

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/9664

15 April 1981

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

(FOUO 10/81)

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NOTE

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

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

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

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

COPYRIGHT LAWS AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING OWNERSHIP OF MATERIALS REPRODUCED HEREIN REQUIRE THAT DISSEMINATION OF THIS PUBLICATION BE RESTRICTED FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/9664

15 April 1981

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

(FOUO 10/81)

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

Soviets Interpret Saudi Arabian History (SAUDOVSKAYA ARAVIYA, 1980).....	1
Inter-Imperialist Competition in Latin America Analyzed (V. P. Kyrychenko; UKRAYINS'KYY ISTORYCHNYI ZHURNAL, Jan 81)...	12
Book Views Prospects of Cooperation in Fighting International Terrorism (Ye. G. Lyakhov; PROBLEMY SOTRUDNICHESTVA GOSUDARSTV V BOR'BE S MEZHDUNARODNYM TERRORIZMOM, 1979).....	20

REGIONAL

Turkmens Study Use of Water, Land Resources (K. Bayryev; TURKMENISTAN KOMMUNISTI, No 12, 1980).....	22
--	----

- a -

[III - USSR - 35 FOUO]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTERNATIONAL

SOVIETS INTERPRET SAUDI ARABIAN HISTORY

Moscow SAUDOVSKAYA ARAVIYA in Russian 1980 (signed to press 20 Oct 80) pp 1-3, 99-112, 271, 272

[Annotation, table of contents, preface and excerpt from Chapter 2 from book "Saudi Arabia (Reference Book)", edited by V. V. Ozoling, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury, 15,000 copies, 272 pages]

[Text] The reference book contains detailed information about the geography, population, history, economy and culture of Saudi Arabia.

Preface

The purpose of this reference book is to provide the reader with the primary information regarding one of the major states of the Arabian East, Saudi Arabia. This book presents data on the history of ancient and medieval Arabia, the nature of the Arabian peninsula, the customs and traditions of the people inhabiting it, and so forth. At the same time, the authors of the reference book concentrated most of their attention on the modern sociopolitical, economic and cultural life of Saudi Arabia. The 1960's and 1970's were an important stage of development for this country. The process of transforming the Saudis from a backward, semifeudal society into a capitalist one was accelerated in these two decades to a considerable degree because of oil profits. The political and economic importance of Saudi Arabia simultaneously increased both among the Arab countries, and in the world in general.

This is the first publication of a reference book on Saudi Arabia in our country. In their work the authors were faced with a lack of a lot of the necessary data, in particular, reliable statistics on certain subjects. The reference book has employed materials both from the national Saudi press and state institutions, the Arab and Western press, and United Nations. The group of authors also relied on works of Soviet orientologists.

The authors of the articles are: O. G. Gerasimov: Physical and Geographical Essay, Population, National Traditions and Customs, Religion, Historical Essay, State Structure (except Armed Forces), and Press; V. V. Ozoling: Petroleum and Gas Industry, Petrochemical Industry, Agriculture, Finances, Trade, Appendix (tables 3-6); G. Sh. Sharbatov: Arabic Literary Language and Modern Dialects of Arabia, Modern Saudi Literature; A. I. Yakovlev: General Characteristics [Economics], Activity of Foreign Petroleum Companies and Government Policy in Area of Petroleum, Other Industry, Transportation and Communications, Armed Forces, Education, Public Health, Radio and Television, Sports and Appendix.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Contents	Page
Preface	3
Country and Population	4
Physical and Geographical Essay	4
Population	22
National Traditions and Customs	27
Arabic Literary Language and Modern Dialects of Arabia	37
Religion	43
Historical Essay	48
Economics	113
General Characteristics	113
Petroleum and Gas Industry	126
Petrochemical Industry	134
Activity of Foreign Petroleum Companies and Government Policy in Area of Petroleum	138
Other Industry	147
Agriculture	162
Transportation and Communications	172
Finances	184
Trade	191
State Structure	198
Administrative Division and Agencies of Local Power	201
Judicial System	202
Armed Forces	203
Culture	209
Education	209
Modern Saudi Literature	218
Information Agencies	230
Public Health	234
Sports	240
Appendix	243
Index of Geographical Names	263
Index of Names	268

Government of Faisal (1964-1975)

After becoming head of state, Faisal began to work more decisively to modernize the system of state control and to strengthen his positions in the country. The king issued a decree in November 1964 in which he concentrated the posts of prime minister, minister of foreign affairs and supreme commander-in-chief in his hands. The king's brother, Emir Khalid was appointed deputy prime minister, and in March 1965 the crown prince.

Faisal's approach to power marked the beginning of the active development of the country's economy and strengthening of cooperation with Western countries. As far back as October 1964, the industrial equipment imported into the country was

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

freed of taxes. The government concluded contracts with a number of foreign companies to build petrochemical enterprises. It gave a French firm the concession to explore and extract petroleum in the central region of the country and in the waters of the Red Sea under conditions that were more favorable than with Aramco [Arabian-American Oil Company]. In 1965 the Italian firms began to build highways and an irrigation dam in North Asir. The American companies obtained a contract to build power plants and water distilling units. The construction boom in Saudi Arabia promoted the more active involvement of the royal family members, sheiks of the leading tribes and king's advisers, and representatives of the local bourgeoisie in enterprise. Young technocrats who had been educated in the universities of the United States and West Europe began to be appointed to the leading positions in the state institutions.

The implementation of the ambitious programs for the country's development, however, could not neutralize the dissatisfaction of the working masses and patriotic forces of Saudi Arabia. As long ago as May 1964, the workers and office workers of the Aramco enterprises in Dhahran and the Getty Oil Company in the divided zone proclaimed a partial strike and boycotted the food stores and general services institutions of the companies. Over 600 activist workers, officials and journalists were arrested at the end of June 1964. As before, the arrests were made under the slogan of the "control of communism." The patriotic forces united into the National Liberation Front continued their activity in the country. Branches of interArabian organizations, the Party of Arabian Socialist Revival (Ba'th), Movement of Arabian Nationalists, as well as different groups of "Arabian socialists" were active in Saudi Arabia in addition to the Front.

In his first public statement in November 1964, Faisal announced in particular that Saudi Arabia will respect the charter of the League of Arab States and will promote the elimination of conflicts in the Arab world, and follow the resolutions of the conferences of nonaligned countries. He supported the solidarity of the Arab countries, their struggle against the Israeli aggressors, and supported the demands of the Arab people of Palestine. Saudi Arabia's policy in the Arab world was formed under the influence of general tendencies of Arabian nationalism and Faisal's attempt to strengthen his position in the Arab world as a counterweight to the progressive Arab regimes.

The question of the attitude towards the Yemen revolution continued to be unresolved. Diplomatic relations were restored in March 1964 between Saudi Arabia and Egypt. The situation in the Yemen Arab Republic became the subject of direct negotiations between Nasser and Faisal at a number of conferences of the heads of states and governments of the Arab countries. In August 1965, an Egypt-Saudi agreement was signed in Jidda on the Yemen question. It stipulated the end of military actions, renunciation by Saudi Arabia of help to the Yemen monarchists, withdrawal of Egyptian troops from the Yemen Arab Republic, and holding of a congress of Yemen representatives in November 1965 to define the nature of the future state structure in the country. Subsequent events showed, however, that Saudi Arabia was not about to fulfill the arrangement on the Yemen question, and continued to support the Yemen monarchists.

Analysis of the documents and official statements from the period of Faisal's government permits the judgment that one of the founding principles for the Saudi Arabian foreign policy became the spread of the idea of pan-Islamism. In April 1965, Faisal convened the World Islamic Conference in Mecca chaired by the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

mufti of Saudi Arabia, Sheikh Muhammed ibn Ibrahim. The conference discussed the creation of an Islamic pact, that, in the opinion of Nasser and other Arab progressive leaders, was created to stop the wave of revolutions in the Arab world. In August-September 1966, Faisal made a trip to the Muslim countries of Asia and Africa. During the trip, he called upon their representatives to participate in the 1967 Islamic conference.

The plans to set up an Islamic pact were rejected by Egypt, Syria, Iraq, the Yemen Arab Republic, Algeria and Lebanon. Attempting to exert pressure on Lebanon, the Saudis withdrew their investments in the Lebanese bank Intra and thus bankrupted it. The pan-Islamic plans were coordinated by Saudi Arabia and the United States with whom relationships were on the upswing. In June 1966, as a result of Faisal's visit to the United States, an American-Saudi communique was published. In it, President Johnson and the Saudi king, noting the "international threat of communism," decided to set up an "American-Saudi joint fund to fight against communism." As stated, the purpose of the fund was to support the economic development of the "anti-communist" countries so that they are capable of withstanding the "attack" of communism.

The active cooperation of Saudi Arabia with the imperialist powers against the progressive Arab regimes elicited sharp dissatisfaction from the Saudi patriots. Despite the official ban, widespread protest demonstrations took place in 1966 that even encompassed the army. In September 1966, at the Air Force base in Dhahran, a group of Saudi officers came out against the British instructors who permitted insulting statements about Nasser. The authorities arrested 35 Saudi officers and sergeants. In Jidda, Ar-Riyad and Dhahran, leaflets were distributed with the text of a draft constitution and appeals to struggle for freedom, socialism and unity. Police made a number of preventive arrests among the petroleum workers who were in the forefront of the democratic movement.

In December 1966-January 1967, a wave of sabotage and terrorism rolled over the country. Explosions damaged the transArabian petroleum pipeline of the American company, Tapline, the palaces of the emirs and the military facilities controlled by the British and Americans. Attempts were made on the lives of the king's brothers, Emir Sultan ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz the governor of the eastern province, Emir Sa'd al-Din al-Jiluwi, and others. The royal family panicked. All of its palaces were turned into fortresses. The entrances and windows were lined with sandbags. Protection from the soldiers of the national guard was strengthened. Although the organization that called itself the Union of the People of the Arabian Peninsula claimed all responsibility for these acts, the government accused Egypt of training saboteurs from the Yemeni emigrants living in the country. It appealed to Britain and the United States to support the struggle against the patriots. Arrests were made in the country among the officers, representatives of the intelligentsia, and the workers. On 17 March 1967, in the capital, 17 Yemenis who were accused of being "agents of Marxism and anarchy" were executed on the square in front of Faisal's palace. In addition, a whole series of individuals were executed secretly.

The rapprochement between Saudi Arabia and the United States, often to the detriment of the idea of Arab solidarity that Faisal had appealed for in his ascent to the throne, caused a new conflict in the ruling family. Faisal's brothers, the Emirs Sultan who was appointed minister of defense and aviation, and Fahd who occupied the post of minister of foreign affairs, condemned the king's policy

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

leading to the undermining of Arab solidarity and subordination of the country to imperialist powers. Faisal's position was complicated even more by the fact that the former king, Saud, arrived in Cairo. He announced his claims to the throne and the support of the Yemen republicans and Nasser's policy towards the Yemen Arab Republic.

Israel's aggression against the Arab countries in June 1967 made important corrections in Saudi Arabia's policy. Faisal could not remain apart from the just struggle of the Arab people without risking a significant undermining of his authority both within the country and abroad. A detachment of Saudi troops was sent to Jordan. It participated in the military actions against the aggressors.

At the conference of the heads of states and governments of Arab countries in August 1967 in Khartoum, Saudi Arabia agreed to give financial help to Egypt, Syria and Jordan to eliminate the economic consequences of the Israeli aggression. The meeting between Nasser and Faisal resulted in a new agreement regarding the Yemen Arab Republic. According to this agreement, Egypt began to withdraw its troops from its territory. However, Saudi Arabia did not fulfill the agreement and continued to support the Yemen monarchists. They made use of the withdrawal of the Egyptian troops and discord among the republicans to blockade the capital of the Yemen Arab Republic, Sana. It is true that the two-month siege of Sana was not successful for the monarchists. They were driven out of the city and soon completely defeated.

The military defeat of the Arabs in the conflict with Israel in 1967 and Nasser's occupation with the attempt to eliminate the consequences of the Israeli aggression afforded Faisal good opportunities to strengthen Saudi Arabia's role in the Arab world. In 1969 after national reconciliation and halting of the civil war in Yemen, Saudi Arabia continued its attempts to strengthen its influence there by using the return of the monarchists to the Yemen Arab Republic and financial aid to the war-torn country.

In November 1967, South Yemen became an independent state, and in June 1969, the left wing of the National Front came to power in Aden. It proclaimed a program of building a new life on a progressive base. The South Yemeni sultans and emirs who had been thrown out of the country by the revolution took asylum in Saudi Arabia. From there they made provocational sorties against the young republic. In November 1969, the Saudi Arabian troops seized the South Yemen boundary post of Al-Badi that supposedly was on Saudi territory.

Negotiations took place in March 1970 in Jidda between representatives of Saudi Arabia and the Yemen Arab Republic. The Saudis officially recognized the Yemen Arab Republic in July and the overthrown Yemen king, Muhammed al-Badr was expelled from the country. However, the relationships with another neighbor, Syria, were complicated by the fact that the Syrians refused to permit repair of the Tapline Company's petroleum pipeline that passed on their territory and had been destroyed in May 1970. After the company agreed to increase the allocations to the Syrians for pumping oil, the repair work was done. In January 1971, pumping of oil was resumed. During the conflict between the Jordanian authorities and the Palestinians in September 1970, Saudi Arabia support King Hussein's government. In contrast to Lebanon and Kuwait, it continued to pay its percentage of the aid stipulated by the decisions of the Arab summit conference in Khartoum.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The early 1970's were marked by further activation of Saudi Arabia's policy in the interArab arena. The growth of oil profits, the ever increasing volume of financial aid to the Arab countries, the active development of the country's infrastructure and construction of new industrial facilities, modernization of the armed forces and increase in the number of Saudi specialists who were educated abroad and in local higher educational institutions convinced Faisal and his followers that Saudi Arabia could and should play a more active and independent role in the Near East. Faisal also had a favorable situation because in September 1970 Nasser, the president of Egypt, died. He was the former acknowledged leader of the Arab national liberation movement. The planned departure from Nasser's political heritage by the new leadership headed by A. Sadat weakened Egypt's position in the Arab world and the degree of its influence on the development of the situation in the Near East. Here the Saudi leadership considered that the Arab-Israeli conflict continued to remain the dominant factor in the Near East situation and any attempt to strengthen its position in the Arab world must be linked to the demands of the Arabs to eliminate the consequences of the Israeli aggression and recognition of the legal rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

In September 1973, King Faisal made an official visit to the United States. The Americans used this visit to obtain assurances that the Saudis in the future will provide regular and increasing supplies of crude oil to the United States. The Saudi monarch used the visit to reiterate the dissatisfaction of Ar-Riyad with the diplomatic and military support of Israel by the United States. He again raised the question of sale of Phantom jets to the Saudi army which was protested by Israel. The Minister of Defense, Sultan Ibn Abdul Aziz, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Fahd ibn 'Abd al-Aziz, also noted in their public speeches in 1973 that Saudi Arabia cannot stand aside from the Arab-Israeli conflict. "Our duty is to leave contradictions aside, or at least temporarily forget about them, in order to dedicate ourselves completely to solving the main problem, the struggle against Israel," announced Fahd.

A new armed conflict erupted between Egypt and Israel in October 1973. On 21 October, Saudi Arabia decided to cut off oil exports to the United States and Holland because of their support of Israel and additional military aid to it. During a meeting with the American Secretary of State, H. Kissinger in November 1973, Faisal announced that Saudi Arabia intended to achieve complete withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territory, the liberation of East Jerusalem, and satisfaction of the legal rights of the Palestinian people.

King Faisal's position on the Near East settlement and his proclaimed embargo on oil supplies to the United States caused a definite cooling in the relations between the two countries. Negotiations on the Saudi capital investments to the U.S. economy were actually frozen. The Saudi Arabian government began negotiations with France and Britain for the purchase of military airplanes, helicopters and other stores and equipment. In order to exert pressure on Faisal, in early 1974 reports appeared in a number of press agencies of the Arab and Western countries about plans to break up Saudi Arabia that were formulated by the American special services back in August 1973, i.e., before the beginning of the October Arab-Israeli War. According to these plans, the El-Hasa region where the main Saudi petroleum fields are located, would be turned into a separate state formation and then transferred to the wardship of the Shah of Iran. In Hejaz, the power of the Hashemite dynasty would be restored, while Nejd would be transferred to the control of one of the Saudis who was against Faisal. Although such plans could hardly have been realized, they

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

did not pass unnoticed by the ruling circles who appealed to France for cooperation in strengthening the Saudi security services. Rumors were also spread that the United States did not exclude direct military intervention and occupation of the oil fields if the energy crisis worsened and the economic interests of the Western powers were threatened.

Some of the leaders of Saudi Arabia supported the continued line that conformed to common Arab interests, i.e., actually a continued embargo policy. King Faisal was among them. Others leaned towards the most rapid halting of the embargo and development of relations with the United States. The Western, especially American, press intensified the spread of rumors about the possible domestic political attacks against Faisal which actually were one of the forms of U.S. pressure on Saudi Arabia.

The oil embargo against the United States and Holland was lifted in March 1974. On 5 April 1974, an American-Saudi communique was published on the readiness of the United States to expand aid to Saudi Arabia in economics and to meet its demands for military equipment. In this period, the United States began its "shuttle diplomacy" to attain separate deals between Egypt and Israel. To a certain measure this removed the Saudi criticism of Washington that it did not want to exert the appropriate pressure on Israel. However, despite this, Faisal announced the possible review of the decision to lift the embargo if the United States continued to unreservedly support Israel in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

In early June 1974, Emir Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz visited the United States. During the visit, an agreement was reached on the creation of a combined commission for economic cooperation, working groups on cooperation in industrialization, training of personnel, scientific and technical research, etc. A decision was also made to set up a commission to examine the already implemented programs to update the armed forces in Saudi Arabia.

The U.S. president, R. Nixon, visited Saudi Arabia in the middle of June 1974 within the framework of his Near East trip. In discussing the situation in the Near East, Faisal again told the American president that "true and strong peace will never reign in this region if Jerusalem is not freed and Arab sovereignty is not re-established over it, if all occupied Arab territories are not liberated, if the Arab people of Palestine do not achieve the right to return to their native land, and if they are not given the right of self-determination." Faisal's statement was evaluated by the Americans as a reminder that relations between Saudi Arabia and the United States were linked to the Near East settlement.

The negotiations between Aramco and the Saudi Arabian government occupied an important place in the Saudi-American cooperation in the early 1970's. Striving to establish national control over the country's oil resources, Saudi Arabia attained shares in Aramco stock. In October 1972, an agreement was signed to transfer 25% of Aramco stock to the Saudis for 500 million dollars in compensation. The payment was to take place over 5 years. By January 1982, according to the formulated schedule, the Saudi government was to receive 51% of the shares. This percentage was to be maintained until the end of the concession in 1999. However, in 1974, Saudi Arabia acquired 60% of the Aramco stock and began negotiations on the complete transfer of the company into the hands of the Saudis.

At the end of July 1974, negotiations were held between Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates to settle mutual claims in the region of the Buraimi oasis. On

7
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

21 August during the visit of United Arab Emirates president, Zayid bin Sultan al-Nuhayan to Saudi Arabia, an agreement was signed on the boundary questions. Diplomatic relations were established between the two countries.

Normalization of relations with the United Arab Emirates was explained by the striving of Ar-Riyad to counteract the attempts of Iran to strengthen its influence in the Persian Gulf Arab countries. As is known, Iran signed an agreement with Oman who had a poorly demarcated boundary with Saudi Arabia. According to the agreement, the shah sent his troops to Oman to fight the Dhofar rebels and obtain the possibility of setting up an air force base on the boundaries with South Yemen. In addition, Iran signed an agreement with the UAE and Oman for demarcation of the continental shelf in the Persian Gulf. Saudi Arabia, disturbed by the strengthening of Iran's political and military positions in the Persian Gulf region, also nurtured plans to set up a military-political block of Arab countries in this region. This could be viewed as a counterweight to the Iranian penetration.

The departure from the previously proclaimed policy of oil boycott for the United States caused a definite dissatisfaction in the country. It even encompassed the Saudi army. In October 1974, Saudi Arabia arrested a group of officers of the national guard for preparing a state coup. At the end of 1974, the conflicts in the royal family were again exacerbated due to the deterioration in Faisal's health and his possible abdication from power. Among the individuals who criticized the domestic and foreign policy of Faisal and the heir to the throne, Emir Khalid, were the brothers of the king, Minister of Internal Affairs Fahd and Minister of Defense and Aviation Sultan. They were joined by the young members of the ruling family who demanded that Faisal abdicate from absolute power and accept a constitution. Trying to enlist the support of the army, Faisal increased the salary of all soldiers and officers, and also made changes in the command of the armed forces.

On 25 March 1975, during the Muslim holiday, King Faisal was receiving the congratulations of his relatives, the tribal leaders and Muslim theologians. He was approached by his nephew Emir Faisal Ibn Musa'id. Instead of a greeting, he took out a gun and shot the king. When the defense burst into the hall, the king was already dead. In the first report on the murder of the king it was asserted that Emir Faisal had gone mad, but in several months he was found normal. The court sentenced him to death. He was publicly beheaded on 18 June 1975.

The reason for the murder remained a secret. Some advanced the hypothesis that the king was killed at the instigation of the Americans who were dissatisfied with his policy in questions of the Near East settlement and cooling towards the United States. Others asserted that it was a vendetta. In 1966, Faisal Ibn Musa'id's brother was killed in an attempt to seize a television station from a group of fanatics. In his opinion, the station was transmitting programs that were incompatible with the Islamic canons.

Saudi Arabia in the Second Half of the 1970's

On 26 March 1975, the brother of deceased King Faisal, Khalid ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz was proclaimed king of Saudi Arabia, and Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz became the heir to the throne. In his first public statement, the new king spoke of his intention to continue the domestic and foreign policy of his predecessor. On the occasion of his ascent to the throne, the new monarch declared an amnesty for the political prisoners who assured the king of their loyal attitude towards the regime, and who supported the creation of an advisory council.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

On 31 March 1975, King Khalid appointed Emir Fahd as first deputy minister, while Emir 'Abdullah ibn 'Abd al-Aziz, the commander of the national guard was given the post of second deputy. The son of the murdered King Faisal, Emir Saud Ibn Faisal was appointed minister of foreign affairs, while the brother of the heir to the throne, Fayd Emir Nayf, became the minister of the interior. On 3 April 1975, King Khalid signed a decree to transfer to Fahd all his powers in domestic and foreign policy, at the same time acknowledging that the heir to the throne was the most capable and experienced political figure in the royal family.

A new, very numerous (made of 25 ministers) government of Saudi Arabia headed by the king was formed on 13 October 1975. Seven key ministerial posts were transferred to members of the royal family. The remaining ministers were from the tribal leadership or young technocrats. The only member of the royal family who was removed from the cabinet was Amir Musa'id Ibn 'Abd al-Rahman, the king's uncle who under Faisal had been the minister of finance. This important post was given to Sheikh Muhammed Ali Aba al'Khayl who was considered a person of undistinguished origin. In the new government, Sheikh Ahmad Zaki Yamani kept for himself the position of minister of petroleum and mineral resources that he had occupied for over 10 years already. All the members of the new cabinet were full and equal ministers with the exception of three state ministers without portfolio.

The composition of the government that was formed in October 1975 reflected the struggle for influence between the group of Emir Fahd who considered himself a proponent of "evolutionary absolutism" and Emir 'Abdullah ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz who was the acknowledged leader of the conservative wing.

In December 1975, the government of neighboring Kuwait established control over the Kuwait Oil Company that belonged to the British Petroleum Company and the American Gulf Oil Company. This accelerated an agreement between Aramco and the Saudis on an analogous question. By 1 January 1976 Aramco was to transfer its property to the Saudi government, but this did not occur. As it turned out, because of the lack of local personnel, operating experience and a marketing network outside the country, the Saudi government could not successfully operate the Aramco enterprises. The latter refused to extract oil under conditions of the Saudi contract, and thus was able to keep 40% of the stock.

Saudi Arabia's foreign policy in the second half of the 1970's bore traces of the influence of the conservative forces controlling the situation in the country. The Saudi Arabian government did not hide its negative attitude towards the progressive Arab regimes, although it considered it possible not to concentrate on the contradictions existing among the Arabs in the unsettled nature of the Arab-Israeli conflict. In July 1978, when the situation in the Yemen region became complicated, Saudi Arabia and Egypt convened an emergency session of the League of Arab States. Five decisions were made to employ sanctions against the progressive South Yemen regime. According to press reports, under pressure by Saudi Arabia, the League Council made a decision to counteract the "communist influence in the Arab countries." The so-called Arab Front of Confrontation was also created. Military plans were approved that their initiators intended to implement. The purpose of the Front was to interfere in any Arab country where "communism is openly manifest."

The reactionary circles in Saudi Arabia tried to undermine not only the progressive regimes. In July 1978, the Beirut weekly AL-HURRIYA published a statement by the representatives of the patriotic movements in certain countries of the Arabian

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

peninsula. It stated that in 1975 and 1976, Saudi Arabia "played the primary role in breaking up the parliament in Bahrain and in Kuwait and unceremoniously interferes in the internal affairs of the YAR. Ignoring the disastrous situation of its people, the Saudi government spends fabulous sums to aid rotten dictatorships in Africa."

The statement of the patriotic forces of the Arabian peninsula underlines the threat for the people in this region that is hidden in the creation of notorious "safety blocks" in the regions of the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. Saudi Arabia was an active participant in the formulation of plans to set them up.

In 1977 Saudi Arabia transferred troops to Zaire to fight the rebels in the Shaba province. Ar-Riyad gave financial support to the puppet regime in South Vietnam up until its downfall. Money flowed from Saudi Arabia to the anticommunist organizations in West Europe. The Saudis supplied part of the resources collected for the preparation and conducting of the next conference of the World Anticommunist League in 1978. Together with the United States, the ruling circles in Saudi Arabia attempted to exert pressure on the leaders of a number of West European countries to prevent the participation of communists in their governments, otherwise they threatened to curtail oil supplies and the volume of equipment and arms purchases.

When A. Sadat went to Jerusalem in November 1977, the Arab world turned its gaze to Ar-Riyad to find out what the reaction of the Saudi Arabian government would be. The fact was that Ar-Riyad's position in the Near East settlement question was always distinguished by duplicity and definite inconsistency. Its support of the Arab countries confronting Israel, financial aid to them, and the requirement that Israeli troops be removed from all occupied Arab territories and that all legal rights of the Arab people of Palestine be satisfied on the whole complied with the common goals of eliminating the consequences of the Israeli aggression. At the same time, Saudi Arabia by using its financial potentialities and increased authority, after 1973 attempted to seize the initiative in searching for a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict and find a solution that would strengthen its position and the position of its allies in the Near East.

At the end of September 1978, the U.S. Secretary of State, C. Vance travelled to Saudi Arabia and attempted to sway Ar-Riyad to support the agreements signed by A. Sadat and M. Begin at Camp David. The visit was futile. The Saudis refused to approve the separate deal that did not solve the main questions of the Near East settlement. It therefore did not lead to the establishment of a just and strong peace in the Near East.

Saudi Arabia supported the fall 1978 initiative of Iraq to convene a meeting of the heads of the Arab states to develop a program of counteraction to the Egyptian-Israeli separate deals implemented under the patronage of the United States. In November it participated in the Arab summit conference after discussing with the other Arab countries the separate course of A. Sadat and the agreements he signed at Camp David. It also participated in the work of the conference of ministers of foreign affairs and economics of the Arab countries in Baghdad on 27 March 1979. It formulated measures for an economic boycott and political sanctions against the Egyptian regime. According to the recommendation of this conference, Saudi Arabia recalled its ambassador from Cairo and broke off diplomatic

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

relations with Egypt. It supported the expelling of Egypt from the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, InterArab Investment Bank, Arab Monetary Fund, and other regional organizations.

Saudi Arabia participated in the conference of heads of Arab states and governments in Tunis in November 1979 that confirmed the negative evaluation of Egypt's separate course in the Near East settlement. The Saudi Arabian government continued to believe that without return to the Arabs of all Arab lands occupied by the Israelis in 1967, including East Jerusalem, and satisfaction of the legal rights of the Arab people of Palestine, a just and strong peace would not be established in the Near East.

At the end of November 1979, a group of armed Muslims seized the Grand Mosque in Mecca and the pilgrims who were there. According to Western press reports, this group of Muslims attempted to attract the whole world's attention to the domestic political situation in the country and the violation of the standards of Muslim law by the ruling dynasty and official circles. The attack was put down by force. Sixty-eight participants in the mosque seizure were publicly beheaded in the squares of eight Saudi cities. In February 1980, there were riots among the foreign workers and Shiite community in Saudi Arabia. They condemned the attempt of the United States to involve the Saudis in an anti-Iranian plot. The participants in the demonstrations made demands of a political nature, including, restriction of the monarchy's power and creation of a parliament.

Saudi Arabia regarded the Soviet Union's aid to the friendly people of Afghanistan as a "threat to the Muslim world." Led by the American administration, Saudi Arabia supported the antiSoviet propaganda campaign in the American press and a number of Western countries. At the same time the Saudis were watchful of the increased U.S. military presence in the Indian Ocean and their intention to set up bases in this region. They assumed that the American military bases and aircraft carriers could not guarantee stability and safety, and moreover, could threaten the independence of the states of the Near and Middle East.

COPYRIGHT: Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatel'stva "Nauka", 1980

9035
CSO: 1807

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTERNATIONAL

INTER-IMPERIALIST COMPETITION IN LATIN AMERICA ANALYZED

Kiev UKRAYINS'KYI ISTORYCHNYI ZHURNAL in Ukrainian No 1, Jan 81 (signed to press 20 Jan 81) pp 89-96

[Article by V.P. Kyrychenko (Kiev): "Intensification of Inter-Imperialist Competition in Latin America in the 1970's"]

[Text] A characteristic feature of contemporary Latin American historical development is a considerable increase in the struggle of a number of countries on the continent towards the strengthening of their economic and political independence and for social progress. Along with the achievements of true socialism, a rise of international communist and worker movement, this struggle undermines the positions of world imperialism considerably, first of all its stronghold -- the United States.

However, this course of historical development elicits violent imperialist anger, trying at whatever cost to stop the national-liberation movements and resorting to further neocolonial politics, direct export of counter-revolution, etc. Speaking in Berlin at an international scientific conference "Joint struggle of the labor and national-liberation movements against imperialism, for social progress," Politbureau CC CPSU membership candidate, CC CPSU Secretary B.M. Ponomar'ov stressed that in "the 70's the problem of liquidating the whole neocolonial structure of exploitation became the order of the day" in response to which "imperialism attempted to 'repeat history', that is, again provide itself with an opportunity to freely exploit those countries which liberated themselves."¹

Internal economic problems of the whole capitalist system became even more critical in the 1970's. "In those years especially," noted the CC CPSU General Secretary, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman L.I. Brezhnev at the 25th CPSU Congress, "an economic crises erupted in the capitalist world, the acuteness and depth of which even according to bourgeois activists could be compared only to the crisis at the beginning of the thirties."² Its considerable intensification brought forth an increase in the expansion of international monopolies and an emphasis on inter-imperialist competition in developing countries. Latin America especially is one of those regions where in the last few years competition is particularly evident. First of all there is the clash on the continent between United States interests on one side and Japanese and Western European interests on the other. Large resources in valuable mineral and agricultural raw material, a promising market for ready-made products, a wide field of activity for foreign capital provide the monopolists with favorable opportunities to obtain maximal profits in this area of the world.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Because the United States consider Latin America part of their sphere of influence they try to prevent competition in the area.

The fall of the colonial system following the rise of the national-liberation movement, and the emergence of young independent countries markedly decreased imperialist opportunities in Asia and Africa. Raw material and energy and currency crises forced countries such as West Germany, France, Italy and Japan to look for new sources of income, new spheres of capital allocation with the result that in the 1970's the issue of a new division in spheres of influence in the capitalist world became the order of the day, including also Latin America. In addition, the so-called small states [countries] of Western Europe and such countries as the South African Republic, Canada, Israel and Australia also "noticed" Latin America, which led to a further increase of inter-imperialist struggle there. Not only individual countries, monopolies and banks oppose each other but also whole economic state blocs.

All of this confirms V.I. Lenin's position that "to the numerous 'old' motives of colonial politics the financial capital added the struggle for raw material sources, for capital export, for 'spheres of influence' -- that is spheres of convenient agreements, concessions, monopolistic profits, etc., and finally for an economic territory in general."³ U.S. competitors are trying to take advantage of the conflicts between the United States and the Latin American states striving to escape the North American dictates by changing the direction of their external economic ties. All this affects the acuteness of the inter-imperialist struggle in the region now. Concurrently, under the pressure of old and new competitors, the United States are trying to change tactics, find new methods and measures for preserving their positions. Their competitors are not far behind, continuously renewing their expansion arsenal in the Latin American countries which, in turn, also increases the inter-imperialist competition on the continent.

Latin America was and remains the chief object of U.S. neocolonialism. In 1979 private U.S. capital investments in this region were estimated at 30 billion dollars, which amounts to two-thirds of all foreign private investments there. The U.S. military-industrial complex obtains there 50 to 70 percent of its strategic raw material.⁴

Economic dependence of continent countries on the United States was caused by the expansion of American monopolies. Thus, in 1977 40 percent of industrial production on the continent fell to the lot of North American companies, of which close to 90 percent in chemical industry production, 80 percent metal working and machine construction.⁵ The monopolistic U.S. capital controls a third of the manufacturing and four-fifths of the region's mining-extraction industry. Enterprises which belong to the United States yield one-fifth of the gross national product and provide the same fraction of export for Latin American countries. This provides the U.S. monopolies with huge profits: for each invested dollar American imperialists receive three to four and even more dollars, whereas in Canada they receive 92 cents, and in Western Europe 62 cents.⁶ In 1971-1978 American investors pumped out of the continent 35 billion dollars which is more than the total sum of their capital in the region.⁷

The series of perceptible defeats for U.S. imperialism in North-Eastern Asia and Africa, a rise in the national-liberation movement in Latin America, and the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

policy of a number of countries on this continent to change the direction of their external economic ties promoted a marked weakening in U.S. positions in the region at the beginning of the seventies. Although in the post-war period United States continue to retain first place in Latin America as to the extent of capital investment, state and private credit and foreign trade, still the specific weight of U.S. monopolies in the total sum of foreign financing sources and in foreign trade of continent countries began to decrease to some extent. This may be explained first of all by an increase in the foreign economic expansion of Western European countries and Japan in this region.

A further rise in the inter-imperialist struggle in Latin American countries characteristic of the seventies is attaining special acuteness and tension in industry, credit and foreign trade, or in the struggle for spheres of capital application, markets and raw material sources. Special activity particularly in the struggle for spheres of capital application may be noted in the neocolonial actions of countries members of the European Economic Association [EEA]. Within the framework of this organization a series of specialized organs were created back in the sixties for the stimulation of economic ties with Latin American countries. They are the European Committee for Cooperation with Latin America and numerous Latin American sections in the EEA commission. In 1972 a special committee within the European Economic Association was created -- the "EEA -- Andean Group". All these organs systematically discuss problems of economic ties with countries of the continent, especially "assistance" programs, investment and trade expansion and coordination, deal with trade and economic delegations, missions, experts, hold meetings with [country] representatives, etc. During the 1970's leaders of the European Economic Association visited all Latin American countries with the goal of establishing contacts with official and business circles of the various states on the continent.

In their struggle with the U.S. monopolies the EEA countries take advantage of the dissatisfaction of Latin American countries with American imperialism. Along with this in the battle for Latin America they offer relatively higher commodity competitive power, more specific (compared to the United States) terms of delivery for certain types of industrial equipment and machinery, more favorable conditions for obtaining credit and loans, etc. One of the comparatively new ways of penetrating Latin America by capitalist countries of Western Europe is their utilization of the continent's integration processes as well as various regional economic groups, especially the Andean pact.

Table 1 which provides data on the rise in private investment of developed capitalist countries on the continent in the 1970's testifies to an increase in the inter-imperialist struggle for spheres of capital application in Latin America.³

Table 1

Countries	1970	1972	1974	1976	1978	1980*
USA (mill.dol.)	12961	14897	19491	25739	27142	30160
England (mill.pounds)	497.3	479.3	491.1	501.2	540.8	551.9
West Germany(mill.marks)	3300	3711	4701	5214	6620	7032
Japan (mill.dol.)	559	989	2510	3301	4026	5061

14 *according to preliminary data

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Western European and Japanese monopolies directed their capital into the manufacturing industry, since the fall of export prices for raw material, comparatively low work productivity, the rapid development of the scientific-technical revolution led to a decrease in profits from Latin American extracting industry -- a traditional sphere of foreign capital allocation. Hiding behind the slogan "help in the continent's industrialization", Western European and Japanese investors met with relatively insignificant social-political opposition. To some extent the Latin American countries favored manufacturing industry investment, introducing additional privileges for this purpose. This provided U.S. competitors with new profits.

Western European and Japanese monopolies applied a series of measures towards the regulation of their activity in continent countries so that at least on the surface it would not be associated with the undisguised, predacious exploitation of natural and human resources of the region by the U.S. monopolies. Some concessions were also made to the local bourgeoisie with a long-range goal of securing their support. Making the local large capital and technical intelligentsia representatives part of the cooperative effort, this symbolic national enterprise "flag raising" to some extent weakened the counter-action towards foreign investors.

Pretending to be peacemakers, bearers of progress, Western European, Canadian and Japanese monopolies, retaining their predatory essence, in many instances influence the economic situation in Latin American countries by working out recommendations for their governments regarding trade, additional politics and currency-financial operations.

A marked rise in the inter-imperialist struggle for the continent's markets in the 1970's was outlined by the old-time competitors -- the United States and English monopolies.

Contrary to previous years, in the 1970's English monopolists began to actively allocate their capital into new branches of manufacturing industry, first of all into machine construction and petroleum chemistry. Thus a large petroleum-chemical combine in San Lorenzo (Argentina) was built and is controlled by the English monopoly "Imperial Chemical Industries". Enterprise branches began to crop up more frequently with considerable experience in the organization of internal zonal trade. The "Rolls Royce Motors" company for aviation carrier construction established in Brazil became one of the favorite suppliers for aviation construction companies in Argentina, Chile and Uruguay. British monopolies are particularly insistent on expanding their positions in large Latin American countries such as Argentina, Brazil and Mexico.

A weakening of influence in former colonies and dependent countries in Africa, an increase in the competitive struggle between the United States and member countries of the EEA forced also French monopolists to look for new markets in Latin America. At the beginning of the 1970's twenty to twenty-eight percent of all private French investments in developing countries were directed to the continent. In Brazil alone there are more than 300 active French firms. A special commission was created to prepare recommendations for "economic cooperation" with Latin America which advised in one study the review of politics towards countries of the region, to make them more flexible with consideration of specific peculiarities of each.⁹

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Of course, other capitalist countries of Western Europe also have "their" interests in Latin America. However, the strongest Western European imperialist rivals to the United States on the Latin American continent are the monopolies of the Federated Republic of Germany. They not only renewed their pre-war positions in the region, but also increased them considerably. Appearing at first as United States corporation partners, West German firms later began to demand "equal opportunities" in Latin America openly and even spoke out against the hegemony of American monopolies on the continent. Although U.S. investments are considerably larger than those of West Germany, American companies are faced with a serious and strong competitor.

The continuing and growing expansion of Japanese monopolies in Latin America is based on such factors as the rapid development of the country's economy, urgent needs for many types of natural raw material, difficulties with the sale of industrial products, a sharp increase in land prices and cruel internal legislation on restricting investment activity in connection with the pollution of natural environment. In "the battle for Latin America" the Japanese monopolistic capital utilizes various measures and methods: providing continent countries with large, long-term credits for building important industrial facilities, considerable purchases of traditional Latin American export goods, extensive participation in mixed companies, partnership with local businessmen, etc. Japanese industrial products noted for their high quality are of great competitive value.

The period researched is characterized by an increase in the inter-imperialist struggle for Latin American markets. This, in turn, is stimulated by the struggle of capitalist countries for spheres of capital allocation in the region. Although the United States continue to maintain the leading role as the goods exporter on the continent markets, noticeable changes did occur in the correlation of forces. The EEA corporations are particularly successful in competing with American monopolies, thanks mostly to their branch structure of capital export characterized by allocating funds into comparatively new and promising branches of Latin American industry. In addition this promotes an increase in the export of machines and equipment essential for these branches from the EEA countries.

Data in Table No. 2 testifying to the increase in the struggle of inter-imperialist countries for Latin American markets provide the dynamics of their export to the continent (in % from the total sum of capitalist export into the countries of the region).¹⁰

Table 2

Countries-Exporters	1970	1973	1975	1978	1980*
United States	46	44	42	38	36
EEA countries	31	30	32	36	38
Japan	8	12	15	18	21
Other countries	15	14	11	8	5

*according to preliminary data

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The inter-imperialist struggle on the continent is also evident in the financial sphere since the meaning of banks and bank credit acquires particular importance during the conduct of economic expansion politics by foreign corporations. Banks in particular assist the monopolists actively in their neocolonial politics, to withstand the acute competitive struggle more successfully. Thus, the English bank "Bank of London and South America", West German banks "Dresden Bank", "Deutsche Bank" are conducting an active attack on the North American banks and their branches. French banks "Banque Francaise et Italienne pour la Amerique du Sur", "Banque Nacional pour le Commerce et l'Industrie", and "Banque Rotschild" have their branches in almost all countries of Latin America. Japanese financiers joined this struggle at a relatively later date. Large banks such as "Mitsui", "Mitsubishi", "Sumimoto", and "Fudzi" gradually shifted to extensive financial operations in Latin American countries.¹¹

Inter-imperialist struggle increased also in the patent markets. Concentration of scientific-technical revolution achievements in the hands of foreign monopolists gives them an opportunity to obtain high profits. English monopolies alone obtain an annual income of almost 2.3 million pounds from the sale of patents and licenses in the region.¹² Small wonder, then, that the struggle on patent markets is becoming more tense. In recent times the income of U.S. monopolies from the realization of licenses increased by more than double. English, West German, French, Italian and Japanese monopolists spare no effort to attain licensing agreements with Latin American firms. For example, the Italian monopoly "Pirelli" circumvented U.S. companies and made an agreement for providing "technical assistance" to the following companies: "Condutores Electricos" (Mexico), "Compania Industrial Brasileira" (Brazil), and "Compania Industrial" and "Commercial de Condutores" (Argentina).¹³

Inter-imperialist struggle in energy and raw material sources, of which the lion's share was previously centered in the hands of U.S. capital, is becoming more acute.

In the 1970's EEA countries especially became comparatively large consumers of the continent's mineral and agricultural raw material and this, in turn, provoked counter-action on the part of U.S. monopolies. Also increasing is the competitive struggle for predominance in extraction and processing branches of iron ore, crude oil and atomic raw material, for establishing control over the most valuable and promising types of raw material. An example is the inter-imperialist struggle for crude oil in Latin America which provides more than half of all primary energy sources of the continent.¹⁴ Among monopolies involved with crude oil extraction and processing in the region a leading place is occupied by the Rockefeller companies "Standard Oil of New Jersey", "Standard Oil of California" and others, which in 1972 extracted 36 percent of the crude oil on the continent. More than 40 branch companies of this group, such as "Creole Petroleum Co.", "Esso", "International Petroleum", "Lago Oil and Transport" and others are, in fact, active in almost all Latin American countries.¹⁵ Since the beginning of the 1970's U.S. monopoly positions were also attacked by the Anglo-Dutch company "Royal Dutch Shell" which controls one-fourth of the crude oil extraction in Venezuela and has 44 branches on the continent.¹⁶ Other foreign companies try to follow closely, especially "Gulf Oil Corporation", "Texaco", "Mobil Oil Corp.", "Oxidental Petroleum", "Phillips Petroleum" and "Continental Oil".

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Of course, it would be erroneous to see massive and continuous conflicts and competition in the inter-imperialist struggle on the Latin American continent. Imperialist tendencies towards conspiracy, to the union of their forces against the growing national-liberation movement must also be considered. In addition to the narrow, covetous interests of the national bourgeoisie of each country, common imperialist interests exist in the name of which competitiveness and conflict are sometimes forgotten and union of forces is achieved for the sake of a common goal. "There are two tendencies," stressed V.I. Lenin, "one which makes the union of all imperialists inevitable, the second -- which pits some imperialists against others, -- two tendencies, neither of which has a strong foundation."¹⁷

None of the capitalist efforts are able to liquidate imperialistic competition. As was stressed at the 25th CPSU Congress: "Governments of capitalist countries make one effort after another to ease off the competition...But such is the nature of imperialism that each tries to attain superiority at the cost of another, forcing his will upon another. Disagreements appear in new forms, competitiveness erupts with new force."¹⁸

Economic, political and ideological imperialism expansion in Latin America promotes a strengthening of the democratic and anti-imperialist struggle on the continent. This struggle is taking place in a qualitatively new international situation which is characterized by a growth in the power of socialist countries. The marked successes of socialist Cuba in building a new society are a vivid example for the peoples of the region.

Fighting actively against imperialist attack, progressive governments of a number of South American countries under worker influence are expropriating and nationalizing U.S. monopolies' properties, restricting and regulating their activity, attempting to introduce uniform conditions for foreign capital allocation, equal economic relations with the United States and other imperialist states so as to establish a new international economic order; they are developing economic integration, introducing progressive social transformations in the interests of the poor masses, are creating regional economic organizations without the participation of the United States, are expanding a mutually convenient cooperation, and economic, scientific and cultural ties with the USSR and other socialist countries.

Our country's Leninist external politics, the readiness of the Soviet government to provide help to nations fighting for their independence respond to the living interests of countries on the Latin American continent. "We," comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated from the 25th CPSU Congress tribunal, "support the aspirations of these countries towards strengthening their political and economic independence and welcome their greater role in international life."¹⁹ The continent's progressive forces are relying on this support in their continuously growing anti-imperialist struggle.

FOOTNOTES

1. PRAVDA, 21 Oct 1980.
2. Reports of the 25th CPSU Congress, 1976, p 31.
3. V.I. Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Phase of Capitalism," Collected Works, vol 27, p 396.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

4. IZVESTIYA, Oct 1978; U.N. Multinational Corporations in World Development, New York, 1979, p 187.
5. WORLD PROBLEMS AND SOCIALISM, No 11, 1979, p 49.
6. PRAVDA, 29 Sep 1979.
7. LATIN AMERICA, No 2, 1980, p. 85.
8. Calculated by the author from: Survey of Current Business, 1970-1980; Britain's Business, 1970-1980; Britains International Investment Position, 1970-1980; Overseas Transactions, 1970-1980; Deutsche Aussenpolitik, 1970-1980; The Japan Economic Review, 1970-1980.
9. Survey of Current Business, no 8, 1976, p 44.
10. Calculated by the author from: U.N. Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, 1970-1980; Yearbook of International Trade Statistics, 1970-1980; CEPAL. Estudio Economico de America Latina, 1970-1980.
11. See: "Latinskaya Amerika: Valyutno-finansovoe polozhenie v 70-kh godakh" [Latin America: Currency-financial situation in the 70's]; "Inostranny kapital v yekonomike Latinskoy Ameriki" [Foreign Capital in the Economy of Latin America], 1978, pp 109-110.
12. THE TIMES, Mar 19, 1978.
13. Z.I. Romanova, "Novye yavleniya v bor'be za latinoamerikanskiy rynek" [New Developments in the Struggle for the Latin American Market], LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 5, 1970, p.49.
14. La Energia en America Latina. Lima, 1969, p 13.
15. See e.g., EL DIA Mexico, 1979, de Sept., 3.
16. Petroleo y Minería de Venezuela, 1971, No 275.
17. V.I. Lenin, Report on foreign policy at the combined meeting of All Union Central Executive Committee [7] and Moscow Soviet, May 14, 1918. Vol 36, p313.
18. Reports of the 25th CPSU Congress, p 31.
19. Ibid., p. 23.

COPYRIGHT: Vydavnytstvo "Naukova Dumka", "Ukrayins'kyi istorychnyy zhurnal", 1981

9443
CSC: 1811

19

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INTERNATIONAL

BOOK VIEWS PROSPECTS OF COOPERATION IN FIGHTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Moscow PROBLEMY SOTRUDNICHESTVA GOSUDARSTV V BOR'BE S MEZHDUNARODNYM TERRORIZMOM in Russian 1979 (signed to press 5 Sep 79) pp 1-2, 168

[Table of contents and brief description of book by Ye. G. Lyakhov]

[Excerpt] Title Page:

Title: PROBLEMY SOTRUDNICHESTVA GOSUDARSTV V BOR'BE S MEZHDUNARODNYM TERRORIZMOM (Problem of State Cooperation in the Fight with International Terrorism)

Publisher: "Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya"

Place and year of publication: Moscow, 1979

Signed to press Date: 5 Sep 79

Number of Copies Published: 15,000

Number of Pages: 168

Brief Description:

This book examines the nature of international terrorism and analyzes interstate measures, conventions and agreements concerning the fight with international terrorism. It shows how disturbing current developments, such as plane hijackings, kidnaping of diplomats, explosions in embassies, the sending of letter-bombs, etc., demand more effective cooperation between states in combatting international terrorism.

Table of Contents	Page
Introduction	3
Chapter 1. On Defining International Terrorism	12
1. Problems of defining the concept of "international terrorism"	12
2. Terrorism as an international crime	33

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Chapter 2.	Basic Causes of International Terrorism	67
1.	Criteria for research	67
2.	Reactionary concepts of the sources of international terrorism	72
3.	Basic causes of international terrorism	84
Chapter 3.	International-legal Forms and Means of Combatting International Terrorism	98
1.	Problems of legal contractual state cooperation in combatting international terrorism	101
2.	The idea of an international criminal court	142
Conclusion		154
Footnotes		157

COPYRIGHT: "Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1979

CSO: 1807

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

REGIONAL

TURKMENS STUDY USE OF WATER, LAND RESOURCES

Ashkhabad TURKMENISTAN KOMMUNISTI in Turkmen No 12, 1980 pp 68-72

[Article by K. Bayryev: "Legal Norms of the Utilization of Land and Water"]

[Text] The Leninist decree "on the land" played a great role in the socialist changes carried out in our country. This decree, which was accepted by the 2nd All-Russia Congress of Soviets, was not only a legal act on the nationalization of land on a socialist basis, but was also one of the most important state measures directed at basically changing agriculture, and at rationally using and conserving the land and water resources of the country. The Communist Party and Soviet government is logically activating Leninist principles for the consequential utilization and conservation of natural resources appropriate to the changing conditions of modern times.

The legal organization for the preservation of nature rests on the basic law of the country. According to the Constitution of the USSR and the Constitution of the Turkmen SSR, the land, the wealth under the land, the water resources and the forests are the property of the state, in other words, the property of all the people. According to this, the objects of nature must be utilized in a planned manner in order to increase the social wealth and raise the degree of the population's material and cultural standard of living. Means of broadening land reclamation and chemicalization and instituting complex mechanization to production processes have been presented in decrees of the XXVth congress of the CPSU. The propitious natural conditions in our country are being safeguarded by a number of legal technically organized means. Measures aimed at defending and conserving natural resources, organizing the utilization of land and water and establishing responsibility for all kinds of legal violations have been formulated in the enacted laws.

As is known, the March Plenum (1965) of the CC CPSU began a new phase in the development of the Leninist agrarian policy of the party. In the period after this plenum the agriculture of the country made a great stride forward economically and socially. Some of the pressing questions pertaining to agriculture were resolved, the material-technical basis was laid, mechanization and land reclamation developed with a faster tempo. On the basis of mutual economic cooperation and the integration of agroindustry the transition of all agriculture to the present industrial base by means of the further specialization and construction of agricultural production is the true way for the rational use of land and water. These

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

and similar successes gained were analyzed in detail and approved at the November (1979) Plenum of the CC CPSU. Along with this the Plenum of the Central Committee noted the existence of shortcomings in agriculture and stressed that the further development of agricultural production depended to a great extent on the rational use and conservation of land and water.

Land reclamation work enters into the complex of measures to improve the condition of the land and to raise the yield of sowing areas. In the decree accepted on 16 June 1966 by the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers "On the broader development of land reclamation in order to take an abundant and steady harvest of grains and similar agricultural products", and in later decrees of the party and government a broad program for land reclamation is put forth. Those using the land must observe the laws pertaining to land and water, preserve the soil by all means and raise the yield of every hectare, struggle against erosion, follow the agricultural rules of cultivating and sowing, use manures and toxic chemicals cautiously and apply the land reclamation measures logically. As for those using water, they are responsible for the water sources being in the best condition, for the rational use of water resources and for preventing water impurity or diminution of water supply. An equivalent responsibility is shouldered by those exploiting underground wealth or animal wealth.

All of these measures take into consideration ecological demands which are activated by the interaction between society and nature, because of the major influence of society on nature in the sphere of exploiting nature's bounty, and which arise from the necessity of detailed legal regulation. The ecological question is dependent on the character of ensuring the national use of land and water as the basic means of agricultural production. Stressing the necessity to conserve land which is used for agricultural needs and is productively exploited, comrade L.I. Brezhnev said at the Third All-Union Congress of Kolkhoz Workers "conserving the soil is the work of our entire society. One must view any kind of damage to the land as having been committed against society. Whoever violates the land or treats it carelessly weakens the original material basis of the people's well-being."

The question of ensuring the rational use of and protection of agricultural lands and the rational exploitation of water for agricultural needs has special importance at the present time. A special place in the law is given to the exploitation of land for agricultural needs. As stressed in the principles of the law regarding land, lands recognized as appropriate for agricultural needs must be given over, first of all, to agricultural enterprises, organizations and administrations. At the same time, the applicable law forbids cutting down on the amount of land or making it less fertile.

Unfortunately, however, in some kolkhozes and sovkhoses of our republic there are situations in which irrigated lands are carelessly exploited. This brings wetness to one part of the agricultural land, and the soil undergoes erosion. In such a situation a part of the land is lost to agriculture and reduces the possibility of increasing the production of agricultural products. For example, as a result of the careless use of irrigated lands in some rayons of Ashkhabad Oblast 11.4 thousand hectares were lost to agriculture in 1976 and 61 thousand hectares in 1977.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

One also comes across data on land in sovkhoses and kolkhozes being snapped up in order to illegally increase the size of private plots or by giving private plots to families with no relationship to the enterprise. For example, in 1979 on the Engels kolkhoz in Vekilbazar Rayon it turned out that parcels of land were divided up and given to non-kolkhoz members. Only after a critical article appeared in the press were such practises forbidden and illegally allocated lands were returned to the kolkhoz.

A negative situation such as illegally taking agricultural lands for other purposes must categorically come to an end. According to the laws, special decrees of state organs are authorized to allocate land parcels for state and society needs at certain times only after taking economic plans into consideration. In the law it is explained that the way is open to allocate the lands which are being used by kolkhozes, sovkhoses, agricultural enterprises, organizations and administrations only under special circumstances. Taking lands used by kolkhozes can only be done with the permission of a general meeting of the kolkhoz members. Taking parcels of land from the state, cooperative or social enterprises, organizations subordinate to sovkhoses, the Union or the republic can be done only with the agreement of the users of the land and the relevant ministries and departments of the USSR or the Turkmenistan SSR.

Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said: "We must look after the land very carefully, we must divide and allocate land for the organization of enterprises cleverly and economically, we cannot get around this. Together with this, we must not reduce the size of productive areas but must constantly increase it."

The laws on taking land from kolkhozes and sovkhoses for needs other than agriculture must be rigidly carried out, because it must guarantee the interests of the users of the land and contribute to the stability of the laws on using lands for agriculture.

In the period of the building of communism the development of social production and urbanization and the raising of the material and cultural level of the population of the country has increased the need for water to a great extent and stepped up the importance of exploiting water rationally and protecting it. The extent to which water can be guaranteed to enterprises in our republic and the careful protection of water resources possess decisive importance. Because of this a very great role is played by the V.I. Lenin Karakum Canal. The canal has changed the republic socio-economically and refreshed its image; significant possibilities for further increasing irrigated areas have opened up. Irrigated areas in the canal zone have increased two and one half times and have reached 450 thousand hectares--in other words, with the coming of canal water irrigated lands in the republic have reached 950 thousand hectares. In the first years of the establishment of the republic irrigated lands totalled roughly 250 thousand hectares. This achievement came about as a result of the great tempo of the building of water holdings.

Reconstruction of the traditions of irrigation under conditions wherein water is always drying up in the republic and the orderly exploitation of water possess primary importance. Great attention is given to the planned organization and

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

rational exploitation of water resources. This, in its turn, strengthens the possibilities for the preservation of water resources. The rational exploitation of water which is the most valuable natural resource is a major economic question in our republic. At the present tempo of conquering new lands, it cannot be assured fully that these lands have sufficient water resources to extract a maximal harvest. Much water is lost because of the negative situation of the irrigation network in some areas, and because the irrigation network silts up.

One meets situations where the laws on water utilization as specified in the plan and the norms and rules for using water are not fulfilled. There are means for the further improvement of the situation of land reclamation and for economizing on water connected with progressive principles in irrigating crops.

One of the important problems in our republic is the development of collector-drainage networks under conditions of irrigated farming. The area in our republic covered by collector-drainage networks is over three thousand hectares. However, in some rayons of our republic the condition of the collector-drainage system does not satisfy present needs. Scientists have shown that when the soil becomes saline cotton productivity drops by 20 percent. As is known, treating this question carelessly does great damage to the enterprise; earlier, hundreds of hectares of fertile soil were not subject to yearly crop rotation and the yield of agricultural crops worsened. Because the collector-drainage network is still insufficient and due to the poor condition of existing collectors, crop fields in different parts become damp and most of the lands become saline. The work of preventing the moisturization and salinization gives a good result when combined with measures to fight water and soil erosion, to use agro-technical and sanitary-technical measures, to plant protective tree zones, and with similar special measures from the rules of the codex of the Turkmenistan SSR on water.

However, in some cases, because the work is done superficially and carelessly, lands are not protected ecologically and ponds and irrigation ditches fill with toxic chemicals.

As stated in article 117 of the code on water of the Turkmenistan SSR, it is obligatory on state water proprietor systems, directorates, kolkhozes, sovkhoses as well as enterprises, organizations and administrations, to prevent danger to water from manures and toxic chemicals and to comply with the regulations on the use of toxic chemicals. In our opinion, it is necessary to strenghten responsibility for the rational exploitation and preservation of water resources and, with the goal of preserving land tracts in good condition, to work out economic stimuli for the exploitation of land and water.

Since water is a gift from nature we must do away with the careless use of crop water and--in some conditions--even reduce watering of cotton. Such a "principle" of work does great damage to the economy. Because of this it is necessary to increase the law's power so that the water not be exploited carelessly.

There are a number of articles in the Criminal Code of the Turkmenistan SSR on carefully looking after land and water and conserving them. Responsibility for unauthorized ownership of land or water, for the criminal use of irrigated lands, or the unauthorized use of state-held lands, for the damage of water control equipment or parts, is penalized. For example, for unauthorized possession of land any

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

produce is confiscated and the fine for the guilty is 500 rubles, for careless and criminal exploitation of irrigated land, the guilty are fined up to 500 rubles, and for the unauthorized use of water control units, the fine is up to 50 rubles.

If the regulations on exploitation of land and water are violated and material damage is done to the state and the users of the land, the guilty organizations or men are obligated to pay compensation for the full extent of the damages. Principles of soviet civil law on the basis of the relevant articles in the Civil Code of the Turkmenistan SSR on payment of damages are applicable. In violating regulation on the rational exploitation of land and water, guilty enterprises, organizations, administrations and citizens, as a means of establishing appropriate responsibility for the use of land and water, can be deprived of the possibility of using a tract of land or source of water.

However, in violating the regulations on the rational use of land and water and the conservation of water resources, it is necessary to note that the guilty have evaded responsibility. In many cases such useless facts are to be decided on only with the agreement of the parties. One must prevent the attempts to evade responsibility for violating the regulation on exploiting water and land and strengthen the question of control.

9676
CSO: 1810

END

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY