

Approved For Release 1999/09/26 : CIA-RDP86T00608R000200160018-5

TCM 75-42

C

1 of 1

Trends in Communist Media

22 Oct 75

No. 42

~~Confidential~~

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST
INFORMATION SERVICE

Trends in Communist Media

~~Confidential~~

22 OCTOBER 1975
(VOL. XXVI, NO. 42)

This report is based exclusively on foreign media materials and is published by FBIS without coordination with other U.S. Government components.

NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION
Unauthorized Disclosure Subject to Criminal Sanctions

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue



CONTENTS

KISSINGER IN PRC

"Friendly" Meeting With Mao Highlights Peking Visit	1
Moscow Notes Secretary's Visit, PRC Attacks on Detente	2
DRV Reports Arrival in PRC, Criticizes U.S. Policy in Asia	3

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM

PRAVDA Recalls 1905 General Strike, Says Tactic Valid Today	4
---	---

WORLD ECONOMY

Moscow Wary of West's Approach to Paris Economic Talks	6
--	---

USSR-EGYPT

Moscow Cites Sadat on U.S. Ties, Arms "Escalation" to Israel	8
--	---

PORTUGAL

Moscow Replays PCP Complaints About Moves Against Left	11
--	----

VIETNAM

PRG To Allow Repatriation of Americans Still in South Vietnam	13
PRG Media Charge U.S. "Henchmen" Among Returning Refugees	14

KOREA

DPRK Maintains Negative Stance on North-South Relations	15
Moscow Cool on KWP Anniversary, Peking Treatment Standard	16

EASTERN EUROPE

Leaders' Speeches in Gdansk Reflect Concern Over Public Unrest	18
Belgrade Leadership Renews Campaign Against "Covinformists"	19

USSR

Soviet Media Criticize Sakharov, Nobel Award	21
Feud Between Mathematical Economists, Gosplan Revived	22

CHINA

Agricultural Conference Ends, Sets Farm Mechanization Goals	24
Peking Commemorates 40th Anniversary of the "Long March"	25

NOTE

Soviet Media on U.S. Grain Deal	28
---	----

APPENDIX

Moscow, Peking Broadcast Statistics	i
---	---

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue

22 OCTOBER 1975

- 1 -

KISSINGER IN PRC

"FRIENDLY" MEETING WITH MAO HIGHLIGHTS PEKING VISIT

Peking treatment of Secretary Kissinger during his visit to the PRC, begun on 19 October, has been highlighted by a "friendly" meeting with Mao Tse-tung on the 21st. Prior to the meeting with Mao, the Kissinger party's visit had occasioned correct Chinese protocol treatment, though Foreign Minister Chiao Kuan-hua's remarks at the usual welcoming banquet contained some less than cordial overtones.

The secretary, as in the past, was welcomed at the airport by a Chinese delegation led by Chiao Kuan-hua, and Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping attended the welcoming banquet on 19 October. NCNA reported that Teng and Chiao held talks with Kissinger on the 20th and 21st. The NCNA report of the meeting with Mao duplicated the agency's report of Kissinger's last session with Mao on 12 November 1973 in noting the "friendly" atmosphere and pointing out that the chairman asked Kissinger "to convey his regards" to the U.S. President. Kissinger had not been received by Mao during his most recent China visit in November 1974. Kissinger thus far has not met with the ailing Premier Chou En-lai, who has made no public appearances in recent weeks.

Chiao Kuan-hua's toast at the welcoming banquet, as transmitted by NCNA, departed from past practice in omitting introductory words of welcome for the secretary. Chiao instead launched into a standard Chinese warning--not seen before during a Kissinger visit--that detente was an "illusion" that should not blind the world to hegemonism--a code word for Soviet expansionism.

Chiao's toast was similar to Chinese welcoming remarks in the past when it observed that "on the whole, Sino-U.S. relations have moved forward in the last few years," and that while there are bilateral differences, the two sides "have common points as well." Chiao recalled that "a new page" was turned in relations between the two countries with President Nixon's 1972 visit to China and the issuance of the Shanghai communique. But Chiao made no mention at all of President Ford, although in a similar toast during Kissinger's visit last November, the Chinese foreign minister had noted "with appreciation" President Ford's commitment to the principles outlined in the Shanghai communique.*

* Kissinger and other U.S. officials have said that preparations for President Ford's visit to China next month were the prime reason for the secretary's current visit. However, Chinese media have not in recent months independently mentioned a visit by the President, a visit which had been agreed on for 1975, according to the communique on Kissinger's Peking trip last November.

- 2 -

Chiao also showed a degree of concern regarding U.S. adherence to the principles of the Shanghai communique. Last November he had expressed confidence that Kissinger's visit would "contribute to the further implementation" of the principles. But now stressing China's sincerity, he said that relations would improve if "our two sides" observed the principles in practice. Chiao's remarks came a week after Peking had accused the United States--in a 13 October statement by a spokesman for the PRC Foreign Ministry's information department--of violating the Shanghai communique "principles" by refusing to stop activities by nationalist Tibetan groups in the United States.

NCNA as usual reported Secretary Kissinger's reply toast, though it did not refer to his speaking a Chinese sentence in the toast, as reported by the Western press.

MOSCOW NOTES SECRETARY'S VISIT, PRC ATTACKS ON DETENTE

As with Kissinger's past Peking visits, Soviet media have covered the current trip discreetly, primarily through brief pickups of Western reports. Moscow's Mandarin broadcasts to China on the 18th and the 20th noted that the main topics of the talks would be President Ford's planned November visit to Peking and the alleged Chinese concern that the United States maintain its military presence in Asia. A TASS account of Kissinger's meeting with Mao on 21 October, based on Western sources, noted Mao's reported criticism of the Soviet Union as an "aggressive power" and Peking's use of the visit for "public attacks on detente."

During the secretary's past visits to Peking, Moscow has often highlighted evidence of a cozy Sino-U.S. relationship. Thus, during his November 1973 visit, the Moscow domestic radio noted a REUTER report that Chairman Mao had received no other foreign statesman as often as he had Kissinger. In contrast, some strains were indicated currently when the 22 October TASS report on meetings with Mao and Teng Hsiao-ping cited "officials in Henry Kissinger's party" as saying that "the Chinese side shows no understanding of the significance of the final act which was signed in Helsinki." At the same time, a 21 October PRAVDA article, available only in a TASS summary, asserted that China was using Secretary Kissinger's visit for "a new wave of anti-Sovietism and attacks on the policy of detente."

Recent Soviet comment has described a certain stagnation in the process of normalizing Sino-U.S. relations and has seemed to reflect a greater confidence in Moscow that there are inherent limits upon Sino-U.S. cooperation that would minimize its potential harm to

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue.

CONFIDENTIAL

22 OCTOBER 1975

- 3 -

Soviet interests. The 17 September LITERARY GAZETTE observed that "the voices of realistic observers" were being heard increasingly often in Western discussions of China, after an initial period of discovery when life there was portrayed in "idyllic tones." IZVESTIYA observer Aleksandr Bovin had assured Moscow TV viewers last July that "realistic" politicians in the West understood that China's ability to upset Soviet detente policy was "fairly limited."

DRV REPORTS ARRIVAL IN PRC, CRITICIZES U.S. POLICY IN ASIA

Following the pattern established during Secretary Kissinger's last two trips to the PRC, North Vietnamese media acknowledged his arrival in Peking in a brief Vietnamese-language radio report on 20 October which noted that he would be in China for four days. An earlier Hanoi radio broadcast in English on the 18th had taken note of the secretary's "Asian tour" without mentioning his scheduled China visit. Explaining that Kissinger was reviewing U.S. policies in the area, the broadcast had warned that despite the phasing out of SEATO, U.S. "scheming" was continuing and Washington still hoped to maintain military bases in Thailand and was sending weapons to South Korea and tightening its alliance with Japan.

DRV media were first noted to have acknowledged a Kissinger visit to China in November 1973, when Hanoi radio similarly reported his Peking arrival and, after he left, cited his talks with Chinese officials and reception by Chairman Mao.* The secretary's subsequent trip to China in November 1974 prompted less-detailed acknowledgment in Hanoi media. Prior to November 1973 the Hanoi media had maintained a disapproving silence on Kissinger's Peking contacts as well as President Nixon's 1972 trip to China, and had indirectly criticized the Sino-U.S. rapprochement in polemical comment warning against U.S. duplicity.

* Kissinger's November 1973 trip to Peking is discussed in the TRENDS of 21 November 1973, page 23.

- 4 -

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM

PRAVDA RECALLS 1905 GENERAL STRIKE, SAYS TACTIC VALID TODAY

An endorsement of mass political strikes as an appropriate form of class struggle for communist parties in the West is the apparent message of an article by N. Cherepenin in the 19 October issue of PRAVDA.* Keyed to the observance of the 70th anniversary of the general strike in Russia in 1905, the article averred in its concluding paragraphs that the use of strikes for political purposes has become "one of the proven means of working class struggle." This implied recommendation of militant tactics to Western communist parties recalls the 6 August Zarodov article in PRAVDA which also challenged the validity of moderate tactics, presumably with reference to varied reactions among West European communist parties to the Portuguese situation. Although the present article contains no clear references to such current situations, it seems intended to lend support to a generally aggressive approach to the selection of tactics for communist party activities in the West.

The clearest indication of this militant tendency came in the concluding passages of the article, where the author offered some general observations on the relevance of the 1905 experience to the present day. After asserting that "Marxist-Leninist parties" are now supporting mass strike movements in various capitalist countries, the author quoted Brezhnev as having urged communist parties to "be prepared for any changes in the situation and to use any forms of struggle." The quote is taken from Brezhnev's address on Lenin's centennial which was celebrated on 21 April 1970. It is particularly appropriate as supporting documentation for the current article, since Brezhnev's argument in the relevant passage of his centennial address was that communists should not be satisfied with limited "democratic" goals but should push for full-scale "socialist" revolutions. An argument that the "democratic" and "socialist" stages of the "anti-monopolist struggle" could be merged was one of the key theses advanced by Zarodov.

Another indication that the article represents the more militant approach to communist tactics is the fact that it contains several critical references to moderate political forces which were also targets of Zarodov's denigrations. The author remarked, for example,

* No biographic information is available on Cherepenin and he is not known to have written for publication previously.

22 OCTOBER 1975

- 5 -

after noting the success of the strike movement in Russia, that it was rejected by the "opportunist leaders of Western Social Democracy." Elsewhere, he pointed out that Lenin's development of the strike tactic had been carried out against the opposition of the "opportunists, who strove at all times to confine the struggle to economic tasks."

These apparently polemical aspects of the article are thrown into sharper relief by the blandness of the complementary article on the 1905 general strike carried in IZVESTIYA on 18 October. Written by candidate of historical sciences V. Kirillov, the article was entirely devoted to an inspirational account of the 1905 events with no didactic conclusions drawn regarding current communist tactics.

A review of past issues of PRAVDA covering the period around the 60th anniversary of the general strike in 1965--the current calendar lists 20 October as the anniversary of the event--turned up no commemorative articles.

- 6 -

WORLD ECONOMY

MOSCOW WARY OF WEST'S APPROACH TO PARIS ECONOMIC TALKS

Moscow has treated circumspectly the agreement between Western industrial and developing countries, reached at a 13-15 October meeting in Paris, to hold a 27-nation ministerial-level Conference on International Economic Cooperation. Consistent with previous comment, Soviet media noted approvingly that the conference, scheduled to begin in Paris on 16 December, will deal not only with the question of oil supplies and prices, as originally proposed by the West, but also with other raw materials and problems of development, as demanded by the Third World countries. At the same time, comment has voiced skepticism that the West will be forthcoming in responding to the developing countries' needs.

WESTERN CONCESSION Typifying Moscow's traditional support for the oil-producing and other developing countries vis-a-vis the West, an Arabic-language commentary on the 18th asserted that the agreement to hold the conference along the lines proposed by the developing countries proved the "fairness" of their demand that a dialog with the West must include a comprehensive discussion of trade and economic relations. Similarly, TASS economics commentator Boris Rachkov on the 14th stressed that the previous preparatory meeting in Paris last April had failed because the West "egotistically" sought to limit the conference to solving its own energy problems while ignoring the needs of most of the Third World countries.* Both commentaries portrayed the West's willingness to accept an expanded conference agenda as a reluctant concession in the face of firm Third World resoluteness, as characterized by the oil producers' latest decision to hike prices by 10 percent. The Arabic-language radio commentary, for example, asserted that it took the West six months to yield to the developing countries' just demand after all Western attempts at "pressure, intimidation and coercion" had failed.

Moscow comment, however, has voiced doubt that the West's willingness to accept an expanded conference agenda means that it has

* For details on Soviet comment on the April preparatory conference, see the Supplementary Article "Energy: USSR Plays on Disputes, Warns of U.S. Pressures" in the 18 June 1974 TRENDS.

22 OCTOBER 1975

- 7 -

abandoned its uncooperative stance relating to the developing countries. Yuriy Kharlanov's "International Review" in the 19 October PRAVDA, for example, acknowledged that U.S. representatives at the preparatory meeting had "softened their tone somewhat and adopted, at least verbally, more conciliatory positions" but added: "Nonetheless, American circles linked with the international monopolies are continuing their demands for table-thumping." Similarly, Rachkov, after referring to the recent OPEC oil price increase, asserted that a "certain 'softening'" of the West's position "does not mean that imperialism is not seeking revenge."

COMMISSION FORMAT Underscoring the contention that the West will attempt to avoid responding to Third World needs, Kharlanov pointed to Western unwillingness to accept a proposal of the developing countries that the December conference be held in several stages to deal consecutively with the problems of energy, raw materials, industrial development and financial problems. According to current guidelines, each of these subjects is to be discussed by an individual commission--a format originally suggested by Secretary Kissinger last May. Several commentaries have suggested that the commission format is designed to enable the West to sidestep those issues of greatest concern to the Third World. TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev on the 13th, for example, asserted that Western "maneuvering" would become evident when the two sides attempt to define the specific tasks of the commissions. More specifically, IZVESTIYA's V. Borisov on the 15th contended that the West hoped to avoid discussing the subject of raw materials by relegating it to one of the commissions.

SOVIET ROLE Although Moscow comment has uniformly refrained from discussing direct Soviet interest in the continuing dialog between the West and the developing countries, a D. Volskiy article in the 3 October Russian-language edition of NEW TIMES acknowledged Western comment on the issue. It dismissed as "feeble-minded anti-Sovietism" the assertion of an article in the British daily GUARDIAN that a successful conference would put Moscow in an "awkward position." Volskiy countered that "progressive people could only welcome it, if the capitalist West were actually to elaborate a constructive approach"--a contingency which he described as a "long way off." As a possible counter to Western initiatives, however, the Soviet front organization World Peace Council, according to a brief 10 September TASS report released at the conclusion of the UNCA special session on economic cooperation, announced plans for a "world conference on the problems of developing countries" in October 1976.

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue.

CONFIDENTIAL

U S S R - E G Y P T

MOSCOW CITES SADAT ON U.S. TIES, ARMS "ESCALATION" TO ISRAEL

Soviet media thus far have avoided direct comment on President as-Sadat's forthcoming official visit to the United States but have conveyed Moscow's displeasure with as-Sadat's foreign and domestic policies. Implying Egyptian gullibility, Moscow has stressed the incongruity of Egypt's efforts to seek closer ties with the United States at a time when the traditional U.S. protective commitment to Israel has been strengthened.

This message has been implicit for weeks in Moscow's continued attention to the "secret" U.S. assurances to Israel on defense, energy and economic requirements, including Israel's request for advanced weapons, set forth in conjunction with the Sinai II accord. To underline the point, TASS and Moscow's "unofficial" Radio Peace and Progress highlighted passages from as-Sadat's 18 October speech in which he referred to the issue of further U.S. military aid for Israel. TASS' account marked the first time in months that Moscow had accorded remarks by as-Sadat any more than brief, passing attention.* The TASS dispatch on the 19th quoted as-Sadat as expressing "concern and protest against any escalation of American military deliveries to Israel and, particularly, the delivery of new types of weapons" and cited his warning that Egypt would meet "escalation on one side by an escalation on our side."

The TASS account also associated as-Sadat directly with policies that have caused persistent discord in Soviet-Egyptian relations. TASS cited as-Sadat's reference to Egypt's pursuit of "balanced relations of friendship" with both the United States and the USSR, "without distinguishing between them because of the fact that one of them has a socialist regime and the other a capitalist one." Similarly, TASS reported as-Sadat's reaffirmation of Egypt's economic "open-door policy" for all countries, with its consequent rejection of "imported socialism" and development of "Egyptian Arab socialism."

* Since the beginning of this year Moscow has taken note of perhaps no more than half a dozen of as-Sadat's many speeches and interviews. Most recently, two-paragraph TASS reports disposed of a Lebanese press interview in June and his 23 July anniversary speech, and PRAVDA late in July made a passing reference to his Khartoum press conference.

CONFIDENTIAL
22 OCTOBER 1975

- 9 -

TASS ignored as-Sadat's remarks on the Sinai II accord, in which he reaffirmed that Egypt remained committed to the retrieval of all Arab lands occupied by Israel and to the restoration of Palestinian rights, adding that Egypt also believed in recovering whatever land was possible at a given historical moment: "Every reasonable person knows that complete liberation will not be achieved all at once." Nor did TASS mention his reference to U.S. assurances to him that it would work for a further disengagement accord between Syria and Israel and for recognition of Palestinian rights.

Moscow has been negative in its limited references to prospects for Syrian-Israeli disengagement talks. Reporting a 21 October shooting episode between Israeli and Syrian patrols on the Golan Heights, for example, TASS cited Syrian newspapers on Israel's alleged buildup of tension in the area "as an attempt by Israel and the United States to pressure Syria to make concessions within the framework of a partial settlement." On a more general level, Moscow has clearly expressed its disapproval of Syrian-Israeli talks through its continued criticism of "partial accords" and advocacy of an overall political settlement at a reconvened Geneva conference.

VISIT TO U.S. Moscow presumably seeks to minimize the potential importance of as-Sadat's upcoming visit to the United States. TASS first took notice of the visit in a one-sentence dispatch from Washington on 10 October citing a White House announcement that the visit would begin on 26 October. The only other available mention of the visit came in a 14 October PRAVDA report on Secretary Kissinger's remarks on U.S. military aid for Egypt, made two days earlier on U.S. television. PRAVDA cited the Secretary as saying that the subject of U.S. military aid to Egypt would be discussed during as-Sadat's visit, but only on a general level, and that the United States would not give "specific pledges" or discuss a "specific list of purchases." Moscow has otherwise ignored U.S. and Arab media speculation on what as-Sadat seeks to accomplish during the visit.

As-Sadat himself--according to the Kuwaiti foreign minister, as reported in the 19 October issue of Kuwait's AL-WATAN--said that he would press the United States for another disengagement on the Syrian front and for acceptance of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) at any conference on a Mideast settlement. As-Sadat also indicated he would discuss the matter of U.S. arms for Israel with President Ford and the Palestinian issue with the U.S. Congress and public. Cairo's MIDDLE EAST NEWS AGENCY (MENA) on the 17th had earlier cited as-Sadat as having told a visiting U.S. Congressman that he would request the sale to Egypt of U.S. defensive weapons, "including planes, electronic equipment, and anti-aircraft missiles."

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 10 -

U.S. ARMS TO ISRAEL Soviet media over the past weeks have continued to report and comment on the issue of further U.S. arms for Israel. Much of the Soviet attention has been reactive to U.S. media publicity and to U.S. Congressional hearings on the accord's provision that U.S. technicians be sent to the Sinai. Moscow had, as in the past, replayed remarks by U.S. politicians and media sources critical of a projected deeper U.S. involvement in the Middle East and of Israel's requests for highly advanced U.S. weapons, such as the F-16 aircraft and the Pershing and Lance missiles. Remarks on Moscow radio's 19 October roundtable were typical, recalling the "secret" U.S.-Israeli understandings--first published in U.S. newspapers on 16-17 September--on U.S. responsiveness to Israel's defense needs and stressing that these increased U.S. commitments to Israel, added to the issue of sending U.S. technicians to the Sinai, were of increasing concern to Americans as well as Arabs and could exert potentially harmful effects on efforts to achieve a comprehensive Mideast settlement. One commentator on the program, reviving a point made on 2 September by TASS Deputy General Director S. Losev, suggested that the issue of U.S. arms to Israel could be viewed in the context of the incompatibility of a country's simultaneously pursuing detente and "fanning the arms race."

A major point Moscow has been trying to convey in its continued comment on U.S. military aid to Israel is that Egypt's agreement to the Sinai II accord has helped Israel militarily. A Radio Peace and Progress commentary in Arabic on the 20th, for example, noting as-Sadat's 18 October remarks on "escalation" of U.S. military aid to Israel, used his warning as a peg for criticism of the Sinai II accord. The commentary also suggested that "Israel and its protectors" had used the "imaginary concessions" under the Sinai II accord to justify an increased military buildup of Israeli forces. Similarly, a Moscow radio Arabic-language commentary on the 16th, alleging a concentration of Israeli armed forces on the Golan front and Israeli overflights of Syrian territory, linked the activity to Israel's encouragement from the Sinai II accord and from "talks being held in Washington on Israel's demands for huge deliveries of U.S. offensive weapons and military equipment this year and in years to come."

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL
22 OCTOBER 1975

- 11 -

P O R T U G A L

MOSCOW REPLAYS PCP COMPLAINTS ABOUT MOVES AGAINST LEFT

Moscow has indicated displeasure with Portuguese Prime Minister Azevedo's attempt to decrease preponderant leftist influence in public affairs by highlighting the Portuguese Communist Party's warning that what is needed is "an immediate struggle against counterrevolutionary forces--not against progressive forces." Although not directly critical of Azevedo, Moscow has reported the PCP's insistence that the centrist Popular Democrats be "expelled from the government" and has noted the Communist Party's more tempered criticism of the Portuguese socialists. At the same time, Soviet media continue to emphasize the now standard theme of the importance of "unity of progressive forces" and has repeated the PCP's call for a meeting with "other leftwing revolutionary parties, as well as the Portuguese Socialist Party" in an attempt to resolve the country's chronic political problems.

While Soviet media were still replaying favorable reports of Portuguese President Costa Gomes' visit to the Soviet Union, IZVESTIYA correspondent L. Agapov on 8 October praised Lisbon's dissident "Ralis" regiment, dismissing as "fantastic" the rumors of Ralis involvement in coup plotting. IZVESTIYA said that the regiment's supporters had "demanded" that the ruling Revolutionary Council restore ousted leftists to their former positions on the Council and in the Armed Forces Movement. And--in a possible effort to dissociate President Costa Gomes from the present administration's policies--IZVESTIYA noted that the president earlier had said that "reactionary forces are trying to destroy the Armed Forces Movement."

Another Agapov IZVESTIYA article on 11 October continued this line by placing blame for the recent violence in Oporto on the region's military commander, who "not only did not stop ultrarightists' provocations but even tried to disband military units loyal to the revolution." Also indicating dissatisfaction with the crackdown on leftists, PRAVDA on 9 October discussed a PCP statement to the effect that Portugal's problems could not be solved "by a swing to the right in government policy." And on the 14th both PRAVDA--in a dispatch by correspondent Kotov--and IZVESTIYA reported a PCP-led mass meeting to protest efforts by "reactionary circles" to "move the policy of Portugal's present government to the right."

While emphasizing the PCP's opposition to the government's move against leftists, the Soviet media seem anxious to portray the party as a reasonable political force, not involved in violent activity.

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue

CONFIDENTIAL

- 12 -

Thus, PRAVDA on the 9th noted that the PCP "resolutely opposes chaos and anarchy," "advocates a political solution" and also "supports military and public discipline." PRAVDA also noted the party's renewed call for a meeting of the socialists, the PCP and other leftist parties, together with "representatives of all trends in the MFA" for a discussion on ways to solve the country's "acute problems."

The "unity" umbrella does not extend to cover the despised People's Democratic Party (PPD), however, which is now openly attacked both by the PCP and the Soviet media. For example, PRAVDA correspondent Kotov on the 10th blamed PPD "raiders" for setting off violence in Oporto, and IZVESTIYA's Agapov on the 11th attributed the Oporto clash to "gangs of fascist cutthroats supported by irresponsible elements in the People's Democratic Party."

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue.

CONFIDENTIAL

22 OCTOBER 1975

- 13 -

VIETNAM

PRG TO ALLOW REPATRIATION OF AMERICANS STILL IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Vietnamese communist media announced on 20 October that the PRG has agreed to allow Americans and other foreigners still in South Vietnam to leave the country if they wish. No explanation for the timing of the decision was indicated, and no connection was made with the Vietnamese refugees sailing back to South Vietnam from Guam. The announcement--transmitted by Hanoi's Vietnam News Agency, which cited Liberation Press Agency (LPA) as the source--described the foreigners as "mostly missionaries" who were unable to leave prior to the communist takeover on 30 April because of the fighting. The announcement said the UN High Commissioner for Refugees had agreed to assist in the repatriation and that this would be effected "in late October or early November."

Since the April takeover of South Vietnam, monitored PRG and DRV broadcasts have rarely alluded to the fate of Americans who remained in the country. The issue was addressed, however, in a 13 September PRG Foreign Ministry spokesman's statement which denied charges that Americans were being held hostage and declared that the PRG was protecting all foreigners residing in South Vietnam.

Prior to the communist takeover, Liberation Radio reported in mid-March that a spokesman of the PRG delegation to the Joint Military Commission in Saigon had noted at a press conference there that "foreigners, including honest Americans, will be well treated and released if they are captured." The spokesman went on to warn, however, that this treatment would not be accorded "U.S. military advisers," since they were "special cases because they had violated the Paris agreement."*

On the related issue of U.S. military personnel still missing in action in Vietnam, Vietnamese communist comment has repeatedly linked Vietnamese cooperation in providing information on the missing with the demand that the United States fulfill its obligation under the Paris agreement to assist in postwar reconstruction "in both zones of Vietnam," which in turn would facilitate normalization of relations between the United States and the DRV. Neither U.S. reconstruction aid nor the possibility of improved relations was cited in the latest announcement on repatriation of Americans still in Vietnam.

* The PRG delegation's press conference at Tan Son Nhut is discussed in the TRENDS of 19 March 1975, pages 8-10.

- 14 -

PRG MEDIA CHARGE U.S. "HENCHMEN" AMONG RETURNING REFUGEES

There has been no new official Vietnamese communist public statement on the 1,600 refugees returning to South Vietnam by ship from Guam since a 15 October DRV Foreign Ministry spokesman's statement endorsed an earlier PRG protest of the repatriation effort.* Vietnamese media comment has continued to echo the earlier official statements, criticizing the unauthorized return of the refugees but still not stating directly that they would be forbidden entry once they arrive. Propaganda in the past week has injected the additional communist concern that undesirable elements might be included among the returnees, as well as the inference that refugees remaining in the United States may soon follow the current group of repatriates.

An LPA commentary broadcast 17 October by Saigon radio, after leveling the now standard charge that unilateral repatriation of the refugees constitutes a "violation" of the sovereignty of Vietnam, accused the United States of attempting "to send back a number of its henchmen with a view to . . . creating disturbances." It is clear from the context of the accusation, however, that the commentary did not include the majority of the refugees making the return voyage in this category. Instead, most are depicted as dupes of the United States "who were deceived and forced into emigrating."

A 21 October commentary in the Saigon newspaper GIAI PHONG, broadcast by Saigon radio, portrayed the Vietnamese refugees as now living "parasitic, wretched lives" and claimed the United States was "cynically taking advantage" of their requests to be sent home. Charging that the United States was "evading its responsibility" to the refugees by "recklessly" letting them sail for Vietnam, the commentary implied that this might be a precursor to subsequent U.S. attempts to deal with refugee problems. Thus, the commentary asserted, "in the future, tens of thousands of other Vietnamese will be left to their fate in the same manner."

* Earlier Vietnamese protests of the refugee return are discussed in the TRENDS of 8 October 1975, pages 5-6, and of 16 October 1975, pages 11-12.

22 OCTOBER 1975

- 15 -

K O R E A

DPRK MAINTAINS NEGATIVE STANCE ON NORTH-SOUTH RELATIONS

Recent authoritative Pyongyang comment, including Kim Il-song speeches on 9 and 10 October marking the 30th anniversary of the Korean Workers Party,* have maintained the North's intransigence on improving relations with the South. Pyongyang underscored its negative stance with a 17 October telephone message from the DPRK cochairman of the North-South Coordination Committee (NSCC) rejecting an ROK offer to resume North-South contacts. Contacts between the NSCC vice chairman have been suspended since the North postponed the 11th meeting, originally scheduled for 30 May. The current message gave the South "another month" to respond to DPRK conditions for resuming the dialog set forth last July.

While Pyongyang has made no specific threats, its conditions are such that the current ultimatum may be laying the groundwork for formally breaking off the NSCC talks. The conditions include demands that the South cease "war provocation maneuvers," renounce the "two Koreas plot" and stop "fascist repression" in the South. The telephone message and a NODONG SINMUN commentary on the 19th complained that the South had not yet responded to these conditions, though it had previously suggested in August that Seoul's bid to join the United Nations represented a negative reply.

Kim Il-song, speaking at the 9 October anniversary rally, made no mention of the moribund North-South dialog. However, he harked back to the formulation he had first used in August 1971--that the North was "ready to hold negotiations at any time with all political parties, including the Democratic Republican Party," the ruling party in the South--and which was a prelude to the Red Cross talks and the formation of the NSCC. He not only ignored the past official dialog, but stressed that the "people" of the North and South should form a "national united front."

At the rally, Kim declared that "some progress" toward reunification had been made in recent years. And later in the speech he observed that the South Korean people were fighting for "resignation of the traitorous, reactionary government." The North-South stalemate was further reflected in Kim's remarks at the anniversary banquet on the

* Other aspects of Pyongyang's commemoration of the KWP's 30th anniversary are discussed in the TRENDS of 16 October 1975, pages 15-16.

- 16 -

10th. He said that to reunify the country "we will have to fight the U.S. imperialists," and that "we will have to go through hardships and must be ready to sacrifice ourselves." He also suggested that the South Korean people were "waiting for our helping hand," but did not go beyond the standard call for the North to "actively support and encourage" the struggle in the South.

MOSCOW COOL ON KWP ANNIVERSARY, PEKING TREATMENT STANDARD

Moscow's low-key treatment of the KWP anniversary was obviously not calculated to reverse the ever chillier atmosphere characterizing Soviet-DPRK relations. No CPSU politburo member attended the DPRK ambassador's anniversary reception in Moscow; the Soviet leadership turnout was led by Central Committee Secretary Katushev. Both Moscow and Pyongyang media merely noted the reception. Teng Hsiao-ping led a Peking leadership turnout on the anniversary, and Peking comment offered standard support.

The CPSU's anniversary greetings to the KWP credited the DPRK's success to its use of the experiences of other socialist countries-- a claim Moscow has not included in past anniversary messages and, something Pyongyang is sure to resent since it contradicts Kim Il-song's claim that the DPRK has been successful precisely because it has not relied on the experience of others. A 10 October dispatch from PRAVDA's Pyongyang correspondent, the only comment on the anniversary monitored in authoritative Moscow media, was mostly devoted to reviewing the North's economic successes. It, too, attributed that success to Pyongyang's "utilizing the socialist countries' experience and expanding cooperation with them." Moscow radio briefly reported Kim Il-song's 9 October rally speech, highlighting his remarks on the DPRK's efforts to develop the international communist movement and strengthen friendship with socialist countries.

Perhaps further reflecting a chill in DPRK relations with the USSR and its allies, Kim Il-song did not meet with a delegation from Hungary, although he did meet with delegations from the other two communist countries which sent delegations to the Korean anniversary--Romanian and Cuba.

Peking honored the KWP's anniversary with a PEOPLE'S DAILY editorial, and a CCP leadership turnout at the DPRK charge's 10 October anniversary reception was led by five politburo members, including Teng Hsiao-ping, Chang Chun-chiao, who spoke at the reception, and Yao Wen-yuan.

- 17 -

Peking's comment on the anniversary offered standard support for the DPRK. The 10 October editorial demanded dissolution of the UN Command and withdrawal of U.S. troops, and pledged support for the "just struggle of the South Korean people." It also noted KWP opposition to "imperialism and modern revisionism" as well as the party's support for "anti-hegemonistic struggles." The CCP's anniversary greetings to the KWP offered support for the Korean people's struggle against the "U.S. imperialists' occupation" of South Korea, and noted KWP opposition to "imperialism, colonialism, and hegemonism."

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue.

CONFIDENTIAL

EASTERN EUROPE

LEADERS' SPEECHES IN GDANSK REFLECT CONCERN OVER PUBLIC UNREST

The Polish regime's concern about popular discontent over inflation, the meat shortage, and party pressure for stepped-up worker productivity was reflected in the attendance by Gierek and Jaroszewicz at a Gdansk meeting on 13 October, where workers' grievances were aired and the two leaders gave frank, defensive speeches.* Apparently prepared to take the risk of negative worker reaction, the present regime has made improved worker performance--combating absenteeism and poor productivity--the central theme of the seventh PZPR congress in December. There was some hesitancy in publicizing the details of the two leaders' speeches: Only brief, bland summaries were carried in the 14 October TRYBUNA LUDU, with details such as Gierek's strong plea for trust and Jaroszewicz's attack on rumors appearing subsequently in a Warsaw radio "recording" on the 17th and in "abridged" versions of the two speeches in the 18-19 October weekend issue of TRYBUNA LUDU.

GIEREK Party leader Edward Gierek's speech betrayed his awareness of diminished rapport between the regime and the people. The PZPR First Secretary frankly appealed to his audience to "learn to trust the leadership, to trust the Politburo, to trust the government." He went on to insist that during the past five years of his stewardship "we gave many proofs of our honesty" and "adequate proof that we can be trusted," claiming that his regime "tried to consult" with the rank-and-file even in making unpopular decisions. Implicitly appealing for the same degree of trust that was accorded him after he took office five years ago, Gierek recalled that while his initial visit to Gdansk as party leader in January 1971 had taken place in an atmosphere of "disbelief and reservations," he had won the confidence of the coastal workers and his subsequent leadership showed that he had not failed them.

On the issue of work discipline, Gierek reminded his audience in characteristically restrained terms of the inseparability of living standards and work performance and, without mentioning absenteeism directly, denounced a prevalent "flippant" attitude toward Poland's economic development. Appealing to patriotism, he predicted that if Poland stood still in economic development it would be overtaken by other countries, lose foreign markets, and "remain somewhere on the fringe of the world."

* See the TRENDS of 1 October 1975, pages 27-28.

- 19 -

JAROSZEWICZ The speech by Premier Jaroszewicz at the same Gdansk meeting spelled out in detail the regime's concern over popular discontent. Thus Jaroszewicz ridiculed alleged rumors to the effect that there was a wave of savings withdrawals, that there would be a currency exchange, and that "all" prices and wages would be increased. The most important thing, he added, was to ask, "How do you know?" and to track down the source of "slogans which demobilize society and obstruct progress."

The Polish premier claimed that there had been a 40-percent increase in real wages during the past five-year period, despite the fact that the sizeable proportion of raw materials which Poland imports from capitalist countries had risen "several hundred percent" in price. While insisting that these import price increases had only an insignificant impact on the domestic market, he pointed out in effect that there was no such thing as an economy without price changes. In this connection, he underscored the regime's concern to "safeguard" the 40-percent increase in real incomes, urged the party aktiv to publicize this concern, and added defensively that "we have no reason to damp down or correct anything" in this respect.

Regarding work discipline, Jaroszewicz was more explicit than Gierk in demanding "improved labor productivity by the maritime economy and the shipyard industry" in the Gdansk region.

BELGRADE LEADERSHIP RENEWS CAMPAIGN AGAINST "COMINFORMISTS"

In a series of recent high-level pronouncements, Belgrade has indicated plans to take harsh measures against unidentified dissidents, whom it labels as "Cominformists" and "Stalinists." An editorial in the 13 October party weekly KOMUNIST and speeches by senior party officials Stane Dolanc and Vladimir Bakaric on 17 and 21 October, respectively, have lashed out at alleged domestic opponents of Yugoslavia's self-management system and nonaligned foreign policy. Underscoring the party's concern, an LCY Central Committee Presidium session chaired by Tito on the 15th discussed the political situation in the country and "certain aspects of hostile activities" against the party and state, according to TANJUG. Similarly, a Serbian party Central Committee Presidium session two days later dealt with "suppression of hostile, illegal and other harmful activities."

Although the significance of the current campaign is unclear, it comes in the wake of rumors in the Western press that Belgrade has arrested a group of pro-Soviet conspirators. The campaign thus suggests last year's Cominformist affair, in which 32 persons

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue.

- 20 -

were arrested and sentenced for "hostile activity" against the state, including plans to form their own political party.* Since that time Belgrade has reported the prosecution of other "Cominformists," and Dolanc revealed Belgrade's growing concern in a speech last June in which he asserted that those who favor "dogmatism" are "more dangerous" than those favoring a return to capitalist relations.

Some features of the current campaign suggest that the party leadership wants to carefully spell out to the rank and file a stiffening policy against disloyal elements. Accordingly, the Central Committee Presidium session, reported by TANJUG, concluded that it would "inform" party members about its "assessments." In addition, the KOMUNIST editorial carefully distinguished the party's positions on different kinds of "dogmatism." Thus the editorial stressed the need to educate those who are dogmatists out of ignorance, but it called for severe punishment of those who preach "dogmatic, Stalinist understanding of socialism" in order to promote their own "private interests." Equating the latter with the Cominformists of 1948, KOMUNIST called for their strict and swift punishment as "deserved by those who follow the road of national betrayal and counterrevolution."

An equally hard line was taken by Dolanc at the conclusion of a long speech in Novi Sad on Yugoslavia's efforts to overcome its current economic difficulties. Defending the regime's policies of self-management, decentralization and nonalignment against persons who offer "pseudo-Marxist demagogy" or "Stalinist slogans about the omnipotence of the centralist bureaucratic system," he labeled them "traitors" who will be punished accordingly.

Neither the KOMUNIST editorial nor Dolanc referred specifically to foreign elements. Bakaric, however, was somewhat less restrained. According to a TANJUG report of his speech in Zagreb, he warned against "foreign influences" on the Yugoslav party, asserting that the Cominformists wanted to "create socialism on the basis of state ownership and join in all organizations ranging from the Warsaw Pact to CEMA." In addition, a 16 October speech by Branko Mikulic, party leader of Bosnia-Hercegovina, and a 20 October commentary by Zagreb radio's outspoken Milika Sundic both attacked unidentified "foreign masters" of the Cominformists.

* For a discussion of the 1974 Cominformist affair, see the TRENDS of 18 September 1974, pages 9-10, 25 September 1974, pages 7-8, and 2 October, pages 16-17.

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue.

CONFIDENTIAL

22 OCTOBER 1975

- 21 -

U S S R

SOVIET MEDIA CRITICIZE SAKHAROV, NOBEL AWARD

Soviet media have responded to Andrey Sakharov's reception of the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize with personal attacks on him and charges that the Nobel committee's choice was a "political gesture" designed to impede detente.

Moscow responded initially through a TASS commentary and several radio reports on 10 October which criticized the award, accused Sakharov of opposing the easing of international tension, and attempted to link him with such Soviet nemeses as Chile's Pinochet and U.S. Senator Jackson.

The harshest attack on Sakharov so far came in a 15 October LITERARY GAZETTE article by A. Viktorov. Viktorov accused Sakharov of "hating" Soviet society, "which so indulgently ignores his anti-social position."

The main central newspapers have picked up TASS reports of criticism of the award from such Western sources as the French communist paper L'HUMANITE but have not yet weighed in with their own commentary.

To date the attacks on Sakharov fall well short in scope and intensity of the 1973 press campaign launched against both Sakharov and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. The 1973 campaign had featured the publication of letters from irate Soviet citizens, presumably to encourage the appearance of wide public support for the regime's position. Soviet media have not yet carried the broad hints dropped at that time--just before Solzhenitsyn's expulsion--that the author of Gulag Archipelago was free to leave the country. The attacks on Sakharov could still intensify further, however. The 1973 campaign was months in the making.

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
six months from date of issue.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 22 -

FEUD BETWEEN MATHEMATICAL ECONOMISTS, GOSPLAN REVIVED

The mid-October award of the Nobel Prize to Soviet mathematician L.V. Kantorovich for his contributions to planning theory seems likely to aggravate the chronic debate between Soviet mathematical economists and the more traditional economists grouped around Gosplan. Kantorovich, one of the founders of Soviet mathematical economics, has strongly endorsed optimal planning methods denounced by Gosplan and has been involved in name-calling with traditional economists. Even before the announcement of the award, the dispute had flared up again as the September issue of Gosplan's journal PLANNED ECONOMY assailed the mathematical economists in three separate articles, while Gosplan rejected a new program presented by this group.

Although the dispute in recent years has centered mainly around the optimal planning methods of the Central Economic Mathematics Institute (TsEMI) and its innovative director N.P. Fedorenko, Kantorovich has been attacked in PLANNED ECONOMY for promoting these methods also.* He participates in the work of the Academy of Sciences' economics division, even though he is a member of the mathematics division. His support has given liberal economists Fedorenko, A.M. Rumyantsev and N.N. Inozemtsev the decisive margin among the six full members of the division. Like Fedorenko, Kantorovich is anathema to conservatives, but appears to have considerable high-level party support.

RENEWED DISPUTE The new flare-up of name-calling appears to have been occasioned by Fedorenko's proposal of a new "System of Complex Planning" (SKP), presented as a preliminary stage in his controversial "System of Optimal Functioning of the Economy" (SOFE). Fedorenko had described SKP at length in a 1974 book entitled "Complex National Economic Planning," and in a November 1974 KOMMUNIST article. Like SOFE, it aims at providing a methodology for matching planning goals with available resources (the "program-goal principle"). It deemphasizes the branch and territorial principles of planning and the directive nature of the plan--although Fedorenko denies that his proposals would undermine these long-established principles.

The conflict appears to focus on the longterm 1976-90 plan, on which TsEMI and Gosplan's computer center are working jointly. Fedorenko in his KOMMUNIST article contended that scientific forecasting, goal-setting and the complex approach play an even greater role in longterm plans than in five year plans.

* For background on earlier controversies between the Fedorenko group and Gosplan during 1972-73, see the TRENDS of 31 October 1973, pages 27-30.

22 OCTOBER 1975

- 23 -

Gosplan officials (notably chairman N.K. Baybakov, deputy chairman and computer center head N.P. Lebedinskiy, and PLANNED ECONOMY chief editor V.S. Glagolev) bitterly resent Fedorenko's criticisms of their present methods and attack Fedorenko's proposed new methods. They stand by Gosplan's "Automated System of Planning Calculations" (ASPR), which seeks to link all computer systems into a national information-gathering system to cope with the increasingly complicated tasks of planning. Glagolev reviewed the 1974 Fedorenko book in the September 1974 PLANNED ECONOMY and complained that the book wrongly claimed that the SKP methodology was compatible with the ASPR system. He cited a September 1973 PLANNED ECONOMY article by Lebedinskiy which flatly declared SOFE and ASPR "incompatible" and "mutually exclusive."

Although relatively restrained since 1973, PLANNED ECONOMY carried three items attacking Fedorenko's ideas in its September 1975 issue. One was a second review of Fedorenko's 1974 book, another was a report of a Gosplan meeting which rejected SKP, and the third article was chief editor Glagolev's attack on an English economist's book which praised SOFE. The review of Fedorenko's book, by Academy of Social Sciences Professor M.Z. Bor, a longtime critic, and S. Logvinov, attacked SKP and described SOFE as based on "concepts of bourgeois theories" and "market socialism." The report on the Gosplan conference indicated that Fedorenko defended his program, but that foes assailed its concepts of adjustable five year plans and goal-setting and defended the "directive character of plans." Computer center chief Lebedinskiy summed up by declaring that SKP in its present form "cannot be used" in ASPR and that development of ASPR had already proceeded too far to include any such new vague theories as SKP. Gosplan's sensitivity was also evident in Glagolev's review of Michael Ellman's 1973 book "Planning Problems in the USSR," which allegedly lauded SOFE and TSEMI and "belittled" the work of Gosplan. Glagolev praised ASPR and cited Gosplan Chairman Baybakov's statement (published in the March 1974 PLANNED ECONOMY) that mathematical economic methods, "no matter how important," are only one of many means of planning.

KANTOROVICH AWARD Kantorovich's Nobel Prize for contributions to the "theory of optimal use of resources" was belatedly reported in PRAVDA on 18 October, and on 21 October TASS broadcast a statement by Kantorovich denying "Western" allegations that optimal planning is connected with "market socialism." The statement was part of an interview to appear in the next day's LITERARY GAZETTE. Answering the interviewer's leading question as to why a capitalist scholarly organization would present such an award to a Soviet economist, Kantorovich defensively argued that his work "is to a considerable degree" applicable to any economically developed country, although "most valuable and most appropriate for the socialist economic system where scientific planning plays an immeasurably greater role."

Classified by 000073
Automatically declassified
on 11/19/2013

CONFIDENTIAL

- 24 -

CHINA

AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCE ENDS, SETS FARM MECHANIZATION GOALS

Peking marked the end of the national conference on learning from Tachai in agriculture--which had opened in Tachai on 15 September and closed in Peking on 19 October--by publicizing selected major speeches and a 21 October PEOPLE'S DAILY editorial.* The editorial stated that the conference "set the seal on basically achieving farm mechanization by 1980" and that it was expected to have a "far-reaching" influence in "accelerating the pace of our country's agricultural development, effecting a still bigger rise in the national economy." The editorial instructed county party committees throughout the country to lead communes and production brigades in learning from Tachai, in strengthening "stability and unity," and in "boosting the national economy."

Throughout the conference Peking has stressed the need to build Tachai-type counties, which are advanced both in ideology and production, and to basically mechanize agriculture by 1980. Speaking at the closing session of the conference, long-time Tachai leader Chen Yung-kuei, as reported by NCNA on 20 October, stated that a "new upsurge" in building Tachai-type counties is expected. The precise quota for forming Tachai-type counties was set forth in a 20 October NCNA account of a speech given by Vice Premier Hua Kuo-feng on the 15th. Hua stated that at least "100 new Tachai-type counties" should be established in the country each year for the next five years. This rate would bring the total number of Tachai counties to 800, approximately 40 percent of all counties in China. Peking apparently will keep close watch on local efforts to establish Tachai-type counties. Hua declared that "every time a Tachai-type county is built, it must be seriously checked by the province and reported to the central authorities." Hua characterized the setting up of Tachai-type counties as an "urgent task in pushing the national economy forward" so that China will be able to advance to the "front ranks of the world before the end of this century"--an objective announced by Chou En-lai at the Fourth National People's Congress last January. Hua specifically called for speeding the rate of farm mechanization in order to increase agricultural yields, thus paving the way for the "modernization of industry, national defense and science and technology."

* For earlier discussions of this conference, see the TRENDS of 17 September 1975, pages 23-24, of 1 October 1975, pages 30-32, and of 16 October 1975, page 29.

TECHNICIAN SHORTAGE The pressing need for larger numbers of skilled workers required to mechanize agriculture in the next five years appears to have prompted a decision to allow limited incentives to technical workers and to insure that their technical knowledge is utilized. For example, an article by Shanghai shipyard workers entitled "Bring the Positive Role of Technical Personnel into Play," published in RED FLAG (No. 10) and broadcast by Peking radio on 15 October, revealed that "most of the technical personnel" who were sent down to the shipyard "to do manual work have been given technical jobs." The shipyard's party committee was lauded for seeing to it that technical personnel "are not used only as a labor force" and for paying attention "to bringing their specialities into full play." A general upgrading of worker skills also appears underway at the shipyard, as the article noted that workers "short in theoretical knowledge and in technical work" are "being trained to enhance their skills while practicing production." The article was careful to warn that it would be ideologically wrong to go too far and "study technology while ignoring the study of politics," but it made clear that "efforts must be made to encourage the technicians to study technology" and to follow the path of "red and expert." Similarly, a new effort to increase the supply of skilled workers was also indicated in a 17 October NCNA report which argued that "it is necessary to build" an "agriculture technical force with high awareness for socialism and technical skills" in order to achieve the farm mechanization goals set at the conference on learning from Tachai in agriculture.

A second RED FLAG article, broadcast on 17 October by Nanking radio, discussed industrialization in a Kiangsu county and indicated that technical personnel could receive incentives. The article stressed that income of workers in commune industries should be decided by the masses, but it noted that "it is necessary to provide a necessary subsidy to those with fairly good skills," though "the amount of the subsidy should not be too high."

PEKING COMMEMORATES 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE "LONG MARCH"

Peking marked the 40th anniversary of the end of the Long March on 19 October with a joint PEOPLE'S DAILY-LIBERATION ARMY DAILY editorial. Both papers also reprinted a full-page article written by Marshal Liu Po-cheng in 1959 reviewing the significance of the Long March in the history of the Chinese revolution. Peking is not known to have marked the anniversary previously, though a number of military reminiscences of the Long March were published in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Comment on the occasion has focused on the current ideological themes calling for unity under Mao's revolutionary line in opposing

- 26 -

revisionism and capitulationism. The Long March commemoration may be an attempt to imbue present campaigns with the revolutionary spirit and enthusiasm of the Long March period. It also serves to rehabilitate the image of the PLA, tarnished since the fall of Lin Biao.

The 19 October joint editorial linked the principal lessons of the Long March experience directly to the current campaigns to consolidate unity and stability under the dictatorship of the proletariat and to criticize capitulationism in the novel "Water Margin." Branding both the "left opportunist line" of Wang Ming, a "running dog of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism," and the "right opportunist line" of the "ignominious renegade" Chang Kuo-tao as "revisionism," the editorial noted that Liu Shao-chi and Lin Biao had "followed the same path" as Wang and Chang. It urged persistence in the struggle against "revisionism and capitulationism" and warned that the struggle between Marxism and revisionism in China will continue "in the next 50 or 100 years and even 10,000 years from now." The editorial counseled that only strict adherence to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line as exemplified by the "very vivid and rich teaching material" of the Long March experience would ensure victory in the future.

The joint editorial also noted that "whether to practice unity or splittism" was an important question during the Long March. Hailing Chairman Mao's advocacy of "unity for a common revolutionary objective," the editorial stressed the current necessity of applying the "Red Army's glorious tradition of uniting for struggle" to the present work of implementing Chairman Mao's instructions to study theory to combat revisionism, to promote stability and unity, and to push socialist construction forward.

PROVINCIAL CELEBRATIONS All PRC provinces marked the Long March anniversary, and most held "grand meetings" on the 18th, usually presided over by a military district deputy commander or political commissar. Canton Military Region Commander Hsu Shih-yu and Foochow Military Region Commander Pi Ting-chun were the only military region commanders known to attend an event marking the date, appearing respectively at a 19 October Canton rally and an 18 October meeting in Foochow. Many provinces were reported to have initiated activities to propagate the spirit of the Long March several days before the anniversary, including discussion meetings and the dispatch of teams of Long March veterans to inspire PLA units by recounting their experiences.

Coverage of the 18 October meeting in Kiangsi, the site of the base area abandoned at the beginning of the Long March, was the most extensive of the provincial celebrations. In his speech at the

CONFIDENTIAL
22 OCTOBER 1975

- 27 -

Kiangsi meeting, provincial party secretary Pai Tung-tsai called for celebration of the anniversary "in close connection with current struggles" and for efforts to "arouse the masses to the fullest extent to fight a people's war of encircling and annihilating bourgeois factionalism," the "major obstacle to the implementation of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and policies."

Classified by 000073
Declassify on: OADR
Authority: E.O. 13526

CONFIDENTIAL

- 28 -

NOTE

SOVIET MEDIA ON U.S. GRAIN DEAL: Consistent with their general silence on the issue, Soviet media have not reported the long-term U.S.-Soviet accord on grain sales reached by negotiators in Moscow. The media had also maintained silence on the negotiations leading up to the agreement. A single broadcast to North America in August, however, did rebut assertions in the United States that last summer's grain sales to the Soviet Union had fueled inflation. Moscow continues to underscore the importance it places on the whole spectrum of bilateral trade. Brezhnev's message to a recent session of the joint U.S.-Soviet Trade and Economic Council, as reported by TASS on 8 October, noted that bilateral trade was increasing "slowly but surely" and expressed gratification that "elements of a long-term character" were appearing in the trade relationship.

- 1 -

A P P E N D I X

MOSCOW, PEKING BROADCAST STATISTICS 13 - 19 OCTOBER 1975

<u>Moscow (2533 items)</u>		<u>Peking (970 items)</u>	
French President	(--)	14%	UNGA 30th Session (15%) 7%
Giscard d'Estaing			Long March 40th Anni-
in USSR			versary (--) 6%
[Brezhnev Speech	(--)	4%]	Japan (1%) 5%
International Young	(--)	11%	Lao Independence 30th (4%) 5%
Women's Congress,			Anniversary
Moscow			USSR (1%) 3%
[Brezhnev Greetings	(--)	5%]	Yugoslav Premier (14%) 3%
China	(4%)	6%	Bijedic in PRC
GDR 26th Anniversary	(15%)	3%	

These statistics are based on the voicecast commentary output of the Moscow and Peking domestic and international radio services. The term "commentary" is used to denote the lengthy item—radio talk, speech, press article or editorial, government or party statement, or diplomatic note. Items of extensive reportage are counted as commentaries.

Figures in parentheses indicate volume of comment during the preceding week.

Topics and events given major attention in terms of volume are not always discussed in the body of the Trends. Some may have been covered in prior issues; in other cases the propaganda content may be routine or of minor significance.