

Brigitte Schulz

THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM IN THE PERIPHERY: EAST GERMAN SOLIDARITY IN THEORY AND PRACTICE*)

Introduction

This paper will take a look at the Eastern European views on Third World development which differ significantly from those of the West. Using the German Democratic Republic as an example, the paper will look at the theoretical underpinnings of the policies of the East vis-à-vis the South. It will then examine various East German training programs inside the GDR for students from the Third World, and the so-called brigades of friendship dispatched by the GDR to work in various African countries. As will be argued, all of these programs constitute an important part of East German foreign policy toward the less developed countries, particularly those seen as embarking on a course of "socialist orientation".

Third World Development in East German Perspective

The view of the socialist bloc on the economic and political development of the Third World has changed and evolved over time. It is a view largely determined by a Marxist/Leninist (1) interpretation of the present epoch, one that is characterized by "a dying capitalism" being challenged and everywhere confronted by a "growing socialism" (2). At this epochal level, the GDR sees itself united with all developing countries. What binds the GDR to the "liberated" countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, according to Erich Honecker, is "the anti-imperialist struggle for peace, freedom, and social progress. It is in this that the fundamental concerns of real socialism and of the national and social liberation struggle intertwine. What binds us is firm solidarity against colonialism, racism, and apartheid, against imperialist tutelage and interference" (3).

The GDR thus sees the Third World as an important ally in its struggle

*) This is a revised version of a paper presented at the Center for European Studies, Harvard University, on 20 March 1986. The research was funded by grants from IREX and Fulbright-Hays and was conducted in the GDR from September 1983 through March 1984 and two weeks each in the summers of 1984 and 1985.

against imperialism, while at the same time viewing the support given by the socialist countries to such demands as a new international economic order as a crucial element of help for all developing countries (4). "Anti-imperialist solidarity" is thus one of the ideological cornerstones of East German policy vis-à-vis the developing countries. In fact, this solidarity is firmly anchored in the East German Constitution of 7 October 1974, which states in Article 6, para. 3: "The GDR supports in their efforts to achieve social progress those states and peoples which struggle against imperialism and its colonial rule, and for national freedom and independence." (5) From these principles, the following tasks for the GDR emerge in its relations with the Third World:

- "Solidarity support for the national and social liberation struggle of the people against imperialism, colonialism, racism, and neocolonialism;
- strengthening state relations, particularly with the non-aligned countries, and deepening international cooperation;
- deepening the brotherly cooperation with countries of socialist orientation;
- increasing foreign trade and economic relations on the basis of mutual advantage." (6)

The term "Third World" is not much liked in the GDR, as in other socialist countries, although that dislike appears to be giving way to a slow acceptance. For example, two of the GDR's most prominent development economists, Helmut Faulwetter and Peter Stier, have explained their use of the term "Third World" in a recently published work in the following way: "... in the present period the term 'Third World' has arisen for those countries in the centers of imperialist power, Western Europe and North America, which despite their independence are disadvantaged and exploited. It is a synonym for disadvantage, lack of rights, and exploitation. Increasingly this term is also used in Marxist theory." (7)

Faulwetter and Stier hasten to add, however, that their use of the term "Third World" has nothing to do with the concept of a "third way", an idea which is emphatically rejected by all socialist countries.

The characteristic common to all developing countries which gives credence to the idea that they be treated as one unit according to East German scholars is the shared history of colonial exploitation. They are seen to continue to suffer from the effects of colonialism through the international division of labor established during colonial times which continues to operate to the disadvantage of these countries through the

mechanism of "neo-colonialism". The chances for development along a capitalist model as envisioned by most development planners in the West are thus emphatically denied. The Third World is seen as having been integrated into the capitalist world economy through a long process of imperialist expansion, assigning to the countries of the South the role of exporters of raw materials such as minerals and tropical agricultural products. Political independence did not alter this situation of dependence created by the Europeans since the basic economic structures established during colonial times were left essentially intact.

This view clearly challenges classical Marxist interpretations of the progressive nature of capitalism in the periphery. Instead, East German scholarship as well as political practice view the establishment of a capitalist "core" as stifling any internal development that would lead to autonomous capitalist growth in the "periphery". What developed instead was a "colonial supplementary or complementary capitalism" (8). While in the capitalist mother countries increasing specialization and an ever more intricate division of labor was taking place, this development was stifled in the periphery.

The conditions created over the past few centuries continue to reproduce themselves up to the present time. During the era of formal colonialism, trade took place mainly between core and periphery, with economic relations between areas in the periphery almost completely non-existent. Political independence was a necessary but not sufficient precondition for breaking this cycle of poverty and dependence. In the current phase of the historical progression outlined above, transnational corporations have become the main "structural elements" of the core-periphery relationship, and "their existence is the foundation of the enormous exploitation of developing countries" (9). East German literature is full of data on the level of profits these transnational corporations are able to syphon out of the periphery because of the conditions established during the era of colonialism and continuing now during the "neo-colonial" period.

It is interesting here to point out briefly that dependency theory, a radical Latin American school which emerged after World War Two, and East German views on the Third World condition are just about identical to this point. Both dependency theory and East German theorists agree on their analysis of the problems facing developing countries as well as on the historical roots of economic backwardness. It is in the remedy advocated to overcome underdevelopment that the two groups differ radically, however.

The prescriptions advocated by the *dependencistas* have tended toward an advocacy of relative economic autarky, a radical rupture of trade relations with the capitalist core, and production for local, not international (viz. "core") needs. Thus demands for a new international economic order have also been seen by the dependency school as a mere attempt to effect cosmetic changes in a system which is fundamentally in need of abolition.

This view is emphatically not shared inside the GDR and *dependencistas* are accused of being "petty bourgeois", despite the fact that they are granted to have a certain "left engagement" (10). For the East Germans, just as for all of the other socialist countries, the options available to the developing countries are of a radically different nature. "Non-capitalist" development (more recently called "socialist orientation") to them means the construction of conditions for socialism at the superstructural level rather than the immediate uncoupling from the international economy. It also means that this can only be done in close alliance with the countries of real socialism, as they alone hold the key to a "scientific" understanding of the development process.

Most countries in the Third World have clearly not opted for this course and have chosen instead a capitalist development path in the post-independence era. The East German position toward these countries is marked by a certain ambivalence. On the one hand, they belong to the world of "national liberation" and are thus historically united with "real socialism" (11) in the epochal clash with imperialism. On the other hand, however, they are clearly capitalist countries at the present time and, as such, relations with them are based on "peaceful coexistence", just as those with the advanced capitalist countries. At yet another level, however, these countries are viewed with interest either for economic reasons or because they are always a potential ally in the struggle against imperialism.

The main emphasis of Germany's Third World policies is toward countries which have opted for "non-capitalist" development and relations with them are based on the principle of "proletarian internationalism". Of these countries, some have already achieved the status of being on a "socialist" development path (Mongolia, Cuba, and Vietnam) and have become members of the CMEA. Others are viewed as being committed to "socialist orientation", a term which is much more ambiguous and there is considerable disagreement in the literature about which developing countries fit into this category. At the present time, Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia and the Yemen People's Republic are cited most often in East German

literature as having chosen this path.

Socialist Orientation

To both Marx and Engels, the idea of trying to establish socialism in an economically backward area in which there was no proletariat to speak of and in which the forces of production were totally underdeveloped would have seemed absurd. To them, a transition to socialism could only be initiated by a proletariat conscious of its exploitation and willing to build a new society on the basis of the material abundance made possible by the capitalist relations of production and the advanced character of the productive forces that would naturally result. This applied equally to Europe and the colonial areas.

Lenin, in adapting the writings of Marx and Engels to the concrete conditions prevailing in Russia at the turn of the century, was much more optimistic about the chances of establishing socialism in economically backward areas (12).

Lenin's views deserve attention because they influence heavily the GDR's conception of both the road taken by the Third World and the role played in this by the socialist countries. Firstly, there is of course the argument that developing countries can skip the capitalist stage and proceed from "precapitalist" to "socialist" relations of production. Secondly, it outlines the importance of the alliance between the "progressive" forces in backward countries with the Soviet Union and its allies. Thirdly, since the Soviet Union was the first country to establish socialism, it holds a central leadership function for the building of socialism anywhere in the world. Included in this leadership function is the course taken in the Soviet Union after the revolution of 1917 which serves as the model for socialist revolutions everywhere in the world, despite the fact that there are certain national variations for which allowances are made. What is not allowed, however, is a "third way" which might challenge the vision of socialist construction put forward by the Soviet Union and subsequently by Eastern Europe.

The whole question of which road the backward nations of the world should take naturally did not become crucially important to the Soviet Union and communist parties everywhere until colonialism gave way to political independence in most "backward" areas in the fifties and sixties. In the "Year of Africa", 1960, the world communist movement held a meeting in Moscow, at which the following tasks facing the "progressive" forces in the

newly independent countries were outlined as follows: "The strengthening of political independence, agricultural reforms in the interests of the peasantry, elimination of the economic roots of the rule of imperialism; limiting and pushing foreign monopolies out of the economy; lifting the living standards of the population, democratizing public life, conducting an independent, peace-loving foreign policy; developing economic and cultural cooperation with the socialist and other friendly countries - those are the overarching national and democratic tasks toward the solution of which the progressive national forces in those countries which have liberated themselves can and in fact are uniting themselves." (13)

The road thus to be taken was labelled as "non-capitalist" to distinguish it from the straight continuation of relations from colonialism to neo-colonialism, but cognizant of the fact that this was not yet the road to socialism itself. In many ways this label was a concession to Third World radicals of the day (for example, Nkrumah of Ghana, Nyerere of Tanzania, and Nasser of Egypt) whose anti-colonial credentials were impeccable but whose understanding of scientific socialism was seen as sadly lacking. It was also felt that colonialism and its aftermath had necessitated an intermediate step toward the establishment of socialism: the state of "national democracy" led by an amalgam of forces united in a progressive "national front" to bring about social changes at home while fighting the imperialist monster in close alliance with the socialist countries.

What emerges is a view of the non-capitalist road which is not a new mode of production but rather a *transitional* phase of indefinite duration. Interesting here is that two decades ago the idea of a backward Third World country nationalizing the holdings of foreign companies appeared not only feasible but in fact seemed to be encouraged by the socialist countries. By the mid-seventies that view had changed, however. Angola, for example, was told after independence from Portugal in 1975 to continue to cooperate with foreign companies since the socialist countries were unable to offer enough technical assistance and the infrastructure in Angola was too weakly developed for Angolans readily to be able to step into the shoes of foreign managers.

Even during the sixties, however, there was a lot of imprecision about these "national democracies" and what precisely the course of their development should be. In sub-Saharan Africa during that decade Guinea, Ghana, Tanzania, and Congo-Brazzaville were considered "national democracies" led by "revolutionary democrats", not in the direction of "bour-

geois democracies" but rather of opening the "perspective of socialism" (14). Since the base of revolution in the Third World cannot be the working class the theory of non-capitalist development places the social transformation of society in the hands of "progressive" urban elites such as the intelligentsia, government bureaucrats, as well as the officer corps.

It was the alliance with these revolutionary democrats which became a cornerstone of East German policy vis-à-vis the newly independent Third World countries in the common struggle against imperialism. This alliance in fact often took place at the expense of communists inside these Third World countries who, as was the case in Sudan, for example, were sacrificed to the overriding anti-imperialist alliance. In other words, Third World communists were encouraged to cooperate with these "revolutionary democrats" at the expense of trying to pursue more orthodox Marxist goals inside their own countries. This policy on the part of the socialist countries naturally led to a lot of criticism, particularly from the Chinese communists, who saw in the anti-imperialist alliance with such regimes a betrayal of the true revolutionary forces in the Third World. *Anti-imperialism*, rather than *anti-capitalism inside the Third World countries* themselves, was the yardstick by which these countries were measured by the GDR throughout the sixties and much of the seventies.

At the heart of these assessments on the part of the GDR as well as the other socialist countries was the tactical consideration that the forces in favor of socialism inside Third World countries were too weakly developed to affect lasting transformations at the present time. Thus East German scholarship is full of warnings about a revolutionary process which is too rapid and thus often leads to relapses due to the impatience of the leadership to bring about change. What is now viewed as having contributed to reactionary developments in both Ghana and Mali, for example, was too hasty a nationalization not only of the large but also of the small productive enterprises and of trade which weakened the social base in these countries and favored subsequent anti-socialist coups (15). What is thus advocated is a very cautious and slow movement *in the direction of socialism* rather than rapid revolutionary activities which end up in counter-revolutionary changes, thus also jeopardizing the anti-imperialist alliance with the socialist countries. At the immediate level, then, "non-capitalist" development means *anti-imperialist solidarity* with the countries of real socialism coupled with the gradual creation of conditions for socialist construction in the developing country itself with all deliberate speed. What this has meant at

the practical level is that these countries should support the socialist bloc in international fora in their disputes with the West.

Due to the conditions created in Africa in the mid-seventies through the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire as well as the ancient monarchy in Ethiopia, *socialist orientation* became the chosen path of the governments of Angola, Mozambique, and Ethiopia. This was interpreted by both the GDR and its Eastern European allies as a decisive shift in favor of world socialism and relations with these countries became particularly close. Based on an assessment of both the revolutionary character of the African governments involved as well as the overall international political climate which seemed to favor such a step, the East Europeans now began to argue for an additional crucial component of the path of socialist orientation - the creation of a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party. Insistence on the organization of such a party is actually the crucial difference between the conception of non-capitalist development prior to the mid-seventies and socialist orientation of the subsequent decade. It is the role of the party to realize the "dictatorship of the workers and peasants" in these countries. It is under the leadership of this explicitly Marxist-Leninist vanguard party that the preconditions for the establishment of socialism are created, which in the present phase means mainly changes at the superstructural level (16).

It should come as no surprise, then, that the GDR places much of its emphasis in relations with the Third World on social organizations which will be able to carry out this future socialist transformation. Training programs for citizens of Third World countries, particularly those of socialist orientation, thus constitute one of the cornerstones of East German solidarity and in fact are an important element of foreign relations with these countries. Discussed below, then, will be the major social organizations inside the GDR which are involved in training peoples from the Third World in various activities deemed important for the task of constructing socialism.

Training Programs for Socialism

The GDR, just like the other socialist countries, has instituted various programs both inside its own borders and directly in the Third World for the purpose of helping in the establishment of socialism in the periphery.

For East Germany, the organization of primary importance in this regard is the *Solidarity Committee of the GDR*, since it coordinates all of the

country's so-called solidarity activities. The Committee was founded in 1960 in order to establish and maintain relations with liberation movements as well as with those independent countries willing to work with it. The Committee continues its work to the present day as the executive committee of all parties and mass organizations in the GDR (it has no members of its own). It mobilizes about 218 million Marks annually for the purpose of showing material solidarity with those involved in anti-imperialist struggles around the world."

Through the Committee, important links are maintained with various liberation movements. For example, both the ANC and SWAPO hold offices with diplomatic status in Berlin through accreditation by the Committee. In addition, the Committee prints and mails out free of charge the periodicals put out by the ANC and SWAPO, *Sechaba* and *Namibia Today*, respectively. During the guerilla war fought by the MPLA and FRELIMO against the Portuguese, it offered vast amounts of material aid to these organizations, such as sending teachers to the FRELIMO school operating in Tanzania and providing the necessary school supplies, as well as flying wounded fighters back to the GDR for medical care.

After one of these liberation movements has gained political independence, solidarity is shown through the shipments of "solidarity goods" to these countries. Goods shipped tend to include anything the recipient country needs which can be donated either by individual East German citizens or purchased for it by the Committee, including such items as eye glasses, optical equipment, blankets, various types of vehicles, etc. Another key aspect of solidarity, and one which has earned the GDR much recognition in Third World countries, is the training of various cadres inside the GDR. According to an official from the Committee, at the beginning of 1984 it had sponsored 37,000 youths from LDCs to study in the GDR, of whom 29,000 received vocational training in specific trades through three-year apprenticeship programs, and 8,000 attended university-level programs (17). According to the same official, roughly half of all trainees are from sub-Saharan Africa. Although precise figures were not provided, due to the particularly close relations with Angola, Mozambique, and Ethiopia, it is safe to assume that the vast majority of them come from those countries. Just to show how far-thinking the Committee is about these training programs in the GDR, it should be mentioned that over 200 SWAPO members have already been trained in East Germany in order to enable them to take over the presently all-white operated railroad

system in Namibia after independence from South African rule.

Although the Committee's official mission is to practise "solidarity" with the Third World, a close examination of its practices reveals that it also works in support of bilateral economic relations between the GDR and a developing country. Cooperation with the coal mines in Moatize, Mozambique serve as a good example of this. There, the East German mining firm "Schwarze Pumpe" entered into a commercial contract for the mining of coal, most of it to be exported to the GDR under the terms of a bilateral government agreement. The solidarity Committee supported this cooperative venture by financing a camp for 350 miners and 150 construction workers and an FDJ friendship brigade was dispatched to build the camp. The prefabricated parts for the houses were paid for by the Committee and sent from the GDR. In 1982, the Committee spent another six million Marks for the construction of a cultural center at Moatize. When problems developed in shipping the coal to the harbor, the Committee made a gift of forty-five trailers to house railroad workers along the railroad line and financed the dispatch of East German railroad engineers. The official designation of all of these activities on the part of the Committee was "solidarity", although the line between it and "mutual advantage", the East German label for its regular economic relations with other countries, here becomes very blurred. Clearly the work of the Solidarity Committee is designed to turn solidarity relations of today into solid political as well as economic relations in the future (18).

Besides the work of the Solidarity Committee, the East German leadership has integrated the cooperation of various mass organizations inside the country into the execution of its foreign policy. Of these, three will be outlined here because of their particular importance to relations with the developing countries: The *Freie Deutsche Jugend* (FDJ, Free German Youth), the *Freier Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund* (FDGB - The Association of Free German Trade Unions), and the *Verband der Journalisten* (VDJ - Association of Journalists). The importance of these organizations is in helping to create the conditions for eventual socialist construction in a country as outlined above.

The Free German Youth (FDJ): Following Lenin's ideas on the importance of including the youth of a country in the process of building socialism and training them for the political leadership of tomorrow, youth organizations are considered vital in all socialist countries. The FDJ also plays an important part in the GDR's foreign policy by helping in the construction of

socialism in developing countries.

The FDJ operates a "Youth College" near the capital city of Berlin in which political cadres are schooled in revolutionary politics along the principles of the Soviet "comsomol" youth organization founded by Lenin. Along with young East Germans, about 150 young people from Third World countries are trained here annually in ten-month courses, and forty of them on average are from black Africa. The FDJ began training cadres from foreign youth organizations in January 1958. By 1985, the 25th course was in progress at the school, which means that roughly 1,000 students from sub-Saharan Africa have been trained so far in what the school describes as "Marxist/Leninist training and communist education" with the goal of "enabling the students to acquire Marxist/Leninist theory and to apply it creatively to recognize fundamental social processes and links, and to develop practical solutions for the activities of the socialist youth organization" (19).

The school organizes an annual tribunal entitled "We Accuse Imperialism", at which students from Third World countries give personal testimony about the injustices committed by the imperialist countries. This obviously is a powerful way of allowing these young people to air their frustrations about the international status quo and to channel the critique squarely in the direction of the Western countries. The costs involved in training these foreign students are covered by the FDJ budget and consist of free room and board, plus roughly 400 Marks monthly as a stipend (20).

In addition to operating this school, since 1963 the FDJ has also assisted in the execution of foreign policy by dispatching so-called "brigades of friendship" to developing countries to set up vocational training centers, work as mechanics (mainly on GDR-supplied equipment), help in bringing in harvests (coffee in Angola, wheat in Ethiopia), and so on. At the end of 1983, there were thirteen brigades in sub-Saharan Africa. Of those, eight were in Angola, three in Mozambique, and one each in Guinea and Guinea-Bissau. The Guinean (Conakry) project has been ongoing since 1967 and the one in Guinea-Bissau since 1976. Both of these are vocational training centers in which local apprentices learn specific trades. A similar center also exists in Mozambique and Angola. The other two brigades in Mozambique are involved in construction (mainly in connection with coal mining operations in Moatize), and the other seven brigades in Angola work in repair shops for GDR-model cars and trucks. In addition, each autumn a friendship brigade is sent on a special three-month assignment to Ethiopia

to repair the East German farm equipment supplied to Ethiopian state farms. This brigade has been sent annually since 1978 (21).

It is interesting that Western interpretations of these friendship brigades normally view them as paramilitary forces in Africa. This comes as no surprise, of course, considering the proclivity of many in the West to see any close levels of cooperation between the socialist countries and the Third World in military/strategic terms. This emphasis seems rather misplaced in the case of the friendship brigades, however, since, if anything, they resemble the US Peace Corps volunteers operating in the Third World. What distinguishes the East German youths, however, is that they are highly trained as mechanics and seem to be dispatched mainly to work on equipment sold by the GDR to their host country. If one needs to look for motives beyond altruistic or revolutionary solidarity which send these brigades to Africa, then they are clearly economic rather than military in nature. Since the East Germans lack international service networks to provide parts and services for their exports of industrial products, these friendship brigades perform this service function rather than any hidden military activities.

The Association of Free German Trade Unions (FDGB): Another mass organization which naturally plays an important part in building socialism is the trade union. Union activity in a country in which the means of production have already been expropriated from the capitalist class is deemed different since the fundamental conflict between capital and labor has been resolved in favor of the latter. The work of the union (the FDGB is the only union in the GDR) is thus closely tied to the party as the ultimate decision-making institution in the country. Its main functions are to support the economic targets established by the party and to explain general government policy to the workers.

Another part of its responsibilities is to work closely with trade union organizers in developing countries in support of their struggle against imperialism. Toward this end, the FDGB operates a trade union college in Bernau near Berlin. Since 1959, the FDGB has trained 3,300 trade unionists here from 85 different countries, with an emphasis on Africa. The unionists come to the GDR for courses varying from three to ten months, depending on their level of prior experience in the field. There are normally no more than fifteen students in one course and the school tries to assemble classes on the basis of similar linguistic or national backgrounds. For example, in January 1979, a special six-month course started for Mozambicans which was

tailored to meet Mozambican needs, as determined by the two governments at that time. In January 1982 another group of Mozambican unionists was trained in a three-month course. The training includes not only the fundamentals of trade union organizing within the context of a socialist society but also of Marxism/Leninism and the nature of the current struggle in the world. In this way, the GDR hopes to instill in visitors from African an understanding of the historical alliance between the developing and socialist countries in the struggle against imperialism. All expenses for the courses are covered by "solidarity contributions" of FDGB members, including a daily spending allowance of 7.50 Marks and a clothing allowance upon arrival. According to school officials, graduates from this union college are now located in just about all African states (22).

The Journalist Association (VDJ): Since political propaganda (this is not considered a pejorative term in the lexicography of the GDR) and agitation are also of primary importance in working with the masses, the VDJ's cooperation with colleagues from developing countries is yet another important tool of GDR foreign policy vis-à-vis these countries. The "College of Solidarity" was founded in 1963 by the VDJ to help young African states as part of east German anti-imperialist solidarity. It was financed by each of the roughly 6,000 members contributing one day's wages to the school and even now is financed through membership fees. While in the beginning, students from developing countries were trained mainly in the fundamentals of "socialist" journalism, there has been an attempt in recent years to train people who already hold rather high positions in the journalistic establishments of their countries, since their political impact is potentially much larger.

The basic ten-month introductory course is still held (in 1983 a group of fourteen Nicaraguans were trained in it) but there are now also many specialized courses lasting only about two months. From October to December 1983, for example, a course was conducted for radio and television journalists. Among the roughly twenty students in the course (most of them were from sub-Saharan Africa) were the heads of TV news in Ethiopia and Afghanistan. The VDJ pays for the flights (in case this involves hard currency, the government assumes the cost), the room and board of students, plus a monthly allowance of 200 Mark and a one-time 500 Mark allowance in the beginning for warm clothing (23).

All of the activities described above by the various mass organizations are part of a coordinated East German policy vis-à-vis developing countries.

with the Socialist Unity Party (SED) the ultimate instance of decision-making in the country. It is through the party that the overall goals and objectives of GDR foreign policy are formulated which are eventually executed by the various state and mass organizations in the country. A main function of all of the groups discussed thus becomes the dissemination and enforcement of decisions reached by the nation's highest ruling body, the Political Bureau of the SED. In other words, they are de facto a part of the governmental structure and operate within the parameters set by the political leadership. Interactions between these groups and their respective counterparts in developing countries are thus not spontaneous expressions of partnership but rather a very carefully designed part of East German foreign policy vis-à-vis a particular country. The heads of these various mass organizations are also leading members of the SED (24) and through the organizational mechanism of democratic centralism party decisions are eventually carried out by these social organizations. This makes possible a unified East German approach to dealing with particular developing countries at any particular time.

Conclusion

The following conclusions concerning East Germany's views on and cooperation with Third World development efforts can be drawn:

1. The GDR sees the developing countries as deeply embedded in the capitalist world economy. This is the result of a process of incorporation into the global economy through European colonialism which will take a long time to overcome. The CMEA countries do not consider themselves in a strong enough economic condition to be able to help these countries overcome their external dependence. It was out of this recognition that membership in the CMEA was denied to both Angola and Mozambique.
2. Because the productive forces inside these countries are so weakly developed, the course of socialist construction is considered a long-term prospect. Even the decision of the leadership of any Third World country to embark on a path of "socialist orientation" does not alter this fundamental fact. The developing countries are urged to maintain their economic ties with the West, using their state power increasingly to wrest certain concessions from the capitalist countries. Thus it is with the full consent of the socialist countries, for example, that radical Third World countries such as Angola, Mozambique, and Ethiopia work very closely with Western countries to obtain official development

assistance from them. The socialist countries themselves do not offer much capital aid, arguing on the one hand that they are not responsible for the underdevelopment of the Third World and thus do not have any financial obligations to it. On the other hand they are skeptical about the prospects of overcoming economic backwardness by pumping massive amounts of money into the hands of neocolonial elites. Development is thus seen as only being possible within the context of a fundamental transformation of society as a whole and by replacing corrupt elites with a progressive leadership.

3. Since developments in the direction of socialism are to take place mainly at the superstructural level at this time, the role of mass organizations becomes crucially important. At the formal state level, this expresses itself in the foundation of a Marxist/Leninist vanguard party able to lead the country into the direction of scientific socialism. At the level of mobilizing the general population, this task is to be accomplished with the help of various mass organizations, foremost among them trade unions, youth organizations, and journalists. Thus the GDR has a strong emphasis on the training of these cadres from the Third World.
4. At the present time, then, "anti-imperialist solidarity" between the East and the South expresses itself mainly at the political, not the economic level. It is to the political level that one thus needs to look in assessing the importance of the GDR for the attempts at overcoming underdevelopment in the periphery.
5. How successful this model of cooperation based on a primacy of political over economic relations will prove to be for the construction of socialism in the Third World remains to be seen. If present conditions in all of the countries of "socialist orientation" are a guide, then the GDR as well as its Eastern European allies will need to do much more in the economic sphere to ensure the lasting success of the model of development advocated by them.

Notes

- (1) It should be noted here that there is no universality of opinion as to what constitutes a "Marxist-Leninist" approach. What is meant here is the ruling orthodoxy prevailing in Eastern Europe and its uses of the above-mentioned nomenclature.
- (2) Autorenkollektiv, Die Leninschen Prinzipien der Sowjetischen Aussenpolitik, Moscow 1970, p. 62.
- (3) Erich Honecker, Bericht des Zentralkomitees der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands, an den X. Parteitag der SED, Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1981, p. 31.

- (4) For a good overview of the GDR's position on the NIEO, see H. Faulwetter, Entwicklungsländer und Neue Internationale Wirtschaftsordnung, Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1982. Faulwetter is one of the GDR's most prominent development economists and represents his country frequently at various international gatherings. For a critique of the practice of East Germany's economic relations with the Third World, see *inter alia* Brigitte Schulz, East German Relations with Sub-Saharan Africa: Proletarian Internationalism vs. "Mutual Advantage", Boston University African Studies Center, Working Paper Nr. 100, 1985; Kunibert Raffer, Official Declarations and Everyday Trade: Some Observations on East/South Relations, paper presented at the AAASS Conference in Portland, Oregon on 27 March 1986.
- (5) Constitution of the German Democratic Republic, 1974.
- (6) Ibid., p. 190.
- (7) H. Faulwetter and P. Stier, Entwicklungsländer am Scheideweg, Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1984, p. 7.
- (8) Martin Robbe, Die Stummen in der Welt haben das Wort: Entwicklungsländer, Bilanz und Perspektiven, Berlin: Verlag Neues Leben, 1984, p. 17.
- (9) Entwicklungsländer am Scheideweg, op. cit., p. 25.
- (10) For an example of this, see Robbe, op. cit., pp. 117 - 118 in an attack on West Germany's most prominent adherent of the dependency argument, Dieter Senghaas.
- (11) The term "real socialism" or "actually existing socialism" is a term used in the GDR and other East bloc countries to refer to themselves; that kind of socialism which "actually exists". This is used in response to those Marxists and radicals (mostly in the West) who would argue for a different kind of socialism, for which there is no actual model anywhere existing in the present world. These critics are labeled as being petty bourgeois, utopian idealists, etc. by the powers that be in the East.
- (12) W. I. Lenin, Werke, Berlin: 1970, Vol. 31, p. 232.
- (13) Erklärung der Beratung von Vertretern der kommunistischen Arbeiterparteien, November 1960, Berlin: 1961, p. 42.
- (14) Gerhard Brehme and Hans Kramer, Afrika: Kleines Nachschlagewerk, Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1985, p. 69.
- (15) Gemeinsame Kommission der Ökonomen der UdSSR und der DDR, Sozialistisches Weltssystem und Revolutionärer Weltprozeß, Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1982, p. 236.
- (16) For an interesting and detailed discussion of how this process is envisioned in a country embarked on this road, see Albin Kress and Siegfried Petzold, Volksrepublik Angola: Aufbruch in eine Neue Zeit, Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1985.
- (17) Interview with official at the Solidarity committee headquarters in Berlin on 9 March 1984. The figures quoted by this official are roughly the same as those submitted by the GDR government to UNCTAD, in which it states that at the beginning of 1983, "a total of 29,249 persons from developing countries were undergoing trades training or upgrading their job qualifications ... in enterprises and institutions of the German Democratic Republic ... In 1982, 4,222 cadres completed their training, bringing the total of developing country citizens having received job training in the German Democratic Republic since 1970, to more than 54,000 ... In the same year, 1,435 persons from developing countries successfully completed studies at German Democratic Republic institutions of higher or technical education, bringing the corresponding total of graduates since 1970 to roughly 14,500." UNCTAD/TD/304, Communication from the Minister of Foreign Trade and Head of Delegation of the German Democratic Republic, Sixth Session, Belgrade,

Yugoslavia, 6 June 1983, p. 3.

- (18) For a more detailed discussion of the tension in East German policy between "solidarity" and the principle of "mutual advantage" underlying economic relations, see my East German Relations with Sub-Saharan Africa, op. cit.
- (19) Unsere Jugendhochschule 'Wilhelm Pieck', (Berlin: 1980), p. 20.
- (20) Data gathered at school during visit in December 1983.
- (21) Interview at FDJ headquarters in Berlin on 8 November 1983.
- (22) Visit to school and interview with school officials on 2 July 1984.
- (23) Visit to school and interview with school officials from 14 - 18 November 1983.
- (24) Harry Tisch, the head of the FDGB, and Egon Krenz, who headed the FJD until spring 1984, are all members of the Politburo of the SED. Kurt Seibt, the head of the Solidarity Committee, is a member of the Central Committee.

Brigitte Schulz
Dept. of Political Science
Seattle University
Seattle, Washington 98122
USA

Vol. 3 No. 3 & 4		September & December 1985		ISSN 0280-3791	
SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES					
Theme 1 Development Alternatives					
Hans Gellert The ECOL Humanistic Technology: the New Technology as Experience from the Past					
John D. Robertson Post-Industrialism and the Structure of International Trade: Elaborating the Nature of Governmental Intervention into the Economy 29					
Sander Gilman & Henry S. McDowell An Analysis of USAID Impact Evaluation Studies Implications for the Future					
Derek Gough					
Marketed Surplus for Foodgrains in India, Current Causes					
External Trade Constraints to Development in Latin America and the Future of an Economic Relations with Europe					
Christen, A. B., Rapp, F. S., Singh, S. P.					
Efficiency of Dry Farming Technological Change					
Joseph S. Siskowitz					
The Technocratic Fallacy of Technological Decision Making					
Jesper Lunde, T. E.					
Integration Project Organization Coordination of Governmental Department Authorities					
Hansson, S.					
Social Forestry: A Case Study of Tribal Regions					
Bor, C. S. S. B., Murthy, M. L.					
The Political Economy of Biodiversity in India					
Thomas B. Nordt Skottchen					
Gunnar Adler Eriksson The Struggle of the Humanist in Anthropological Culture in Sweden 181					
Tage Elmqvist & Kurt Wicksell Has Energy Policy Influenced Energy Conservation?					
An International Comparison					
Suzanne Sinner, Le & Cécile Bona					
Education: A Resource for Immigrant Women's Adjustment to a New Culture - The Case of Norway					
Christen, Sander					
Scenarios for the Future of Human Settlements in the Nordic Countries					
Frieder Vorkwede					
Höbel Prior to Economics to France Mobilizes for Studies on Savings					
SPECIAL ISSUE ON DEVELOPMENT AID & MIDDLE COUNTRIES					
This is a journal of interdisciplinary social sciences specially devoted to the studies of present development related to basic human needs satisfaction such as socio-economic problems, conflict and peace, human rights, mig- ration, environment, North-South relations and anthropological issues					
Scandinavian Journal of Development Alternatives Post Box 7339, 103 90 Stockholm Sweden.					

Journal für Entwicklungspolitik 2, 1986, S. 81 - 92

Herwig Palme

INDIENS "COUNTER-TRADE" MIT DER SOWJETUNION

Der Handel zwischen Industrie- und Entwicklungsländern auf der Grundlage von Gegen- bzw. Kompensationsgeschäften, der neben anderen Formen des Warentauschs als "Counter-Trade" bezeichnet wird, läßt sich, historisch betrachtet, mit den langfristig beobachtbaren periodischen Zyklen des weltwirtschaftlichen Auf- und Abschwungs (den sogenannten Kondratieff- oder Schumpeterzyklen) in enge Verbindung bringen. Seit den 30er Jahren ist eine steigende Bedeutung der Gegengeschäfte (weiterhin als Bezeichnung für "Counter-Trade" verwendet) im gesamten Welthandel in Perioden des weltwirtschaftlichen Aufschwungs festzustellen. Zumindest auf kurze Frist weist diese Form des Handels als Mittel zur Umgehung der Auswirkungen des wirtschaftlichen Rückgangs auf globaler Ebene einige Vorteile auf. In längerfristiger Betrachtung müssen die Vor- und Nachteile dieser Handelsform erst eindeutig bestimmt werden. Es gibt Anzeichen dafür, daß qualitative Veränderungen auf dem Gebiet der Technologieentwicklung und der geopolitischen Lage die Erfahrungen mit Gegengeschäften in der Vergangenheit als Grundlage für Abschätzung seiner künftigen Auswirkungen nicht mehr geeignet erscheinen lassen (Griffin & Rouse 1986: 193).

In der jüngsten Vergangenheit, in der Periode des Rückgangs des Welthandels zwischen 1980 und 1983, hatten die Gegengeschäfte jedenfalls eine spektakuläre Ausweitung zu verzeichnen. Dies betraf den Handel sowohl zwischen als auch innerhalb der verschiedenen Kategorien von Ländern: marktwirtschaftlich orientierte, Industrie- und Entwicklungsländer, sowie solche mit zentral geplanten Wirtschaften. *Business International* (23. Dez. 1983: 354) gibt an, daß mehr als die Hälfte der in *Fortune* angeführten 500 größten Unternehmungen eigene Abteilungen für Kompensations- und Gegengeschäfte unterhalten und die meisten der übrigen Unternehmungen die Schaffung solcher Abteilungen erwägen. Obwohl sich der Welthandel seit 1984 deutlich erholte, scheint sich das rasche Wachstum der Gegengeschäfte weiterhin fortzusetzen. Die Schätzungen über den Anteil der Gegengeschäfte am gesamten Welthandelsvolumen gehen weit auseinander, sie liegen zwischen 12 und 50 Prozent. Der *Economist* (London) schätzte jüngst dessen Anteil auf ein