

# RADIO FREE EUROPE *Research*

*This material was prepared for the use of the editors and policy staff of Radio Free Europe.*

RUMANIA/48  
12 December 1975

## S I T U A T I O N   R E P O R T

### Culture

1. Cultural Information Policy Becoming Increasingly Restrictive?
2. Historical Film Pursues Propaganda Goals

### Foreign Relations

3. Rumania and the MBFR Talks in Vienna
4. West German Foreign Minister Genscher Visits Bucharest

### Trade and Economic Co-operation

5. 1976 Trade and Payments Agreement with Hungary Signed
6. Rumanian Airlines Inaugurate Regular Flights to Peking and Amman

12 December 1975

CULTURE1. Cultural Information Policy Becoming Increasingly Restrictive?

Since 1971, and particularly since the Press Law was passed in March 1974, Rumanian information media have been reporting less and less about official discussions of and decisions with regard to cultural and artistic matters. This is in marked contrast to the democratization of Rumanian public life heralded as one of the benefits the Press Law would bring about. The lack of frankness has been accompanied by increasing authoritarianism in enforcing the leading role of the party in culture and the arts.

On at least two occasions in 1975 communiqués on meetings of the Political Executive Committee merely stated that its members had discussed and approved measures already taken or to be taken in regard to ideology, culture, or education, giving no details (Scinteia, 31 May 1975, and Radio Bucharest, 14 October 1975). Another meeting of the Political Executive Committee which took place on December 3 and at which ideological and cultural matters most probably came up for discussion was given no press coverage at all; the only indication that it was held is to be found in a Scinteia report (December 5) of a speech delivered by Ceausescu to the nationality councils.

Press coverage of the two 1974 plenary sessions of the Council on Socialist Culture and Education, held in January and September (see Contemporanul No. 3, 17 January 1975, and Romania Libera, 2 September 1975) was equally poor: Contemporanul published neither the report delivered at the January session by Dumitru Popescu, the council's chairman, nor the speeches of the participants, but confined itself to Popescu's brief closing speech; and in September Romania Libera merely named some of the participants who had taken the floor -- without going into what they had said -- and gave only a brief, general summary of the speech delivered by Popescu. A meeting of theatrical directors that took place at the headquarters of the Council on Socialist Culture and Education in the fall received similar treatment -- Radio Bucharest (October 2) quoted only a few sentences from the speech delivered by Constantin Maciuca, head of the council's theatrical directorate.

Press reports on meetings of the leading bodies of the Writers' Union were, to say the least, confusing. Romania Literara (No. 16, 17 April 1975) stated that Virgil Teodorescu had been "unanimously" elected chairman of the Writers' Union Council at a plenary session of the union of April 11; the April 10 issue of Romania Literara, however, had referred to him as already in that post. The latter publication was also somewhat cryptic in its description of the April 11 meeting. In its issue No. 16 (17 April 1975) it was stated that "the plenary session took a number of decisions about membership in the Writers' Union, in conformity with the union's statutes and the Code on Socialist Ethics and Equity." Later on,

it transpired that this passage referred to the expulsion of Dumitru Tepeneag (editor-in-chief of the Paris review Cahiers de l'Est) from the Writers' Union. The word unanimous was not used in the Romania Literara report, and in fact there were rumors that at least one writer, Geo Bogza, had asked for a justification of the decision, probably because he did not agree with it.

The latter journal's report on the October 15 meeting of the Writers' Union Bureau (in issue No. 43, 23 October 1975) was hardly intelligible. It said that, among other points on the agenda, the bureau had been "informed about the activities of the commissions set up in response to decisions taken by the union's council and bureau." Since these decisions were not published and no reports on the activities of the commissions in question have appeared, the statement has no information value whatever for those who were not present at the meeting.

At a meeting of the Political Executive Committee on December 10 it was announced that a congress on political education and culture -- first mentioned by Ceausescu in a speech to a gathering of Ministers of Culture of the socialist countries last September -- would take place in May 1976. It was also decided that between February and April 1976 meetings should be arranged in party and mass organizations and cultural and ideological institutions to discuss the implementation of the party's program to improve ideological education and suggest ways of improving activity in this field.

## 2. Historical Film Pursues Propaganda Goals

A new film, Cantemir, directed by Gheorghe Vitanidis, has been released in Rumania, obviously for the purpose of popularizing new interpretations of history. It focuses on the life of the Moldavian ruler Dimitrie Cantemir, the 300th anniversary of whose birth was hailed two years ago in articles in such publications as Scinteia and Era Socialista (see Rumanian Situation Report/34, Radio Free Europe Research [EERA], 23 August 1973, Item 5). After being enthroned by the Turks in 1710, Cantemir accepted Russian sovereignty a year later in order to liberate his country from the Turkish yoke. When Tsar Peter I's troops were defeated in the battle of Stanilesti in 1711, however, Cantemir had to go into exile in St. Petersburg, where he wrote the major part of his historical work. Era Socialista (No. 10/1973) used Cantemir's anniversary as a pretext for emphasizing Rumanian national unity and even for subtly reiterating a historical claim to Bessarabia.

The programmatic, utilitarian character of Cantemir is even more obvious than was that of Marin Preda's novel Delirul (see Rumanian SR/39, RFER, 10 October 1975, Item 8). The script was written by Mihnea Gheorghiu, chairman of the Academy of Social and Political Sciences, with the assistance of two well-known historians, Virgil Candea and Dan Zamfirescu. The latter took it upon himself



12 December 1975

to explain to the readers of Luceafarul (in that weekly's 18 and 25 October 1975 issues) the political and ideological implications of Cantemir. Gheorghiu's image of the Moldavian ruler, he said, was a new one. He described the film as a "cinematographic monograph" with an "innovative perspective" that had not hitherto been achieved "by any merely scientific monograph, by any learned treatise or novel." This "new vision" was "representative of the new way in which the Rumanian people, the Rumanian cultural community, regard the architects of [the history of] past centuries." (This is in keeping with Dumitru Constantin's statement [in Saptamina No. 247, 29 August 1975] that "the RCP has always regarded history, the queen of sciences, as an important element in political-ideological and cultural-educational work.")

The culminating point of the film, according to Zamfirescu, is the scene in which the interests of Cantemir come into conflict with those of the Russian sovereign, though the two rulers had had identical goals for some time: "The policy of the great empire and that of little Moldavia came to a dramatic parting of the ways when, at Stalinesti, they confronted one another -- though with love and understanding: for Peter, this [battle] was just an episode in a development that was only beginning, a pause in a vast scenario whose ultimate goal was universal affirmation of a huge empire; for Moldavia, however, it meant falling under the hooves of the horses, it meant pillage and death and a prejudicing of its rights that was to last for a century." (This sequence was probably intended to underline current Rumanian government and party concerns regarding the danger of entrusting one's fate to the superpowers. It also points up alternative perspectives which can result in differences between states.)

Drawing attention to the "topicality" of Cantemir's policy and to the permanence of the goals pursued by Rumanian rulers past and present was one of the main objectives of the press coverage given to Cantemir. Writing in Saptamina (No. 253, 10 October 1975), Radu Georgescu called the film a topical one and said it was being shown "precisely in order to demonstrate the continuity and permanence of our desires and our policy" -- i.e., "political unity and independence within the borders that have always been inhabited by Rumanians." Both Georgescu and Zamfirescu made special mention of the Lutsck Treaty of 1711, which guaranteed "the inalienable and indivisible political individuality of Moldavia" (Zamfirescu) and "the right of Rumanians to live within natural frontiers, upon territories which Cantemir, the great scholar of the Age of Reason, proved had always belonged to us" (Georgescu). This emphasis on the unity of the province of Moldavia is no doubt irritating to the Soviets, to whom Bessarabia, which is part of that province, was ceded in 1940. The Rumanian claim to the territory that is apparently implied in the film seems to follow the usual formula of being implicit rather than explicit.

It is interesting that while Cantemir is a film destined for the Rumanian market, it has been accompanied by an "annex" entitled Muschetarul Roman (The Rumanian Musketeer), an adventure film that

deals loosely with the historical topics treated in Cantemir. Zamfirescu owned that this is "a sort of 'Descriptio Molodviae' [the title of Cantemir's historical magnum opus] in cinematographic terms, which will be particularly suitable for foreign viewers."

### FOREIGN RELATIONS

#### 3. Rumania and the MBFR Talks in Vienna

After submitting to the UN General Assembly a document outlining its stand on disarmament (see Rumanian SR/44, RFER, 13 November 1975, Item 1) and a resolution on the economic and social consequences of the arms race (see Rumanian SR/47, RFER, 5 December 1975, Item 4), Rumania took occasion to express its views on the troop reduction talks (MBFR) going on in Vienna. Although the RSR is only an observer at the Vienna negotiations, the head of its delegation, Dumitru Aninoiu (who is Rumania's ambassador to Austria) took the floor on December 4 to criticize the lack of progress (his speech was published in Scinteia on December 5).

In broad lines, Aninoiu criticized the fact that the negotiations had made almost no progress since they began two years ago. He made concrete suggestions with regard to disarmament and military disengagement, and criticized the practice of holding "informal meetings" outside the conference. Advantage had not been taken, he said, of the ample opportunity provided by the six previous rounds and the present one (which began on 26 September 1975) for a broad exchange of views and discussion of the suggestions that had been submitted.

After providing statistical data on military strengths, conventional and nuclear weaponry, and foreign military bases and troops in Europe, he turned to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the question of détente. The time is ripe to pass from words to deeds, and it is imperative that governments and agencies involved in the talks begin negotiating in earnest. Any agreements reached with regard to a reduction of armaments and troops in Central Europe, he said, would constitute the first step in the process of withdrawing foreign military forces within their own national borders.

The Vienna negotiations apply to only part of Europe, said Aninoiu; a "plenary" agency should be set up to examine measures applicable to the whole of the continent. The agreements reached in Vienna should represent one stage on the road to the final goals: military disengagement and general disarmament.

He described the proposals submitted so far as inadequate. Provision should be made for at least a 10 to 15 per cent reduction in both troops and armaments, including nuclear weapons, with the higher percentage applying to large countries with powerful armies.

There should be simultaneous demobilization of forces stationed at home and abroad, and any agreements arrived at should contain pledges not to introduce troops or arms on the territory of other European countries, and not to increase the number of troops



12 December 1975

stationed on the territory of European states that are not party to these agreements. Another of Aninoiu's suggestions was that a program of reducing military budgets be adopted, so that within a decade they would be cut by at least 25 or 30 per cent.

According to Aninoiu, although the Vienna talks are limited to Central Europe, they will have an impact upon the security of all countries on the continent. There can be no question of achieving the security of one country at the expense of another, and this is why Rumania regards observing the principle of "not diminishing the security of any state in Europe, or any area of it" as one of the main features of the Vienna negotiations. The MBFR talks should help to create the prerequisites for eliminating military blocs, disbanding military bases, and withdrawing foreign troops from the territories of European states.

Aninoiu then turned to the manner in which the Vienna talks are being conducted. Their goal would be well served, he said, if "democratic work methods," procedures, and rules were adopted, which would make it possible for all participants to express viewpoints and make proposals. Efforts should be made to achieve progress within the procedural mechanism set up for the conference and on a democratic basis. The practice of holding "informal meetings" gives a bloc-to-bloc character to the discussions which tends to delay them. Steps should be taken to make it possible to harmonize the interests and positions of all participants, so that they may act as equal representatives of sovereign and independent states.

The time to take tentative positions, to engage in consultation and preliminary clarification has past. Every participant in the talks must now give evidence of "lofty responsibility and good faith," of "political determination" to resume the talks and break the deadlock. It is time that the proposals already submitted be carefully examined in a spirit of understanding and readiness to compromise, said Aninoiu.

On the whole, his statements on the Vienna talks and his hints regarding the desirability of a general disarmament conference in which all European states would take part reflect Rumania's dissatisfaction at being refused permission to attend the Vienna conference as a full member, and its concern lest the results of the meeting jeopardize its own security. Nevertheless, the RSR's proposals on disengagement and disarmament are too general; they fail to take into account both the real balance of forces and geographical conditions -- which have been and still are responsible for the deadlock at the Vienna Conference.

Aninoiu's remarks about the difficulties faced by the MBFR conference are not entirely consistent with statements made by NATO and Warsaw Pact representatives (Reuter and UPI/Vienna, 6 November 1975). After the 83rd plenary session in Vienna, an Eastern spokesman said the Warsaw Pact "took exception" to reports that the negotiations were deadlocked: "We do not agree with this evaluation," he said. Another Reuter dispatch (November 13) added that after the 84th session both sides said that there had been no deadlock, despite the lack of progress. The meeting of foreign ministers of the North Atlantic Council now taking place is expected to adopt a proposal to be submitted to the East to the effect that 1,000 US tactical nuclear weapons be removed from the FRG in exchange for a Soviet pullback of 1,700 tanks and 65,000 men from Central Europe (RE Special/Brussels, 10 December 1975). That proposal would respond to earlier Warsaw Pact proposals that force reductions include nuclear weapons.

12 December 1975

#### 4. West German Foreign Minister Genscher Visits Bucharest

West German Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher arrived in Bucharest on December 4 for a two-day official visit at the invitation of his Rumanian counterpart George Macovescu. Rumanian-West German relations have developed favorably since the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries in 1967, and Rumania was the first East European country after the Soviet Union to establish diplomatic relations with the FRG.

Apart from the question of the reunification of families, Rumania's growing trade deficit with the FRG is the darkest cloud in the sky, although something of a setback occurred in March of this year when talks between the two countries on an agreement on scientific co-operation were broken off because the Rumanians opposed the inclusion of West Berlin within its purview (see Rumanian SR/12, RFER, 26 March 1975, Item 1).

It was probably no coincidence that only a day before the arrival of Genscher in Bucharest Ceausescu addressed (on December 3) a joint meeting of the Councils of German and Hungarian Minorities. As in February 1971, when the Rumanian party leader objected to the notion that family reunions should take place in one direction only -- i.e., from Rumania to the FRG (see Rumanian SR/8, RFER [EERA], 1 March 1971, Item 2) -- he stressed that "the place of each Rumanian citizen is here, irrespective of his Rumanian, Hungarian, German, Serbian, or Jewish nationality." At the same meeting other speakers dealt with cultural questions relating to the German minority in Rumania. It was announced that in 1974 290,000 copies of books in German were printed in Rumania and 150,000 were imported from abroad. Rumania was said to have 358 school units attended by 41,661 pupils, and 17 general and 12 special lyceums where the teaching is done in German.

Despite a falling away in the number of reciprocal high-level visits since 1973, contacts have continued on various levels. For instance, Genscher and Macovescu met recently during the UN General Assembly in New York and again during the Helsinki summit, which also provided the occasion for a personal encounter between Ceausescu and FRG Chancellor Helmut Schmidt. It should also be noted that CC Secretary and member of the Permanent Bureau Stefan Andrei was in the FRG in May of this year for talks with Schmidt, Genscher, and Economics Minister Hans Friderichs.

Prior to Genscher's departure for Bucharest, a Bonn Foreign Office spokesman said that the FRG Foreign Minister would discuss economic and humanitarian problems during his two-day visit. Rumanian reports on the talks were vague and avoided any mention of humanitarian problems, which of course include the reunification of families. Radio Bucharest (December 4) said only that the two foreign ministers discussed possibilities of extending relations and developing trade and economic co-operation between the two countries. On the following day the Radio reported that during Ceausescu's meeting with Genscher the two men expressed the wish for expanded economic and political co-operation, and increased



12 December 1975

commercial, technological-scientific, and cultural relations. Co-operation in industry was specifically mentioned in this context. They also called for the implementation of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and for the reduction of armaments and military expenditures.

The joint communiqué dealt principally with bilateral economic matters, touched briefly on the humanitarian issue, and then turned to purely international problems. The two foreign ministers noted that the volume of trade between their two countries had increased substantially during the last few years, and declared that they would make increased efforts to achieve the highest possible volume accompanied by a proper balance in their commercial relations. The numerous economic co-operation ventures that have taken place in the last two years were noted with approval, and it was agreed to encourage organizations and enterprises in both countries to study new opportunities for co-operation. The ministers said they favored the opening of negotiations for an agreement on the promotion of investments and the provision of reciprocal guarantees. Exchanges in the domains of education, the arts, culture, and scientific co-operation were also mentioned as deserving encouragement.

The passage in the communiqué dealing with humanitarian questions was extremely vague. It said that:

The two sides reasserted their intention to facilitate contacts between citizens of the two countries, and to contribute to the solving of humanitarian problems on the basis of mutual trust and good will, in the spirit of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

The last part of the communiqué dealt with disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, under effective international control, and with other world problems. It was agreed that new efforts should be made to reach a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East in the shortest possible time, and that the Cyprus problem must be solved on the basis of the island's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity. Concern was expressed about the gap that exists between the advanced and developing countries, and the two sides intimated their determination to endeavor to solve complex international economic problems in the spirit of the final resolution of the Seventh Extraordinary Session of the UN General Assembly.

The communiqué announced that Macovescu had accepted an invitation to visit the FRG. The date of the visit will be decided in due course. A visit by Chancellor Schmidt to Rumania may follow later.

The West German information media dealt extensively with the economic and humanitarian aspects of relations between Bonn and Bucharest. With regard to the former they stressed the persistence of the Rumanian trade deficit, which amounted to DM 872,000,000 in 1974 and to DM 619,000,000 in the first nine months of 1975. The Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (December 4) said that the two sides intend to increase the number of co-operation ventures from the present level of between 40 and 60. The matter will be discussed



in Bucharest in February 1976 when a delegation of the Ostausschuss headed by its president, Otto Wolff von Amerongen, will visit Rumania. The Stuttgarter Zeitung (December 5) said that Rumanian debts to the FRG already amount to over DM 2,000 million, and that Rumania would welcome a state credit of DM 1,000 million, but that Bonn has no intention of granting it. The Muenchner Merkur (December 5) reported that during his state visit to Bonn in June 1973, Ceausescu asked for a DM 1,000 million credit with a 2.5 per cent interest rate, repayable over 15 years, and recalled that a Rumanian government delegation had requested a loan in May this year. This paper also stated that Bonn is not prepared to grant to Rumania the DM 1,000 million credit that it wants.

Der Tagesspiegel (December 5) said that Rumania's debts to the FRG will this year exceed for the first time the DM 3,000 million mark, and Reuter (December 6) said that Genscher has rejected a request for a large government credit to cover Rumania's trade deficit with the FRG. According to a Foreign Ministry spokesman in Bonn, Genscher advised the Rumanians to seek credit on the West German private money markets. The Sueddeutsche Zeitung (December 6/7) said that, despite the fact that negotiations between the Volkswagenwerk AG of Wolfsburg and the Rumanian government had failed to yield positive results in 1974 (see Rumanian SR/15, RFER, EERA, 3 May 1974, Item 5c), Genscher had been asked during his recent visit to Bucharest about the possibility of establishing a Volkswagen plant in Rumania. The same newspaper published a report from Bucharest to the effect that after two and a half years of negotiations a contract establishing a joint company will be initialed in December; the two parties to it will be VFW-Fokker of Duesseldorf and the Rumanian government (see Rumanian SR/17, RFER, 7 May 1975, Item 5).

The Rumanians were primarily interested in economic and trade matters, whereas the West Germans were also concerned about humanitarian issues -- in particular the easing of emigration for Rumanian citizens of German stock, for those who have made "mixed" marriages, etc. As a gesture of good will Macovescu presented his German counterpart with a list of 100 marriage permits granted to Rumanian and West German citizens. The Stuttgarter Zeitung (December 5) claimed, however, that private organizations had paid over a certain period DM 4,000 for each emigrant, and added that Bucharest would like to see this "tax" increased.

The Sueddeutsche Zeitung (December 5) said that prior to Genscher's arrival many requests for permission to emigrate had been received at the West German Embassy in Bucharest. The paper also claimed that the publication of a communiqué was jeopardized by Rumanian objections to the inclusion in it of a passage in which the Rumanians pledged to look for ways and means of increasing the number of encounters and contacts "between citizens." The Frankfurter Rundschau (December 8), like most of the other newspapers, dealt with the emigration problem. It said that Bonn would like to see the figure of 8,000 emigrants, recorded in 1974, repeated again this year, but that any arrangement for trading grants or loans against emigration permits -- along the lines of the one reached with Poland -- can be ruled out in the case of Rumania.

TRADE AND ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION5. 1976 Trade and Payments Agreement with Hungary Signed

The Rumanian and Hungarian governments have signed a protocol on goods exchanges and payments for 1976, under terms of which Rumania is to supply Hungary with machine tools, power and oil equipment, installations for the chemical industry, hydraulic excavators, calculation techniques, tractors and agricultural machines, hydraulic diesel locomotives, chemical products, building materials, consumer goods, etc. In return it will receive machine tools, equipment and installations for the metallurgical, light, and chemical industries, telecommunication equipment, electrotechnical products, measuring and control apparatus, transport vehicles, chemical products, consumer goods, etc. (Radio Bucharest, December 9).

According to Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade and International Economic Co-operation Marin Traistaru, in 1975 trade exchanges between the two countries will be 40 per cent over the 1974 figure, and the protocol for 1976 provides for a 30 per cent increase over 1975. The trade protocol for the latter year provided for only a 26 per cent increase over 1974, but neither the protocol nor Traistaru specified whether this pertains to the provisions for or the actual achievements in 1974, so it is difficult to draw a concrete conclusion.

According to Hungarian statistics (see Hungarian SR/33, RFER, 5 August 1975, Item 1), trade exchanges between Rumania and Hungary were valued at 3,098 million forint in 1974 -- an increase of nearly 29 per cent over 1973 -- and to 976,000,000 forint in the first quarter of 1975. Despite a spectacular increase in trade exchanges in the last few years, Hungary ranked only 11th among Rumania's foreign trade partners in 1973, accounting for less than 3 per cent of Rumania's total trade. In the RSR's trade with the Comecon countries, Hungary ranked fifth -- preceded by the USSR, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and followed only by Bulgaria, Cuba, and Mongolia.

In the 1976-1980 period, trade volume is expected to double compared with 1971-1975, according to Traistaru.

Magyar Hirlap (December 9) reported that this year's trade turnover is expected to exceed 200,000,000 rubles in value, but complained that in monetary terms co-operation projects represent only a little over 1 per cent of the value of goods exchanges. It added that there are good opportunities for co-operation in the machine industry and the manufacture of automotive vehicles, noting that there are already co-operative ventures involving the delivery of automobile engines, rear axles, dashboards, and other equipment, and that recently opportunities have presented themselves in the production of power-station machinery, oil producing equipment, and in the chemical and light industries -- mainly on the basis of Comecon's Comprehensive Program.



12 December 1975

6. Rumanian Airlines Inaugurate Regular Flights to Peking and Amman

On 5 December 1975 Radio Bucharest reported that a TAROM Airlines Boeing 707 had taken off from Bucharest's Otopeni Airport on an "inaugural" flight to Peking via Athens and Karachi, and described the event as illustrative of the good relations between China and the RSR. On December 7, Radio Peking reported in a Rumanian-language broadcast that the Directorate General of Civil Aviation had given a reception to mark the opening of the air link and to greet a Rumanian delegation headed by Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Constantin Oancea.

This is the second announcement of the inauguration of the Bucharest-Peking air link. In November of last year, according to Romania Libera (22 November 1974), a TAROM plane landed in the Chinese capital, and Rumanian Ambassador Nicolae Gavrilescu gave a reception at the airport to mark the occasion (see Rumanian SR/39, RFER, 13 December 1974, Item 4g). Apparently difficulties arising from the oil crisis prevented TAROM from scheduling the Peking flights on a regular basis. (Similar difficulties prompted Pan Am to cancel its flights to Bucharest; they were resumed only in May 1975, according to an RFE Special/New York dated 20 May 1975.)

On 26 November 1975 Radio Bucharest reported that TAROM had begun regular flights to Amman -- the seventh Arab capital to be served by the airline (the others are Algiers, Beirut, Cairo, Damascus, Kuwait, and Tripoli). Again, this was the second announcement of the inauguration of the Bucharest-Amman link -- Romania Libera reported on 17 July 1975 that service had begun. No explanation for the "reinauguration" has been given.

- end -