

There are two ironies about this “political independence” demand. One is that several core DPP influentials or sympathizers are from families which collaborated with the Japanese, during the long Japanese occupation of the island. Second, a serious move for “Taiwanese independence” would provide a perfect pretext for the mainland Chinese Communists to invade the Republic of China. This is virtually admitted by the liberal *Far East Economic Review's* week-of-Sept. 29 edition, in an article documenting the growing Peking military threat to Taiwan. While a military confrontation between the two is unlikely, *FEER* says, “this situation could change . . . if Peking considers hopes for peaceful reunification are threatened as a result of a strengthening in pro-independence sentiments in Taiwan.”

In any case, the DPP program adds up to quite a violent and hardly democratic package, reminiscent of the violent trends in the Green Party. One person who helped arrange the DPP tour in Europe and who has accompanied the DPP group to several of its destinations, is a certain Li Hsien-jung (a.k.a. Shane Lee), a Taiwanese emigré who is a Canadian citizen and Canadian government official. In mid-August of this year, he addressed, by video, a World Federation of Taiwanese Associations meeting that was taking place in Taiwan. He denounced the ruling Kuomintang Party as a “regime of robbers devoid of the rule of law,” and called on his listeners to topple the regime and set up “a legal government representing the Taiwanese people.” He charged the KMT with having transformed Taiwan into an “ugly island of garbage.”

The “Green connection” in the DPP is otherwise quite direct. Two DPP leaders were trained in West Germany since the mid-1970s, and collaborated with individuals involved in founding the West German Greens. One, Chu Kao-Cheng, gained notoriety in Taiwan in April of this year, when he physically assaulted the head of the Taiwanese Legislative Assembly during a parliament session. In his campaign literature, Chu boasts of modeling his activities on those of the Greens in Germany. Chu spent the period from mid-June to mid-September of this year at the University of Bonn, gaining a postdoctorate in “philosophy of law.” He had earlier gotten a degree from Bonn University, during the late 1970s/early 1980s.

DPP Central Committee member You Ching studied at the Faculty of Law at the University of Heidelberg from 1974-78, and is an open advocate of “green” policies. He was part of the DPP delegation touring Europe, until his Sept. 22 return to Taiwan.

Also, from Aug. 4-18 of this year, the West German Green Party's “foreign secretary,” Jürgen Meier, was in Taiwan on invitation from the DPP, and met several DPP leaders. Meier later traveled to South Korea, and was arrested and thrown out of South Korea over the Aug. 27-28 weekend, for attempting to attend an illegal conference on “peace and reunification.”

Soviets join U.S. war against Panama

by Gretchen Small

Moscow has not only come up with a new scheme to get its hands on the Panama Canal, but is now signaling that it will help Washington overthrow the nationalist government and military in Panama, to implement the plan.

The gist of the proposal is that the Panama Canal be “demilitarized,” and placed under “international” control. Tailor-made for “regional matters” negotiations with the United States, the proposal boils down to a deal: The Soviets want U.S. military bases removed from the Canal Zone, but want Panama's Defense Forces removed, too. That Soviet troops would be volunteered to participate in policing the Canal is only unspoken.

The proposal surfaced in the August issue of *América Latina*, the monthly of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences' Latin American Institute. In an Institute-sponsored roundtable on the causes and possible consequences of the Panama crisis, *América Latina's* deputy director, Vladimir Gavrilov, argued that the current crisis over Panama stems from the United States' insistence that it maintain control of the Canal through “the old model” of a system of military bases.

“It is logical that this provokes suspicion throughout the world because of the possibility for blackmail of the world community,” Gavrilov warned. “Basically, no one threatens the security of navigation in the Panama Canal. Except, perhaps, international terrorism. Therefore, new models for operation of the installations, in the service of humanity's interests, are needed. This presupposes their demilitarization.” He suggests that this “new dimension” be taken up by those proclaiming “international solidarity” with Panama.

So much for Russian concern for Panama's sovereignty.

Anti-PDF propaganda gears up

The very fact that the debate which occurred in the course of the roundtable was published, marks a shift in Soviet policy. Throughout the current U.S.-Panama conflict, except for attacks on Gen. Manuel Noriega allowed in several Latin American Communist Party newspapers, the Soviet media have adhered strictly to the line that Moscow wishes to defend Panama from the Reagan administration's crazy war against it.

The Latin American Institute experts who participated in the roundtable along with TASS's Panama correspondent, Igor Klekovkin, warn that Panama's Defense Forces—and specifically the two commanders who have led the fight for

Panama's sovereignty, Gen. Omar Torrijos and Gen. Manuel Noriega—are no friends of Moscow. While the experts debated over what role Torrijos and “Torrijismo,” the political movement founded to continue his nationalist project, should be accorded in history, all participants agreed that Torrijos and his followers had failed to implement the domestic “progressive changes” which they had promised, instead compromising with the bourgeoisie.

A particular bias against Panama's Defense Forces had shown through the debate. All participants agreed that the PDF cannot, and must not, be viewed as either anti-American or pro-left. Two of the Institute's Caribbean and Cuban experts reminded the others that the PDF, under both Torrijos and Noriega, participated in over 20 joint military exercises with the United States, asserting that Noriega has been on the Pentagon's payroll for years. They demanded that “contradictions” within the military be studied carefully, in light of charges by Panama's communists that the PDF has displayed an increasing “appetite for bourgeoisification.”

Then, in mid-September, the widely circulated *New Times* weekly (No. 38, 1988), carried an article which not only attacked Panama's Defense Forces, but signalled that the Soviets have opened contacts with Washington's Panamanian opposition movement. Mikhail Baklanov, Novosti's correspondent in Panama, penned the new line:

“A compromise is needed. . . . Panamanians are tired of the crisis. There is a pressing need for a gust of fresh air, for new ideas. The government is trying to maintain the status quo. As for the opposition . . . is it capable of carrying out the long-awaited reforms? This is no rhetorical question. Over the past year, any political action against the regime has been identified with the extreme-right ‘civil crusade’ movement, which the U.S. embassy in Panama has certainly had a hand in organizing. . . . However, not all of the opposition are prepared to betray the interests of the nation.”

Baklanov then reports that he was invited to the Union Club, the oligarchy's most exclusive whites-only club, to lecture opposition leaders on *perestroika* in the Soviet Union. His conclusions from the meeting? “Even Panamanian big businessmen are tired of the old ways and also want change. . . . The atmosphere grew warmer as the evening progressed.”

His *New Times* article makes no mention of the Soviet's new Canal proposal, but suggests that Panamanian interests in recovering sovereignty are motivated solely by greed. Panama's “army is looking after its own corporate interests in the matter,” when it demands that the Canal be returned to Panama, Baklanov charges—just as Panama's “big businessmen also want the Canal back . . . to reap the dividends.”

Was this the agenda Karen Brutents, deputy chief of the Soviet Communist Party's International Department and a top controller of Soviet operations in both the Middle East and Central America, brought with him when he visited Panama City on Sept. 15-18?

Panama's Solís Palma U.S. war plans before

by D.E. Pettingell

In his first trip abroad since he took over as Constitutional Chief of State in February, Panamanian President Manuel Solís Palma laid out before representatives of the world's nations attending the United Nations General Assembly, the truth of the United States' escalating economic and military war against Panama. This war is no defense of democracy, nor a fight against drugs, but “an act of piracy without precedent in world history” which seeks to strip Panama of its right to national sovereignty, Panama's President stated.

He emphasized that, without support from other nations, Panama now faces the danger of military invasion.

Panama's civilian and military leaders, by sticking to their defense of Panama's right to sovereignty and economic development, have become an obstacle to the liberal U.S. Establishment's efforts to set up a joint world dictatorship with the Russian imperialists. President Solís's decision to take the global “Big Lie” campaign against Panama head-on, by personally bringing Panama's case for sovereignty before as many nations as possible, exemplifies the international potential Panama's nationalists represent.

Solís Palma's speech shook the delegates, who commented upon both the bluntness of his warning, and the dignity with which he delivered it. The U.S. delegation was notably absent from the General Assembly hall.

“I categorically state that my government has abundant reason to fear direct U.S. military aggression against the Republic of Panama,” he said. The United States has installed “commandos of surprise attack specialists, an elite battalion of the 82nd Airborne Division, electronic warfare experts, and over 300 attack and personnel transport helicopters; in addition to units for the control and occupation of urban centers.” He added that the U.S. military presence in Panama has increased by 1,300 troops and 800 marines and her “offensive military equipment” has expanded beyond that required for the defense of the Panama Canal.

“Fighter planes have taken over the Panamanian skies; not only do they carry out with significant frequency threatening maneuvers against Panamanian military installations, but also against international commercial planes,” he stated.

Solís Palma's presence at the U.N. was in itself a triumph since, up until the last minute, the U.S. government, the only