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1. Maurer and Manescu Leave for Britain

Following their visit of last month to Belgium, Prime Minister Maurer and Foreign Minister Manescu departed on November 24 for a six-day visit to Britain at the invitation (extended in September 1968) of Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart. The event marks the first visit of a Rumanian Premier to Britain since the last war. The Rumanians will be the highest-ranking Communist officials to visit Britain since the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

The visit is expected to stimulate British-Rumanian economic relations considerably, but it is of equal significance that it is taking place during negotiations for a European security conference. The emphasis on economic matters is evidenced by the composition of the Rumanian delegation, which includes, among others, Deputy Foreign Trade Minister Nicolae Nicolae, Deputy Minister of the Machine Building Industry Gheorghe Oprea, General Director of the Ministry of Machine Building Stefan Ispas, and Finance Ministry Counselor Nicolae Cristescu.

The trip follows the return to London earlier this month of a high-powered trade delegation sponsored by the London Chamber of Commerce. Lord Limerick, a merchant banker and head of the delegation, said last week that Rumania might place 250 million dollars in orders with British concerns shortly. This includes two contracts for irrigation projects which themselves would total 96 million dollars. An RFE special from London (November 18) said that Rumania had recently placed in Britain an order for three chemical glass plants -- to be delivered during 1960 -- and another order for a 48,000 dollar hot concrete mixer. (For figures on trade between the
According to an RFE Special from London of November 21, one entire day will be devoted to a tour of the Rolls Royce Company's headquarters and plants. The aircraft engines produced by that company are used in the six BAC 111 planes which Rumania has bought from Britain at a cost of over 28 million dollars. Reuters reported on November 24 that Rumanian officials are negotiating in Bucharest with Hawker Siddeley about buying twin-engined medium-range aircraft for domestic lines. A further piece of news is that Britain has just completed the financing of a large irrigation project near the Danube, and has agreed to buy Rumanian agricultural produce over the next eight to ten years.

In the field of atomic power, Rumania has not taken up British offers of enriched uranium power plants, apparently preferring the natural uranium equipment which she can obtain from Canada.

Commenting on British-Rumanian relations, Agerpres said on November 21 that they are now in their most fruitful period ever. The agency recalled that trade exchanges between the two countries had increased 4.8 times in the 1960-68 period, with Britain ranking third in Rumania's list of trading partners among the developed Western countries, and sixth in Rumania's trade as a whole.

On November 23, Romania Libera hailed the "upward evolution" of Rumanian relations. On the same day, Radio Bucharest spoke of the visit as illustrating the lively Rumanian foreign policy which is promoting bilateral relations with all the countries of the world. The radio recalled that British-Rumanian exchanges which saw, inter alia, the visits of Rumanian vice-premiers to London in 1966 and 1967 and of a first vice-premier in 1968 will now be raised to a qualitatively higher level. As for international questions, Maurer and Manescu are expected to discuss in Britain not only European security but also the Middle East, Vietnam, and disarmament.

Rumania has of course joined the Warsaw Pact Declaration issued in Prague calling for a European Security Conference in Helsinki in the first part of 1970, but a number of Rumanian pronouncements made after the Prague conference, indicate understanding for the Western position that a European security conference must be well prepared and must include the U.S. and Canada. (Cf., the statement issued after the cabinet meeting of November 13 and an article entitled "Aims and Means in International Policy" published in Romania Libera of November 20.) It appears also that the Rumanians are pressing for a series of conferences, starting with uncontentious matters. The British leaders will certainly be interested in Rumanian views on East-West relations, but it is known that they maintain that an agenda must be agreed upon in advance and that the conference must have a reasonable chance of success.
2. "Romania Literara" Round Table

The literary weekly Romania Literara (No. 45, 6 November 1969) contains the minutes of a round table discussion between literary critics and writers: Nicolae Breban, G. Dimisianu, and Adrian Paunescu of the editorial staff of Romania Literara met with Nicolae Balota, Ion Dodu Balan, Matei Calinescu, Serban Cioculescu, Ov. S. Crohmălniceanu, Ion Negoițescu, Edgar Papu, and Corneliu Regman. The discussion, which concentrated upon several basic concerns concerning literature and literary criticism in Romania, was characterized by remarkable frankness.

The main topic discussed was the stagnation of literary criticism in present-day Romania. The panel agreed that literary criticism lags behind life and behind literature, but different reasons were given for this phenomenon. Nicolae Breban blamed "the epoch of dogmatic criticism" for the absence of courage in criticism: "The most striking shortcoming in our literary criticism is the lack of any effort at polemic debate about certain ideas and certain aesthetic principles." This lack of critical combativeness and polemic courage was said to be due to the instability and lack of real freedom surrounding the critic, as well as to the unpredictability of literary development.

Referring to the concept of socialist realism (without openly mentioning it) the progressive poet and journalist Adrian Paunescu complained about...

...the appearance and disappearance of certain concepts, as well as of certain facts of reality. Everyone knows about those concepts which were in great vogue about ten years ago. One of them was extremely widespread, and it has disappeared without almost no warning. A number of articles were written by Liviu Rusu and Gh. Achitei in Luceafărul, and the concept was buried. This is a very interesting situation indeed: the disappearance of a term which for some time had been in general use, is passed over in secret. Critical discussions about such situations are not elucidated, they may reappear at any moment. We do not refer to just any kind of concept, but to those concepts which caused the stagnation of literature and which have hindered critics from freely discussing literary works. I think that this is a kind of original sin of our criticism...

Paunescu significantly expressed fear of a return to a literary climate similar to that of the 1950s at the very moment when the regime has demonstrated signs of exercising increased control over cultural affairs. Even during the period of relative liberalism following the RCP Ninth Congress, critics have not
been entirely free to speak their minds and those who did were reprimanded. Paunescu mentioned the case of the critic Nicolae Manolescu, whose audacious poetry anthology, though printed, was never distributed to the reading public, and who was subsequently harshly criticized by Ivascu, Dima, and others. A second instance cited by Paunescu was that of the critic I. Negoiteacu (a participant in the round table), who, after having published the draft of a very original history of Rumanian literature, was not permitted to publish it in final form. Paunescu strongly opposed the idea of a single, and necessarily dogmatic, guide line in literary criticism; he opted for pluralism of opinion in the field of criticism.

Another problem concerning the position of the critic in present-day Rumania is that of the opportunities of expression granted to him by the periodicals. Participants in the debate complained that critics were not given enough room in the literary papers. This was said to be the reason for the state of unhealthy and even unfair competition which can be observed in the field of criticism. Only very few critics are allowed to conduct regular columns in magazines, and the majority of them have difficulty in obtaining publication of a single article. In this climate literary criticism can hardly attain objectivity, since polemics are very often waged on strictly personal grounds. Those present at the round table also pronounced themselves in favor of stability and continuity in critical activity; they advocated the creation of a Critics' Association, and demanded space in the non-specialized mass circulation papers, such as Scanteia, Romania Libera, and Informatia Bucurestiului.

Another important topic discussed was the increase in literary production in Rumania. Faced with a "literary inflation" in Rumania, critics ask themselves what position to adopt. The enormous quantity and diversity of the literary output make it very difficult for the critic to distinguish between valuable and worthless works, and to create a link between art and its consumer. This was said to be a real problem, since the critics, who have for so long been accustomed to making simplified and unilateral judgments only, are now obliged to create for themselves the critical premises upon which to consider works of art. One of the phenomena in Rumanian literature which demands a definite reaction from the critics was defined by the writer Breban as "a flight from social topics, from pre-established patterns, from the classical elements of prose in general." In Breban's opinion, this is due to the fact that these elements have so long been associated with "certain concepts" (another allusion to socialist realism) which has been used "in a stupid and abusive way." The writer and critic Matei Calinescu raises Breban's observations to the rank of a general truth. "The fear of the social phenomenon in literature is in itself a social phenomenon."
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The reaction of the official Party paper Scanteia to the round table was prompt and not unexpected in light of dogmatic pronouncements that have come in the wake of the Ninth Party Congress. On 9 November 1969, Scanteia half-heartedly acknowledged the importance of the initiative undertaken by Romania Literara. This formal approval is, however, undermined by reservations and even by severe criticism. M. Rusu, the author of the Scanteia article, suspects the editors of Romania Literara of not having published the entire text of the discussion. He is critical of the fact that no "clearly defined" conclusions were drawn from such very divergent opinions. Referring perhaps to Paunescu's hardly veiled allusions to socialist realism, Rusu stresses the necessity of "explaining" some of the ideas expressed during the round table discussion.

Eugen Barbu's reaction to the round table, in the Bucharest daily Informatia Bucurestiului, (11 November 1969) was purely negative. This is not surprising, since the report of the discussion contained a number of thinly veiled critical allusions to this writer. He was accused -- although not named -- of having suppressed free criticism in the literary paper Lucafarul, whose editor-in-chief he was between 1963 and 1967. He was also charged with having encouraged personal enmity in his paper. In his Informatia Bucurestiului, Barbu attacked the "opportunism" of some of the critics who took part in the Romania Literara debate. Although Barbu did not mention anyone by name, it is not difficult to deduce that he was referring to some of the older generation of critics, especially Cioculescu and Grohmalnicau. He was evidently trying to discredit their present progressive position by calling attention to their former dogmatic writings, which date from a period when critics could choose only between writing in a conservative manner or not writing at all. Barbu wrote:

I should like to begin by speaking about the snobbery of some representatives of today's criticism who, after having for many years defended realism in literature with notorious assiduity, have now passed -- with drums beating and trumpets sounding -- into the opposite camp (Let us not call it the "idealistic one," because this would not be true) joining those for whom literature has nothing to do with man's daily existence (i.e., writers of fantasy, etc.). No one denies critics the right to refuse and to detect what is outdated and uninspired in literature, but is it not an odd sort of theorizing in several ways? The question follows logically: when were you being true to your own views, Mr. Critic? Yesterday or today?"

Barbu's philippic is based upon arguments not totally wrong in themselves, but it seems that he is using them in a bad cause: the discrediting of a progressive movement -- however timid -- in Romanian literary criticism. The charges made by Barbu against
critics in general, and those writing for Romania Literara in particular, are rather serious, raging from "incapacity," "lack of professional skill," to -- what is worse -- "ideological drawbacks." He finds it quite natural that critics who lack character -- i.e., who have not maintained the same attitude all the time -- should not be given more space in the newspapers.

The round table organized by Romania Literara indicates that, although such "progressive" elements as Anghel, Năcău, and Ivasiuc have left its columns, this paper is still trying to defend its progressive orientation. Some of the demands made by the critics present at the round table remind us of Ivasiuc's postulates -- the demand for a literature which deals critically with social topics, and a criticism courageous enough to point out social implications; a literary climate free of unfair quarrels and personal rivalry; freedom of expression and of dialogue.

3. Ceausescu's Interview with "Komunist"

On November 19 the weekly of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Komunist published an interview granted to its editor-in-chief, Gavro Altman, by Rumanian Party and state leader Nicolae Ceausescu. On November 20 Radio Bucharest broadcast what appears to be the official Rumanian version of the interview.

The interview dealt with such questions as the causes of political instability, the principles governing relations among socialist states, European security, the principles on which economic and technical-scientific relations should be based, modernization of the Rumanian economy (including collective management and participation), and Rumanian-Yugoslav relations.

The interview was in no way startling, nor did it touch directly on many controversial issues. Whether the cautious approach and the bland formulations used reflect that a certain degree of pressure is being exerted on Rumania by the Soviets is a matter for speculation. Stress throughout was on the well-known principles governing relations among socialist countries, and a particular accent was on the principle of non-interference, and repeated warnings against imperialist domination. In this fashion the two countries demonstrated their intention to maintain their stand -- in a period of negotiations following the Prague Declaration -- on national independence, and self-determination. Ceausescu's pronouncements should be seen as pertaining in the first place to current preparations for a European security conference. The parts of the interview dealing with reform of Rumanian management and planning and with Rumanian-Yugoslav relations can be considered of secondary political value, and intended primarily for Yugoslav readers. Nevertheless, it is apparently becoming more and more routine for Ceausescu to grant interviews to such papers as Komunist or the Italian CP organ Unità than, for instance, to Problems of Peace and Socialism (World Marxist Review).
Open provocation was avoided. The text did not mention Czechoslovakia by name, nor did it refer to Communist China. Instead, it stressed the growing role of the small and medium-sized countries and -- with a bow to Peking -- asked that all countries of the world participate in the resolution of the problem of peace.

On relations among Communist countries, Ceausescu said that "a new type of relation among them cannot be achieved by itself; it presupposes in fact liquidation of a series of old mentalities which continue to exist in varying forms even in socialist conditions." Ceausescu spoke in this connection of "subjective manifestations which have their roots in disregard of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, of proletarian internationalism." He added, however, that the current state of affairs is transitional and that the difficulties will be overcome.

It is primarily in connection with the preparations for a European security conference that Ceausescu had the fate of such smaller countries like Rumania and Yugoslavia in mind when he said that every European country should advocate renunciation of force and economic co-operation. He said that the forces promoting detente and co-operation were on the increase, and recalled that progress had been made in this direction at the meetings in Bucharest (July 1966), Budapest (March 1969), and Prague (October 1969); he said, however, that a whole series of bilateral and multilateral meetings should be held, in order to ensure optimal conditions for the holding of a European security conference. He also said that recent years had seen the development of more realistic conditions for consideration of the problem of European security.

Speaking of the principle on which economic and technical-scientific relations should be based, Ceausescu pointed to the need for renunciation of closed economic groupings such as the Common Market. Economic co-operation should benefit each partner and should ensure a free flow of technological information, free of all forms of domination. Naturally, the intensification and expansion of economic, trade, and technical-scientific exchanges is of prime importance. Here again Rumanian and Yugoslav interest in developing co-operation with the West becomes apparent.

The part of Ceausescu's interview dealing with the economic reform in Rumania contained no new elements. He added that Rumania is proceeding in a selective manner, adopting from other countries whatever it considers good and applicable.
He described relations between Yugoslavia and Rumania as 'among the best,' and observed that the two countries have developed 'extremely broad co-operation in every field.' But with regard to the Iron Gates project, he noted that 'maximum co-operation has not been achieved, and it is necessary to continue working toward the implementation of decisions which have already been adopted....'

4. Trade Agreement with the Soviet Union

Radio Bucharest of November 22 reported the signing of the Rumanian-Soviet protocol on trade relations for 1970 which provides for trade exchanges worth 840 million rubles -- i.e., roughly a 3 per cent increase over the planned 1969 level of 815 million rubles. Under the new protocol Rumania will supply the Soviet Union with ships, steel pipes, oil and chemical products, timber, furniture, knitted goods, etc., and will receive in return lifting machinery, road and construction equipment, machine tools, coke, iron ore, ferrous rolled metals, and cotton. This list is the same as last year's, with the exception of passenger cars which are no longer included in the list of Soviet exports.

The 1966-1970 long-term trade agreement between the two countries provided for goods exchanges worth 3,800 million rubles. According to the Rumanian Statistical Yearbook, the volume of trade between Rumania and the Soviet Union amounted to 15,095.6 million lei (or 2,263 million rubles) in the first three years of the above mentioned period. Assuming that the 1969 target of 815 million rubles will be reached, total trade in the first four years will amount to 3,078 million rubles, which would mean overfulfillment of the long-term plan.

The Soviet Union's share of Rumania's total foreign trade dropped from 51.5 per cent in 1958 to 28.2 per cent in 1967, but recovered slightly to 28.7 per cent in 1968; since the 1969 economic plan provides for an increase of total foreign trade by 9 per cent (whereas the Rumanian-Soviet trade agreement for the same year envisages a growth of only 6 per cent), one would assume that the share of the Soviet Union in Rumania's foreign trade will once more decline, if plans are not exceeded again.

The volume of Rumanian-Soviet trade has been low in comparison with Soviet trade figures covering dealings with the other Comecon partners, and this situation was hardly to be rectified by the planned increase for 1966-1970, which gave Rumania the smallest target and smallest percentage increase among Comecon countries.

According to the May 1967 issue of Foreign Trade, the house organ of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade, trade increases were to be as follows:
5. Long-Term Trade Agreement with FRG

Radio Bucharest of November 24 reported that a long-term trade agreement and the 1970 protocol for trade exchanges between Rumania and the FRG have been initialed, but gave no other details.

DPA of November 22 said that an agreement dealing with trade and economic co-operation, which covers the period from January 1970 until December 1974, has been concluded and will be signed before the end of 1969, prior to which event Bonn is to consult the Common Market authorities in Brussels about terms. The two countries signed in December 1963 a three-year trade agreement which was regularly extended until 31 December 1969, thus avoiding negotiations on the so-called "Berlin clause." It is likely that once again the two partners have avoided this delicate issue. Rumania no doubt has insisted during the negotiations on increased FRG imports from Rumania in order to reduce her negative trade balance which in the 1965-1968 period passed the 2,000 million lei mark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>70 per cent</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1967</th>
<th>1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rumanian Imports</td>
<td>662.8</td>
<td>889.2</td>
<td>1,536.8</td>
<td>1,031.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumanian Exports</td>
<td>379.4</td>
<td>444.7</td>
<td>578.9</td>
<td>634.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Balance</td>
<td>283.4</td>
<td>444.5</td>
<td>957.9</td>
<td>397.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(more)
According to DPA of 15 August 1969, Rumania's trade balance with the FRG improved in the first six months of 1969 compared to the same period of 1968 -- i.e., Rumanian imports fell by 21.1 per cent to 305 million DM, while FRG imports rose by 8 per cent to 214 million DM, and the deficit thus decreased to 91 million DM (136.5 million lei) against 188.5 million DM (282.8 million lei) in the same period of 1968.

It remains to be seen to what extent the revaluation of the Mark will affect the trading situation and whether the FRG will be willing to import from Rumania -- in addition to the latter's traditional export commodities like food, timber, etc. -- increased quantities of manufactured goods, machinery, etc.

6. Other Economic News

A. Meeting on Industrial Centrals. A conference attended by the directors of the Industrial Centrals, combines, trusts and groups of enterprises and by county Party secretaries whose responsibility is the economic section took place at the Central Committee of the RCP on November 22, reported Radio Bucharest the same day. Also taking part were Ceausescu, Niculescu-Mizil, Trofin, Verdet and other high-ranking Party and state officials.

The conference, according to the Radio, discussed problems concerning the organization and operation of the new economic bodies, and those present, proposed measures aimed at improving them.

In his address, Ceausescu dealt in detail with the economic tasks of these bodies, as well as with the planning of production; technical and material supply; sales; specialization and co-operation with other economic units; the strengthening of technical planning sectors; and an improvement in foreign trade activity. He then called for the completion of the organization of these new economic units, for the provision of economic and technical cadres for these bodies, and for measures -- to be enacted by central state organs -- enabling them to carry out the responsibilities and exercise the powers granted to them by their statutes.

Concluding, Ceausescu outlined the tasks of the economic bodies and Party organs in fulfilling the current year's economic plan and their duty to make measures in good time to implement the 1970 plan, the last year of the five-year plan.
B. Construction Enterprise Set Up. According to Radio Bucharest of November 21, a construction enterprise called Arcnor has been set up within the Ministry of Industrial Construction for work in foreign countries. This enterprise will carry out drafting, research, industrial construction, and the building of roads, bridges, airports, railroads, etc.

C. Tourism Rises. Agerpres of November 20 reported that the number of foreign tourists visiting Rumania amounted to 1,685,200 during the first 10 months of 1969, as against 1,450,000 during the whole of 1968.

D. GATT to Meet Again on Rumanian Bid. According to an RFE Special from Geneva (November 24), the working party on the accession of Rumania to GATT membership is to begin a three-day meeting on that date to thrash out the final terms of full members. (See Rumanian Situation Reports/87 and 90, Radio Free Europe Research, 12 November 1968 and 16 October 1969 respectively.) The objections of Rumanian representative Mircea Petrescu to any fixed rate of increase were well received by the Common Market countries, which informed other GATT members that they would be willing to permit Rumanian entry without a fixed rate of increase if in return the Common Market would continue some of its quantitative restrictions.

Members of the Polish delegation to GATT were said to have informed Western representatives that they are concerned that Rumania will be permitted to enter on easier terms than Poland, which had agreed to increase its imports from GATT countries by at least seven per cent each year.

E. Exports Increasing. Agerpres (November 20) reported that exports this year are some 16 per cent higher than in 1968. The 1969 plan provided for an over-all increase in foreign trade of 9 per cent, 14.6 per cent in exports and 3.0 per cent in imports. (The plan provided for exports amounting to 10.1 thousand million lei.) If the 16 per cent increase in exports as well as the 9 per cent over-all increase are achieved, the trade balance for 1969 would show a slight excess for exports.

F. Partial Agreement with EEC on Farm Exports. An RFE Special from Brussels (November 20) reported that the EEC commission has decided to lift the supplementary levies on pork and some poultry produce imported from Rumania, following on the latter's guarantee to respect the community's "sluicegate prices" for these commodities.
G. Trade Protocol with Algeria. Rumania and Algeria signed the 1970 trade protocol on November 19, reported Radio Bucharest the same day.

H. Trade and Co-operation Agreement with Austria. Radio Bucharest (November 19) reported that the Rumanian-Austrian Commission on Economic Co-operation has signed a trade protocol and a protocol on economic and technical co-operation for 1970. Under the trade agreement Rumania will export chemicals, metallurgical products, machinery, food, and consumer goods, and will import metallurgical products, machines, tools, and chemical products.

7. Miscellaneous

A. Macovescu Meets Schumann. First Deputy Foreign Minister George Macovescu, returned on 20 November from Paris where he had been at the invitation of the French Foreign Ministry (See Rumanian, SR/100, RFER, 17 November 1969, Item 6 A) and met with French Foreign Minister Maurice Schumann on November 16. The two Ministers discussed ways of increasing political, trade, cultural, and technological co-operation.

B. Students' Winter Vacations Include Christmas. According to Scanteia Timișoarei of 8 November, The winter vacation for students will take place between 21 December 1969 and 4 January 1970, thus including Christmas Day. Hitherto students have always had their vacations in the first half of February, but after the student demonstrations during Christmas 1968, when they called for vacations at Christmas time, the government has obviously seen fit to make concessions in this respect.

C. Ceausescu Meets Scientists. Radio Bucharest (November 13) reported that Party and state leader Nicolae Ceausescu, CC Secretary Paul Niculescu-Mizil, and Executive Committee members Dumitru Popescu and Leonte Rautu had held a working session with researchers and professors of social sciences on November 13. Ceausescu spoke about the necessity of improving activity in this field.

D. Nuclear Agreement with Czechoslovakia. Radio Bucharest (November 19) reported that an agreement on the peaceful use of nuclear energy has been signed by the Czechoslovak Atomic Energy Commission and the Rumanian Nuclear Energy Committee.

E. Minister of Internal Affairs to Budapest. On November 19, Minister of Internal Affairs Cornel Cătărescu left for Budapest at the invitation of his Hungarian counterpart, Andras Benkő, according to Radio Bucharest on the same day.
F. Minister of Building Materials to Sofia. Radio Bucharest (November 18) reported that Deputy Minister of the Building Materials Industry Valeriu Cristescu had left for Sofia to negotiate a co-operation agreement between this Ministry and the Bulgarian Ministry of Construction and Architecture on 22 November. Radio Bucharest reported the signing of a protocol covering construction co-operation between the two countries.

G. Party Activists Tour Soviet Union. Radio Moscowl, in a Rumanian-language broadcast on November 19, reported that a delegation of Rumanian Party activists, headed by the First Secretary of the Galati County Party Committee, Constantin Dascalescu, had visited the Soviet town of Jaroslav.

H. Youth Leader to Moscow. Radio Bucharest (November 19) reported that Vasile Nicoliciu, Secretary of the CC of the Union of Communist Youth, had left for Moscow the same day at the invitation of the Soviet youth organization's Central Committee.

I. Nuclear Energy Commission to India. A delegation representing the Rumanian Committee on Nuclear Energy, headed by its First Vice Chairman, Ioan Ursu, has left for India at the invitation of the Indian Commission for Atomic Energy, according to Radio Bucharest (November 19).

J. Delegation to East Germany. Radio Bucharest (November 19) reported the departure to East Germany of a Rumanian parliamentary delegation composed of Mihai Levent, Stanciu Stoian, and Anton Breitenhofer.

K. Maurer Meets Delegation of Yugoslav Socialist Alliance. Radio Bucharest of November 21 reported a meeting between Premier Ion Gheorghe Maurer and a visiting delegation of the Yugoslav Socialist Alliance headed by Ljupo Arsov. The Yugoslav delegation came to Rumania at the invitation of the Rumanian Front of Socialist Unity.

L. Ample Coverage of Apollo 12 Flight. Rumanian media gave good coverage to all phases of the Apollo 12 flight. Romania Libera of November 21, for instance, dedicated half a page to the mission, describing the astronauts' activity during their moon walk and stressing that the whole program had been successfully carried out.

M. Relations with USA. During the last few days a number of Americans have visited Rumania. Assistant US Secretary of Agriculture Clarence Palmby discussed agricultural co-operation
between the two countries; a delegation of engineers headed by Phillip Myers from the University of Wisconsin visited higher education institutes, industrial enterprises in Brasov County and the hydro-power station Arges; and American composer-conductor Aaron Copland conducted a concert given by the Rumanian radio-tele-
vision symphony orchestra.

N. Party Delegation off to Chile. Radio Bucharest of November 20 reported the departure to Chile of a Party delegation headed by Dumitru Popenescu, Executive Committee member and Secretary of the CC, who will attend the 14th Chilean Party Congress. Other members of the Rumanian delegation are Constantin Vasiliu, Deputy CC Section Chief; Mihai Ghere, alternate member of the Executive Committee and secretary of the CC; and Gisela Vas and Bujor Sion, CC Section Chiefs.

CORRECTION:

To Rumanian SR/100, 17 November 1969:

Page 5, paragraph F: Please change heading to read "Shortages in Food Supply"

To Rumanian SR/101, 20 November 1969:

Page 2: replace the first two paragraphs with the following:

of Agricultural and Forestry Sciences -- a post probably better suited to a scientist like Giosan. On the other hand, the delay in switching Giosan from one post to the other may have been due to the disarray caused by this year's poor harvest and the criticism leveled against both the Higher Council on Agriculture and the National Union of Agricultural Production Co-operatives (headed by Vasile Valcu) by Party and state leader Nicolae Ceausescu in his Harvest Day speech (October 5) (see Rumanian Situation Reports/87 and 92, Radio Free Europe Research, 6 and 23 October 1969, Items 5 and 2, respectively).

Both Giosan and Miculescu are members of the Central Committee. Giosan, a university professor (born in 1921), was a Deputy Minister of Agriculture in 1953. He was elected alternate Central Committee member in December 1955, and in June 1960 he became a full member of that body. A director of the Maize-Growing Research Institute, he was appointed Vice-Chairman of the Higher Council on Agriculture when this body replaced the Ministry of Agriculture in May 1962. In August 1965, Giosan became Chairman of the Higher Council.

Page 4, 3rd line from bottom: Delete etc. after "Council of State Security".