rate that is equal to the average monthly pay of junior experts, university graduates, working in Bulgarian administration offices and enterprises. Of their scholarship money the students pay up to 70 stotinki for lunch and dinner in the students canteens every day, which makes about 21 leva per month. They live in comfortable hostels, free of charge, they are entitled to free medical care and pay nothing for tuition. The summer holidays they spend in students rest-homes and camps for a minimum fee. Those of them who get married are given separate homes by the state for their own use only, and their children are being taken care of in creches and kindergartens free of any charge. The foreign students also have free access to all libraries and reading rooms to prepare for their examinations, to gymnasiums, swimming pools and sports grounds, they have a culture club of their own.

With its care for the foreign students the Peoples Republic of Bulgaria is helping, along with other countries in the world, the cultural development of the underdeveloped countries, thus contributing to their creating a national intelligentsia of their own.

\* \* \* \* \*

Accra, Ghana, Feb 15 63 "African Students Leaving Bulgaria, Charge Discrimination."

Ghana's largest circulation newspaper, The Daily Graphic, Friday published an editorial saying "the conditions under which African students studying in Bulgaria live, is giving rise to great anxiety to all open minded Africans."

"Last year," the paper recalled, "seven Ghanaian students, including one girl, returned to Accra by air from Sofia, capital of Bulgaria, some with bandaged heads in rather mysterious circumstances. This week, Reuters reported that a demonstration by about 200 African students in Sofia was ruthlessly broken up by Bulgarian police who arrested several of the students while others were injured.

"We cannot sit unconcerned when Africa students are being maltreated by countries who profess to be friends of Africa."

Meanwhile, the National Executive of the Union of Ghana Students, in a statement deploring the Bulgarian regime's actions, declared:

"Friendship with Africans must be founded on the basis of absolute equality and mutual respect."

A.K. Kludze, President of the Ghana Students Union, said Ghanaian students were "shocked and disappointed" over the news from Sofia.

The Ghana students union, Mr. Kludze added, believes African students in Bulgaria had a right to organize themselves into an All-African Students Union to further African unity at the student level.

Mr. Kludze's reference was to the Bulgarian regime's refusal to allow formation of an All-African Students organization in Bulgaria. This action led to a demonstration by the African students and the clash with Bulgarian police. Unrest among the Africans in Bulgaria -- as in other communist countries -- has been building for other reasons as well. Reports over the past two years have cited such grievances as Communist Political Indoctrination at the expense of regular studies, severe language problems, isolation from the local populace -- and overt racial insults against the Africans.

\* \* \* \* \*

Washington, Feb. 15, 1963 Effect of Bulgarian Incident.

The wholesale exodus of African students from Bulgaria is expected to have long-range political and psychological repercussions on future relations between African states and Eastern Europe, officials here feel.

Diplomatic reports from Sofia do not indicate that the students incident was severe enough for Ghana or any other African country to resort to open diplomatic retaliation. The Bulgarian authorities seem to be doing everything in their power now to mitigate the political effects.

While the majority of African students in Sofia is reported ready to leave as soon as transportation becomes available, there is no clear indication as yet whether the Arab and Asian students will follow suit.

Officials here point out that many if not most of the students who may decide to stay have only a limited choice to do otherwise. It is a fact that the bulk of all Afro-Asian students now studying in Eastern Europe have previously tried their luck in the West. The

majority of them was rejected by Western Universities on the basis of poor knowledge of English or French, or because of poor academic aptitude, or both. A fair number of these students were known leftists, some of them members of outlawed African and Asian organizations, who were refused exit visas by their governments, such as the Kenyans, Congolese as well as other nationals who happened to be out of political step with their current governments.

Western diplomats in Sofia have long reported to their foreign ministries that a strange mixture of Bulgarian social primitivism and political superiority complex have amounted to what is now referred to as racial, anti-African feelings. They say that most Bulgarians absolutely refuse the claim of the Ghanaian students, for example, that the Ghanaian peasant, despite his primitive agricultural tools in some regions, is far better off than his Bulgarian counterpart. There is very little respect among Bulgarian students, diplomatic reports indicate, for what is proudly called "the African personality" by their dark colleagues. The Africans wanted to mix freely with the Sofians. The Bulgarian authorities wanted them limited to a few assigned student chaperons. The Africans were said to have resented the presence of these "political informers" in their dormitories. Last but not least, after the initial curiosity of the Bulgarians wore off, their social contact with the African students became lukewarm to cool and sometimes hostile.

The Sofia incident, US officials feel, will result in some deep re-evaluation among the Afro-Asian governments and the prospective students themselves as to the wisdom of trying to get technical education behind the Iron Curtain. Some officials feel that the entire Soviet Bloc student project would soon crumble if the west could come up with enough stipends for those now studying in the east.

\*\*\*\*\*