

19990514 143

JPRS-USA-85-011

28 October 1985

USSR REPORT

USA: ECONOMICS, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY

No. 8, August 1985

Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language monthly journal SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA published in Moscow by the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

State of U.S.-USSR Scientific-Technical Cooperation Examined (pp 3-12) (N. A. Berdennikov).....	1
Changes in Antitrust Laws (pp 13-21) (G. I. Nikerov) (not translated)	
Role of Moralism in U.S. Foreign Policy Viewed (pp 22-31) (M. S. Chetverikova).....	13
Spread of Hinduism and Buddhism in American Society (pp 32-43) (B. Z. Falikov) (not translated)	
U.S. Attitude Toward All-European Process (pp 44-55) (Yu. P. Davydov).....	25
Role of USSR in Defeat of Militarist Japan (pp 56-64) (A. A. Koshkin) (not translated)	
Washington's, Pretoria's Role in Namibia Hit (pp 65-68) (Ye. A. Antonov).....	39
Tragedy of the Black Ghetto (pp 69-71) (S. A. Chervonnaya) (not translated)	
AFL-CIO: Search for New Solutions (pp 72-77) (K. D. Rostiashvili) (not translated)	
Some Distinctive Features of U.S. Credit System (pp 78-83) (S. V. Pyatenko) (not translated)	
Free Banking Zones (pp 84-88) (A. M. Belov) (not translated)	

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release

Distribution Unlimited

- a -

[III - USSR - 39]

CONTENTS (Continued)

The Abolition (Conclusion) (pp 89-94) (Jonathan Schell) (not translated)	
Management, Organizational Crisis in U.S. Corporations (pp 95-101) (G. B. Kochetkov).....	44
Development of Fodder Supply for Canadian Animal Husbandry (pp 102-110) (V. N. Morozov, Ye. A. Shevlyagina) (not translated)	
Book Reviews	
U.S. Book on Nuclear Proliferation Reviewed (pp 111-113) (V. F. Davydov).....	54
Review of U.S. Book on Nuclear Threat, Public Opinion (pp 113-116) (M. M. Petrovskaya).....	58
Review of 'Dynamics of Present-Day Capitalist Economy' by Yu. A. Chizhov (pp 116-118) (S. M. Menshikov) (not translated)	
Review of 'Secret Weapon of Aggression' by F. M. Sergeyev (pp 118-119) (E. A. Tokarev) (not translated)	
Memoirs of Soviet Diplomat in Beijing, New York Reviewed (pp 119-120) (A. V. Zotov).....	62
Exchange Rate of Dollar and Foreign Trade (pp 121-127) (M. V. Yershov) (not translated)	

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : USA: ECONOMICS, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY
No 8, August 1985

Russian title : SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : V. M. Berezhev

Publishing House : Izdatelstvo Nauka

Place of publication : Moscow

Date of publication : August 1985

Signed to press : 18 July 1985

Copies : 29,350

COPYRIGHT : Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika,
politika, ideologiya", 1985

STATE OF U.S.-USSR SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL COOPERATION EXAMINED

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 8, Aug 85 (signed to press 18 Jul 85) pp 3-12

[Article by N. A. Berdennikov: "The State of USSR-U.S. Scientific and Technical Relations"]

[Text] The development of international scientific and technical cooperation has now become an objective tendency and the natural result of interaction in the world economy. All countries have learned through their own experience that this kind of cooperation plays a perceptible role in the achievement of a higher level of development in certain fields of science, technology and industry with a substantial savings in resources and time.

Now that the authority of Soviet scientific schools has been acknowledged throughout the world, foreign scientists regard our country as a promising and appealing partner in scientific and technical cooperation. The Western business community's recognition of the Soviet Union's colossal potential to carry out large-scale technological and industrial projects and its interest in acquiring advanced Soviet experience are reflected in the constant rise in the number of foreign scientific organizations and firms cooperating with the USSR and the broader exchange of scientists and specialists.

Many years of scientific and technical cooperation with France, the FRG, Italy, Finland, Austria, the United States and many other countries provide the most conclusive confirmation of our country's reputation as a reliable and promising partner.

People in the United States are well aware of the value of international division of labor and have been able to derive great benefits from this for a long time. According to several American sources, annual U.S. income from international scientific and technical cooperation amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars.

The development of scientific and technical relations with the Soviet Union is arousing the interest of U.S. business circles disturbed by the mounting competition of Western Europe and Japan. They view this prospect not only as a chance to use Soviet experience in the development of new technology, machines and equipment, but also as a real possibility of using this kind of cooperation

to carry out large joint projects, with all of the resulting multimillion-dollar long-term contracts.

The improvement of USSR-U.S. relations at the beginning of the 1970's created favorable conditions for the development of Soviet-American cooperation in various fields, including science. The signing of 11 intergovernmental agreements on cooperation in such fields as the peaceful use of atomic energy, the study of outer space and the world ocean, environmental protection, power engineering, construction, transportation, agriculture, medicine and public health laid the foundation for the unification of the efforts of Soviet and American scientists and specialists in the resolution of several urgent problems.

Within the framework of these agreements, specific programs were drawn up for joint work on more than 100 major problems, and results of great practical value were obtained. The Soyuz-Apollo space flight of July 1975 was seen throughout the world not only as an outstanding achievement of science and technology but also as a convincing example of successful international cooperation.

The interest displayed by U.S. scientific and industrial circles in contacts with the Soviet Union led to commercial contacts between Soviet establishments and organizations and more than 300 American firms. Agreements were signed with 75 of them.

In 1974 a committee on science and technology was created by the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council (ASTEC) to secure the development of direct scientific and technical contacts between American industrial firms and Soviet organizations. More than 200 seminars and symposiums have been held in the USSR with the participation of American firms since the time the committee was created.

The development of scientific and technical relations between our countries, however, did not please certain circles in the United States. After all, the natural result of constant contact was stronger mutual understanding, trust and friendship between scientists and specialists in the two countries. It would be difficult to think of a more favorable environment for the development of these processes than joint creative efforts to solve important problems for the good of our two countries and of all mankind. And it is precisely on problems of this kind that representatives of Soviet and American science and technology were working. Various means were used to prevent this. Official American spokesmen lost no opportunity to complicate the implementation of existing Soviet-American agreements. They arbitrarily reduced exchanges of scientific and technical information and documents, refused to issue visas to Soviet delegations, cancelled tours of scientific centers and enterprises and organized provocative actions against Soviet scientists and specialists visiting the United States. It did not bother them that these actions were flagrant violations of the commitments the American side had assumed in the agreements on cooperation signed by high-level representatives of the federal administration. The White House's subsequent behavior in the international arena showed the entire world that American violations of commitments were the rule rather than the exception.

Lies and Facts

A propaganda campaign was launched in the United States against scientists and businessmen advocating the development of contacts with the Soviet Union. In the absence of facts to justify the cessation of cooperation, a rumor was spread, suggesting that it did not benefit the United States and that the Soviet Union supposedly had nothing to offer in exchange for American technology, since the United States was far ahead of the Soviet Union in terms of all scientific, technical and industrial indicators. For this reason, the development of scientific and technical contacts with it was unnecessary and was "obviously unprofitable."

Statements of this kind, however, sound absolutely absurd to businessmen: No firm has ever conducted business exclusively in the interests of a partner, without deriving some advantage. The administration was furnished with complete information about Soviet-American scientific and technical contacts, constantly submitted to the Capitol in the form of reports on comprehensive investigations of the operations of American organizations involved in this cooperation. These investigations were conducted by the Committee on Science and Technology of the U.S. House of Representatives, and in this connection all executive agencies were ordered to "constantly and continuously submit the appropriate documents to this committee."¹

Two reports based on investigations conducted by commissions of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences at the request of the White House were published in 1977. One dealt with inter-academic exchanges (the so-called Kazin report, which took 2 years to prepare), and the other dealt with undertakings connected with the agreement on scientific and technical cooperation (the Garvin report). The main conclusion of the Kazin report was that the Soviet Union had been more successful than the United States in many fields and that scientific cooperation had given the United States "sufficient scientific benefit to substantiate the continuation of scientific exchanges." The Garvin report came to a similar conclusion: "The United States derives direct scientific and technical advantages and indirect cultural and political advantages from cooperation with the Soviet Union, and for this reason it should be continued."²

These reports were carefully studied by the Committee on Science and Technology. Scientists, specialists, administrators of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation and other scientific organizations in the country and officials from the State Department and White House were invited to the hearings. For example, when Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs T. Pickering addressed the committee in 1979, he assured the congressmen that the recommendations of the previous committee hearings, that "American-Soviet agreements on scientific and technical cooperation should be assessed on the basis of the benefits the United States derives from them," had been implemented. He stressed that this was certainly "not a charitable program" and that projects not meeting U.S. interests were cancelled.³

Pickering cited examples of contacts benefiting the United States. For example, one of the most productive forms of cooperation in power engineering, in his

words, was the program of joint experiments in magnetohydrodynamics. "In the late 1960's and early 1970's the Soviet Union continued to make large capital investments in this field while the United States concentrated on other fields of research.... As a result of cooperation, we were able to combine our advanced technology in the field of superconducting magnets with Soviet large-scale installations and make an important breakthrough."⁴

Among these benefits, Pickering also included the improvement of weather forecasts and the substantial increase in the volume of information about various developments in the world ocean; the results of germ cell exchanges which supplemented the group of genetic methods of combating a new flu epidemic, and the acquisition of samples of a new type of virus from the USSR; quicker methods of testing cancer medicines. The United States was able to save 2 years of experimental research as a result of the use of Soviet experience in the mirror method of nuclear synthesis and to lengthen the service life of metal-cutting instruments from threefold to eightfold as a result of the Soviet process of spray-coating them with titanium carbide and cobalt with electronic beams.⁵

Doctor H. Stever, director of the National Science Foundation (former scientific and technical adviser to President Nixon and chairman of the American half of the Soviet-American intergovernmental commission on scientific and technical cooperation), told a Soviet journalist who was interviewing him: "Together we are studying the possibilities for the use of computers in large urban economic complexes. Moscow, Leningrad, New York and Los Angeles have been chosen for this purpose.... The exchange of ideas on chemical catalysts deserves mention. It has been quite successful. Several joint projects are being carried out in such important fields as electrometallurgy and microbiology.... We can obtain mutually beneficial results more quickly by pooling our resources than by working alone." He stressed that the cooperation was benefiting both sides equally.⁶

As for the opinion of the House Committee on Science and Technology, it was defined quite precisely in the record of the November 1979 hearings: The scientific and technical advantages derived by the United States from cooperation with the USSR were indisputable.

Long-Range Policy

The old desire of the imperialist states to deprive our country of the chance to use international division of labor in science and technology and thereby impede its dynamic development to some degree lies at the basis of the current American approach to scientific and technical cooperation with the Soviet Union. It is to this end that the efforts of the White House, State Department and U.S. special services are working in their attempts to do everything within their power to impede the normal development of scientific and technical contacts with the Soviet Union.

An important role in this campaign has been assigned to the West European NATO allies and Japan. The crudest pressure has been exerted on the governments of these countries to force them to cease or minimize scientific and technical contacts with our country. In this way, the United States is trying

to involve the West European countries, Canada and Japan in its policy of isolating the Soviet Union and to simultaneously block their access to the USSR's colossal scientific and technical potential. The cessation of scientific and technical cooperation with us by these countries would have a definite negative effect on the state of their economy and trade, and this would also "work" in the United States' favor.

This is also the purpose of the American idea, so earnestly popularized by the bourgeois mass media, of "detering" the development of Soviet science and technology, as they allegedly depend largely on advanced technology from the United States and other capitalist countries.

This "idea" is nothing other than another attempt to substitute fiction for facts.

The scientific and technical progress of the Soviet Union has never depended on cooperation with capitalist countries. Our country has enough strong scientific and technical potential of its own to solve its most important national economic problems by itself. Scientific and technical contacts with foreign countries are regarded as a reserve, contributing to the more effective investigation of certain problems and saving time in the incorporation of research findings. Generously sharing our experience and achievements, we also derive considerable benefit from cooperation with other countries, including the United States.

Plans for the development of our national economy emphasize the use of domestic research and development, machines, technology and raw materials. The proportion accounted for by imports of foreign technology, machines and equipment does not exceed a few percent. Of course, with the aid of imports we can solve certain problems more quickly, but this certainly does not have a decisive effect on our scientific and industrial development.

"Can our country get along without scientific and technical cooperation with the United States? Of course it can," said Academician A. P. Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. "Sufficient evidence of this can be found in the most complex scientific and technical fields of the present day. The development of atomic, space and laser equipment in the Soviet Union was accomplished without any assistance from the United States or any other country, although foreign forecasts often called our country incapable of any of these accomplishments, as in the case, for example, of the separation of uranium isotopes."⁷

As for advanced foreign experience, the Soviet Union has sold the United States more licenses than it has bought. The American Government has not restricted the acquisition of Soviet technology by American firms at all.

The INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE reported that the United States is buying Soviet licenses and patents without advertising this fact. The newspaper stressed that the United States eagerly buys Soviet inventions and new technology. Therefore, there is no reason to believe in the myths about the "weak Soviet economy."⁸ Expressing the same idea, the WASHINGTON POST commented:

"The Reagan Administration asserts that the Soviet Union needs us, but we do not need it. Why then are such companies as Bristol Myers, duPont and 3M buying new patent medicines and surgical instruments in the USSR? Why are Kaiser Aluminum and the Olin Corporation acquiring complex technological processes from the Russians? ...American companies usually buy Soviet technology for the same reasons that the Russians buy ours. One of the reasons that the Soviet Union is able to derive benefits from our technology is its own high level of technical development. If we regard the Soviet Union as a technically backward country trying to catch up with the West by buying or borrowing Western technology, this motivates us to pursue a completely different policy than if we gain a more accurate view of the Soviet Union as a country with colossal scientific potential."⁹

One of the by-products of the idea that the technological and economic development of the USSR is dependent on advanced technology from the United States and other capitalist countries is the assumption that this dependence can be used to obtain political concessions from the Soviet Union. In a letter to Congress on 17 February 1984, President Reagan stated: "Our relations with the Soviet Union...in the sphere of science and technology have deteriorated seriously as a result of the disillusioning behavior of the Russians. In my report...I made it clear that this cooperation will depend on whether or not the Soviet Government's actions correspond to the accepted standards of international behavior. To date, this correspondence has not been achieved, and our position has remained unchanged. We will continue to keep a close watch on the behavior of the Russians and adjust our policy on scientific and technical cooperation accordingly."¹⁰

It would be naive to believe that people in the State Department and White House are unaware of all of the absurdity of this idea. The principles of Soviet foreign policy are well known there. The issue here is something quite different. The demand for political concessions, according to its authors, is supposed to irritate Soviet representatives, who justifiably interpret actions of this kind as provocation.

These actions are also evoking negative reactions from American scientists and specialists, and this is also no secret to the U.S. Government. Here, for example, is what one of the reports submitted to the Committee on Science and Technology said about this: "In itself, the discussion of the possibility of using technology transfers as a means of political pressure...causes American firms to lose interest in establishing commercial contacts with the Soviet Union or beginning lengthy trade negotiations with it because they are afraid that the government could interfere in their commercial affairs at any time."¹¹

The plans of U.S. ruling circles assign equal importance to scientific and technical contacts as one avenue for the pursuit of the general foreign policy line of escalating international tension and fueling hatred for the Soviet Union, so as to create an atmosphere to facilitate the expenditure of billions of dollars on an unbridled arms race. This is also the reason for all of the attempts to prevent the favorable impact of creative cooperation by Soviet and U.S. scientists and specialists, the reinforcement of mutual understanding and trust and the relaxation of international tension.

Anti-Sovietism is being fueled within the American scientific community, and attempts are being made to introduce elements of mistrust and suspicion into the atmosphere of goodwill and to substitute counterproductive debates, particularly about the "defense of the creative freedom of scientists," for joint creative work by scientists and specialists. The U.S. Government issued a special directive instructing official representatives of the American side to boycott or undermine joint undertakings on the pretext of the "defense of human rights."

The implementation of this directive was seriously discussed by the House Committee on Science and Technology in November 1979. Apparently, the honorable congressmen felt somewhat embarrassed when they had to discuss the real, and not imaginary, restriction of the American scientists' own rights and freedoms. After all, it was with good reason that the categorical warning was issued there against "airing dirty linen in public" and instructions were issued to make every effort to keep the U.S. Government from "getting mixed up" in the campaign to "defend the creative freedom of Soviet scientists." The committee issued recommendations which essentially said "even the external signs of governmental coordination should be avoided."¹² The hypocrisy of this campaign is attested to by the fact that official American data indicate that around 20,000 scientific personnel in the United States have now joined the army of unemployed. In other words, they have lost the most basic human right--the right to work.

"Zero Option"

In January 1980 the U.S. administration used the events in Afghanistan as an excuse to "put a freeze" on Soviet-American scientific and technical cooperation through governmental channels. A short time later the U.S. National Academy of Sciences was pressured by the White House to impose a "moratorium" on undertakings planned within the framework of an agreement with the USSR Academy of Sciences. In accordance with these actions, the American side undermined regular sessions of intergovernmental commissions, meetings of working groups, scientific conferences and symposiums, cancelled trips to the USSR by a number of American delegations and denied many Soviet scientists and specialists permission to visit the United States.

The heads of American scientific organizations who broke off relations with their Soviet partners made every effort to make it seem as though their decisions had been made independently of the U.S. administration. After all, admitting that the American scientific community had simply given in to diktat would mean "losing face," and losing it not only in America. But regardless of how much the American scientists valued their academic freedom and sense of personal dignity, directives are issued to be carried out.

Let us look at the facts. When the late Professor P. Handler, the former president of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, addressed a joint session of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology of the Committee on Science and Technology and the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on 31 January 1980, he said that the academy agreed with administration policy and that all cooperation with Soviet scientific organizations would soon cease.¹³

Handler also informed Congress that American scientists had asked him for "advice" on projected visits to the Soviet Union and that he had recommended the cancellation of these trips (even before the National Academy of Sciences had made the decision on the "moratorium"!--N. B.). He stressed that he had asked scientists long ago to word their denials "more carefully" so that the Russians would not think that "the government has ordered us not to go."¹⁴ The options of American scientists who were totally dependent on the allocation of the necessary funds for their work were quite limited.

Nevertheless, many U.S. scientists were brave enough to voice protests. "We must be fully aware of our own interests in our relations with the Soviet Union," prominent American scientist, President D. Acker of Kansas State University, said in the Congress. "Scientific and technical exchanges provide us with important and useful information...and promote trade and better mutual understanding between governments and people, and in my opinion the encouragement of their development is in the highest interests of the United States."¹⁵

It must be said that the Washington administration certainly considered all of the possible consequences before it decided to put a "freeze" on scientific and technical contacts with the Soviet Union. The preparations for this began long before. On 31 January 1980, Doctor F. Press, then the President's adviser on science and technology, informed the Congress: "Many contacts with the Soviet Union were reduced by the United States long before Afghanistan."¹⁶

Apparently, preparations for specific proposals aroused strong passions. In connection with this, Professor H. Feshbach, president of the American Physical Society, informed congressmen: "We must be careful and keep the United States from going overboard in setting up barriers during the current crisis."¹⁷

The American Government eventually attempted to keep the "moratorium" from injuring the United States. Immediately after it was announced, the State Department explained the content of the restrictions, which were essentially the following.

Scientific and technical cooperation with the USSR in highly technological fields would be completely curtailed...with the exception of:

Joint research and development of "special interest" to the United States;

Cooperation in "humanitarian" fields (medicine and others);

Unofficial exchanges of individual scientists.

All of these exceptions had one purpose: On no account should contacts in fields of special interest to the United States be curtailed. It is known that the American side was particularly interested in cooperation in medicine (cardiology, oncology, space medicine and the effects of prolonged space travel), where the achievements of Soviet scientists were quite significant. Individual exchanges of scientists were supposed to serve as a channel for familiarization with the achievements of Soviet basic science, which was also one of the highest priorities from the standpoint of "special interest."

What then could this American moratorium with its group of "exceptions" represent if not a repetition of the "zero option" President Reagan once proposed at the talks on the reduction of medium-range missiles? It represents exactly the same kind of attempt to acquire unilateral advantages, and not only at the expense of the Soviet Union but also at the expense of the United States' partners in NATO and other blocs.

Within the first months after the institution of the American economic, scientific and technical "sanctions," it became clear that they were having the most severe effect on the West European countries and Japan. People there quickly realized that the United States was asking them to make much greater sacrifices than it was making. The White House was carefully guarding the interests of American monopolies and did not hesitate to erect additional barriers for the companies of its allies. Reagan quickly cancelled the ban on exports of agricultural products to some socialist countries, especially the USSR. According to the calculations of Western economists, they represent around 75 percent of all American exports to these countries. As for the West European states and Japan, 80 percent of their exports to socialist countries are manufactured goods. Washington's restrictions had a much more severe effect on them. These countries account for around 20 percent of the USSR's foreign trade, but the United States accounts for only around 2 percent.

Besides this, people in Western Europe and Japan were well aware that total reliance on U.S. scientific and technical potential could cost them too much: None of them had any doubts that the United States, their chief rival in world markets, would "squeeze" the maximum out of its monopoly in order to enrich itself even more at the expense of its allies and heighten their dependence.

When the U.S. administration involved its allies in the policy of "sanctions" against the USSR, it said that its actions were motivated by "national security interests," for the sake of which, according to its reasoning, economic interests had to be sacrificed. Obviously, this approach was not supported by the business and scientific communities in Western Europe.

Under these conditions, the isolation of West European countries from scientific and technical exchange with the Soviet Union became especially inconvenient for them. For this reason, they did not allow the American administration to involve them in this unscrupulous and, what is most important, counterproductive game and, judging by all indications, took a more realistic approach to economic, scientific and technical contacts with our country than their overseas partner.

The Failure of the "Sanctions"

In subsequent years the "sanctions" had virtually no effect on the state of Soviet scientific and technical contacts with the majority of West European countries. What is more, these contacts were developed: The USSR and FRG signed a long-range program of economic and industrial cooperation, extending into the next century, the 21st; long-range programs of economic, scientific and technical cooperation were signed with Finland, France, Norway, Austria,

Sweden and Greece; a long-range program of world ocean research was signed with France; public health care agreements were signed with Belgium and Spain; agricultural agreements were signed with Canada.

Over 100 new agreements on scientific and technical contacts were concluded with firms and industrial associations in the capitalist countries in 1980-1984. Besides this, agreements expiring in 1980 and 1981 were renewed with 70 firms. They include Mitsubishi, Sumitomo, Nisse-Iwai, Tokyo Boeki and Komatsu (Japan), Linder, Meyer and Schwarzkopf (FRG), Ron-Poulenc (France), ENI and Snia Viscosa (Italy), British Petroleum and Ferranti (England) and Diamant Bohr (Belgium). This testifies that the governments of these countries, and not only their scientific and business communities, do not want to sacrifice the advantages of scientific and technical contacts with the Soviet Union for the sake of the interests of certain circles in the United States, and that they have no wish to turn international communication by scientists and specialists into an instrument of American foreign policy.

Earlier agreements were also renewed with a number of American firms having no wish to stop mutually beneficial contacts with Soviet organizations. They include such large corporations as Tenneco, Rohm & Haas, International Harvester, H. H. Robertson and others.

Soviet-American intergovernmental agreements on cooperation in environmental protection, medicine and public health, the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and world ocean research were renewed in 1980-1983 on the initiative of the American side.

As for the attitude of the world's scientists toward the policy of "freezing" scientific and technical contacts, it was clearly expressed at a science forum in Hamburg in 1980, when the leading representatives of the scientific communities of 35 countries which had signed the Helsinki Final Act unanimously, despite the opposition of the American delegation, recommended the further development of scientific contacts in such key areas as power engineering, food production, public health and environmental protection.

The conclusions and recommendations of the science forum were approved in full in the final document of the Madrid meeting of representatives of states party to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. It underscored the importance of the further development, on the basis of mutual advantage and mutual agreement, of the forms and methods of cooperation envisaged in the Final Act. The participating states reaffirmed the value of economic, scientific and technical contacts in the reinforcement of peace and security in Europe and the rest of the world and declared their determination to continue and broaden this communication, regardless of differences in social systems.

Now we can definitely say that the U.S. administration's economic, scientific and technical "sanctions" did not have the desired impact. They injured the United States and its allies, and not the Soviet Union, which has continued to work successfully on problems facing its economy. As prominent Chicago businessman and member of the American Committee for East-West Accord A. Salk said, the victims of this policy were the American companies that lost large orders. Trust in the United States as a partner was undermined. As for the Soviet Union, "a more reliable partner cannot be imagined."¹⁸

Our country's position on scientific and technical contacts with foreign countries is clear and consistent. "The Soviet Union," General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M. S. Gorbachev said at the April plenum of our party's Central Committee, "favors productive and comprehensive economic, scientific and technical cooperation, based on the principles of mutual advantage and devoid of any kind of discrimination; it is prepared to work toward broader and deeper trade relations and develop new forms of economic contacts based on the mutual interest of the sides in the joint incorporation of scientific, technical and technological innovations, the design and construction of enterprises and the exploitation of crude resources."¹⁹ M. S. Gorbachev expressed the hope that the United States would reconsider its present position. This would pave the way for mutually acceptable agreements. Our side is obviously willing to do this.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Key Issues in U.S.-USSR Scientific Exchanges and Technology Transfer," Report Prepared by the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology of the Committee on Science and Technology, U.S. House of Representatives, 96th Congress, 1st Session, Serial W, Wash., November 1979, p 25.
2. Ibid., p 6.
3. Ibid., p 27.
4. Ibid., p 26.
5. Ibid.
6. TRUD, 1 December 1973.
7. A. P. Aleksandrov, "Scientific Cooperation with the West," in "Ot Khelsinki do Belgrada. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov" [From Helsinki to Belgrade. Collected Documents and Materials], Moscow, 1977, p 236.
8. THE INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 17 August 1983.
9. THE WASHINGTON POST, 18 August 1983.
10. "Science, Technology, and American Diplomacy, 1984. Fifth Annual Report Submitted to the Congress by the President Pursuant to Section 503(b) of Title V of Public Law 95-426, April 1984," Wash., 1984, p VI.
11. "Key Issues....," pp 9-10.
12. Ibid., p 11.
13. "The Helsinki Forum and East-West Scientific Exchange," Joint Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Science and Technology and the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign

Affairs, House of Representatives and the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, 31 January 1980, Wash., 1980, p 98.

14. Ibid.
15. Ibid., p 130.
16. Ibid., p 52.
17. Ibid., p 188.
18. BIKI, 7 February 1985.
19. PRAVDA, 24 April 1985.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1985

8588

CSO: 1803/13

ROLE OF MORALISM IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY VIEWED

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 8, Aug 85 (signed to press 18 Jul 85) pp 22-31

[Article by M. S. Chetverikova: "Moralism in Foreign Policy"]

[Text] In Washington it has become customary to justify the pursuit of policy from a position of strength with references to some kind of "moral" considerations. To people, what is moral is anything they consider to be permissible, even if it includes overthrowing legal governments, pursuing a policy of government-supported terrorism and fighting undeclared wars. This is the main reason for the escalation of existing tension and the creation of new seats of tension.

The moralist rhetoric and the justification of U.S. actions in the international arena with references to some kind of universal and abstract ideological moral values have traditionally been employed by Washington for demagogic purposes, to fool the public. The tendency to deliberately manipulate moral and ethical values and categories for the attainment of certain specific political goals dates back to the origins and development of the American national consciousness. The foreign policy activity of the Carter and Reagan administrations highlighted this tendency even more clearly. Both presidents tried, although in different ways, to make moralism an instrument of their policy in world affairs.

J. Carter, who won the reputation of the most prominent "moralist-president" since W. Wilson's time, took office in the extraordinary sociopsychological atmosphere following the war in Vietnam and the Watergate scandal. At that time U.S. ruling circles had no unanimous views on American foreign policy, and public opinion was colored by the moral indignation aroused by the disclosures of genocide and inhumane behavior during the war in Indochina and of corruption and abuses of power at the time of the Watergate affair. Under these conditions, the emphasis on the moral aspects of sociopolitical affairs, which became a distinctive feature of J. Carter's domestic and foreign policies, was regarded by many Americans as a form of protest against amorality, cynicism and unscrupulousness in politics. In an attempt to put these feelings to work in his own interests, J. Carter assigned priority to the restoration of the United States' moral authority. Assuming the guise of a messiah destined to lead America and the rest of the world to the "heights of

freedom and happiness," he launched a sweeping demagogic campaign "in defense of human rights" within the country and in the international arena.

The ethical principles and categories employed in this campaign, however, soon revealed their incompatibility with the cultural traditions, values and spiritual, social and economic needs of the majority of other countries and peoples. Furthermore, the widely publicized and globalist "human rights" campaign began to come into conflict more and more perceptibly with the actual objectives of the United States' imperious foreign policy, which was firmly committed to alliances with many military dictatorships based on terrorism and unconcealed contempt for the most basic human rights. A double standard and an anti-Soviet content became increasingly evident in Carter's moralism.

All of this, combined with America's serious failures in the international arena, strengthened the already present public awareness of the severely contradictory and inconsistent nature of Carter's foreign policy line. Furthermore, his obvious confusion during the events in Iran, his abrupt changes of stance on the extremely important matter of a strategic arms agreement with the USSR and his actions which later undermined the ratification of the SALT II treaty he himself had signed, gave him the reputation of a "weak president." Against this background, the energetic appeals of nationalist and extreme rightwing groups for a return to the days of global power politics began to gain more and more support.

"The tragedy of J. Carter," wrote S. Hoffman, prominent American theorist of international affairs, "was that the failures (of his policy--M. Ch.) caused us to regress, back to the oversimplified theories of containment and the bipolar world characteristic of the cold war years. The absence of strategy in Carter Administration policy paved the way for those who seemed to have this strategy, however false or obsolete it might have been."¹

The start of the Reagan Administration, in contrast to the Carter presidency, was marked by a definite change in American feelings about the general goals and aims of foreign policy. By 1980 the prevailing mood was in favor of radical changes in American foreign policy for the purpose of restoring America's leading role in the world. R. Reagan and his administration made use of these changes. They also revived many of the postulates and moral precepts of the cold war era, the appeal of which was clearly reflected in the nostalgic statements of Jeane Kirkpatrick, the U.S. representative to the United Nations in Reagan's first administration: "The cold war years were a relatively happy time, when free societies and democratic institutions were safe. The West was strong, united and self-confident."²

These were not mere propaganda slogans. They were real foreign policy aims. As American researchers of international affairs S. Bialer and J. Afferica admitted, the basic principles of this policy had remained unchanged for a long time: "In spite of the pressure which inevitably leads any president to move toward the pragmatic center when faced by domestic and international issues...the domestic and foreign policies of the Reagan Administration still retained the features of the 'ideological crusade.'"³

Reliance on force combined with moralism as a form of ideological propaganda support for foreign policy has been quite characteristic of the Reagan Administration. One of the most prominent and constant themes in President Reagan's speeches is the theme of the "exceptional" mission of the American nation of "God's chosen people," allegedly giving this nation the moral right to lead the world. Idealization of the American past, lavish praise of the morals of private enterprise, capitalist competition and market relations and the absence of any kind of discerning interpretation of the lessons of U.S. history are characteristic of his statements. Although he acknowledges the chronic and serious nature of the problems facing the country, he sees their primary cause as America's abandonment of the divinely ordained high principles to which it must return.

In the speeches of Ronald Reagan, which are permeated with moralist rhetoric, the United States represents all of the virtues of successful private enterprise and capitalist accumulation. It is precisely with the exercise of these virtues that the demagogic use of the term "freedom" is linked. "We are the only surviving island of freedom on earth...and we can either defend freedom or watch it die."⁴ When he talks about America's "morality," he tries to ignore the specific incidents contradicting this view or simply distorts the actual state of affairs. The President has often spoken of the "high purpose" of the war in Vietnam, which was allegedly fought for the sake of "fraternal relations between peoples." He advocates alliances with openly dictatorial regimes, which is far from consistent with the declared high standards of international morals. Reagan is inclined to interpret the most flagrant violations of democratic standards by these regimes as a "political necessity."⁵

Anticommunism, a fundamental element of Reagan's foreign policy moralism, has permeated all postwar U.S. foreign policy behavior and constitutes a basic component of the prevailing feelings in this country. It has been reflected in different ways and with differing degrees of intensity, however, in the behavior of different administrations.

Ronald Reagan, as American experts have pointed out repeatedly, is an advocate of the black-and-white view of the world, is not inclined to see shades of gray or doubt the validity of his own beliefs and political actions and does not entertain any doubts about the moral virtues of the United States and the capitalist system in general. In his mind, the Soviet Union is the reason for all of the evil and unrest in the world and for America's failures. He and the others who see the world in these terms have a limited and oversimplified understanding of the surrounding world and the objective course of events. In the words of American researcher Betty Glad, "exaggeration of the adversary's strength and his complete dehumanization" are characteristic of this type of thinking.⁶

"Dehumanization of the adversary" is a quite precise definition of the purpose of Reagan's moralizing anti-Soviet declarations. He must exaggerate the adversary's strength to justify militarist plans and programs to the American people. He has declared several times that military superiority in a specific military field is a necessary and primary condition for dealing with the Soviet Union.

"Since when has America's desire for military superiority been reprehensible?" Reagan asked before he took office in 1980.⁷ These were the objectives he brought with him to the White House. These objectives revealed the peculiar correspondence of the personal ideological and moral convictions of Reagan and his closest advisers to the pragmatic aims of his foreign policy.

This type of morality is based on a belief in the indisputable value of the preservation and reinforcement of capitalism as a system and views the struggle between private interests, in which the success of one side is the failure of the other, as a universal model of interpersonal relations; this kind of morality motivates imperious, chauvinistic global foreign policy and stimulates confrontation with the USSR and the buildup of military strength. These pragmatic political aims needed propaganda support, however, and this gave rise to various demagogic arguments with a moralizing content.

Later, however, when the Reagan Administration encountered new international problems, the ability of the system of deep-rooted foreign policy commandments and principles to serve as the basis for Washington's actual behavior was called into question.

"The lesson which most observers learned after Reagan's first year in the White House," S. Hoffman commented in this connection, "was a simple one: Ideology is not strategy, and a group of ideas cannot constitute a policy."⁸ The discrepancy between Reagan's oversimplified moral and ideological views and aims and the real world was soon apparent. His administration's approach to foreign policy not only failed to solve many international problems but even complicated and exacerbated them. This was attested to primarily by the failures of Reagan's foreign policy in the most basic areas.

The reliance on forcible pressure and the attempts to gain military superiority to the Soviet Union, to disunite the socialist countries and to interfere in their internal affairs turned out to be completely futile. The attempts to exert brutal pressure on Cuba and Nicaragua and to suppress the national liberation movement in El Salvador produced no results.

The morality of total confrontation with the USSR frightened millions of Americans and the public in Western Europe and other regions. Attempts to secure American capitalism's egotistical interests on the international level created additional conflicts in relations with other states, including allies. Contrary to the expectations of the U.S. administration, the militarist and adventurist policy line promoted the growth of the antiwar movement in Western Europe.

The moralist statements about America's global responsibility for the future of the world and about the high moral criteria allegedly lying at the basis of U.S. relations with other countries revealed their purely propagandistic function. Rhetoric of this kind, as even American researchers commented, "represents the United States either as a defender of the often abnormal status quo, as in the case of El Salvador, or as a policeman offering protection to those who have not requested it."⁹

The danger of this kind of moralist approach to foreign policy issues is attested to by many historical examples of the use of moralizing phrases to substantiate war and aggression, the initiators of which have invariably claimed to be guided by the highest moral considerations. The manipulation of moral terms as a cover for the arms race is particularly dangerous. After all, the threat of nuclear war affects the interests of all humanity. The anxiety of the world and American public has recently become obvious, and it is no coincidence that the Reagan Administration began to include peaceful rhetoric in its propaganda statements more and more frequently toward the end of Reagan's first term.

A discussion of the role played by morality and moralism in the foreign policy consciousness of Americans throughout the country's history can aid in a better understanding of the sources, internal contradictions and critical symptoms of Reagan's characteristic variety of foreign policy moralism and of the attitudes of the public and various segments of the political elite in the United States toward his morality, moral rhetoric and political practices.

It has become customary in the United States to view the development of political consciousness and political behavior in general and of foreign policy consciousness and foreign policy behavior in particular as a process of the contradictory interaction of two different and, in the opinion of many, alternative approaches: On the one hand, the pragmatic approach based on criteria of practical value and benefit; on the other, the moralist or moralizing approach, focusing on abstract and universal ideological moral postulates and ideals.

A clear understanding of the origins and nature of the interaction of these approaches demands recognition of an extremely important fact: The United States is a country whose historical destiny is bound up with a single socio-economic structure--the capitalist structure. For this reason, the practice of private enterprise and capitalist competition, based on the achievement of personal success and prosperity, has been clearly and consistently embodied in the sphere of morality. Political pragmatism, particularly in foreign policy--in other words, the emphasis on benefits and advantages for a single individual or nation--is authorized and engendered by the specific type of morality that has been so thoroughly developed throughout the history of the United States. Furthermore, it is indicative that the pragmatic approach in U.S. politics has been most consistent when the policymakers have been closely associated with the ideals, values and standards corresponding most fully to the practice of capitalist enterprise, competition and market relations.

Personal or national egotism and voluntarism--that is, reliance on force and will, exerted against those viewed as competitors or rivals--can take the form of consistent pragmatism unhampered by any kind of moral considerations or limitations, openly and even cynically. But this same egotism and voluntarism, this same emphasis only on advantage and force, can also take the form of a specific type of moralism. In this case, the emphasis on the strength of the individual, group or nation is regarded or publicized to others as the embodiment of common ideals and demands for freedom and "the progress of the entire human race."

It is important that moralism of this type in the United States is based on deeply entrenched traditions of bourgeois ideology and psychology, assigning absolute value to the principles of competition and private enterprise, but there is also the equally widespread belief in America that adherence to this ideology and psychology makes the American people a nation chosen by fate, history or God for a special destiny or a special mission on earth.

The belief that Americans have an absolutely unique system of ideals and values of general and universal significance has become firmly established in the national consciousness. This belief has had a strong effect on the planning and pursuit of foreign policy. "We Americans believe that, first of all, there is nothing exclusive about our values and, secondly, that these values affect or should affect foreign policy," renowned American sociologist N. Glazer wrote.¹⁰

It is true that America is probably more inclined than any other country to justify virtually all of its foreign policy actions, even openly egotistical and obviously unscrupulous ones, on "high moral grounds." This kind of moralism, which is sometimes sincere but is generally used as a cover for a policy of national egotism, is based largely on the distinctive cultural and historical traditions stemming from the specific features of the United States' origins and development. In the words of famous American sociologist S. Lipset, "Americans inherited their moralistic outlook from their Protestant past."¹¹

The Puritans, who defied European feudal conventions to move from the Old World to the "virginally pure" lands of an unexplored continent,¹² regarded themselves as the builders of a new society meeting the requirements of an ideal model of social organization. The religious zeal with which the first settlers defended their moral and ideological values and their belief in the unique destiny of the "New Canaan" they had founded set the pattern for the superiority and exclusivity characteristic of "Americanism."

From the very beginning, the idea of "America's mission" gave the extremely heterogeneous community of settlers a sense of unity and common goals and instilled the budding national consciousness with inner meaning. Besides this, this moral and ideological messianism served and still serves as a specific form of psychological compensation for the "national inferiority complex" of a young society devoid of historical, cultural and other traditions. As American sociologist R. Gabriel commented, "national beliefs should satisfy the psychological needs of those who profess them.... They should give a nation suffering from an inferiority complex a sense of superiority, arising from the belief that the nation has a special mission."¹³

The atmosphere of religious fanaticism and moral zeal reigning in the colonies of the new settlers, who clung with rare fervency to their own convictions, helped to strengthen the sense of this "special mission." This made their opinions particularly rigid and gave rise to a tendency to view all events through the prism of the strict moralist dichotomy of good and evil. As a result, they regarded America as the ideal of moral perfection, opposed by a largely hostile world embodying sin and vice. The idea of America's

uncompromising struggle against the "forces of evil" had a significant effect on the subsequent development of the American foreign policy consciousness.

The rich lands of the New World, its geographic remoteness and safety, guaranteed by vast expanses of ocean, and the lengthy absence of economic and political dependence on the surrounding world all reinforced the "pilgrim fathers'" belief that they were morally right and that they had an exceptional destiny. Furthermore, America's later history was devoid of social upheavals serious enough to deform or change the most common principles of the national system of values. On the contrary, by virtue of the distinctive history of American development and the abstract and moralistic nature of the ideals of "Americanism," the standards of bourgeois morality which they reflected and which became widespread in America turned out to be quite tenacious. Even today, these extremely flexible and abstract standards and values are employed in attempts to justify and validate reversals in U.S. foreign policy.

It is also significant that the distinctive development of the American national consciousness had a perceptible effect on the American view of the outside world. Above all, there was already an inclination in the earliest periods of U.S. history to associate the American nationality with a definite system of political and moral-ideological values and standards.

"Wholly absorbed by his life in the New World and delighting in its riches and rewards, the American cherished the undiscerning and indisputable belief that this was the best of all possible worlds. The moral superiority of his country was also obvious to the American. The assumption of superiority was accompanied by a sense of predestination and mission," remarked renowned American historian H. Commager.¹⁴

The deep-seated sense of superiority in the American national spirit was oddly combined, on the one hand, with a belief in the exclusivity and uniqueness of the American pattern of development and, on the other, with the certainty that America's experience was of general and universal value to all mankind. Even the first settlers did not view America only as a country territorially separate from the rest of the world, but as a new society escaping the power of history and consciously created in accordance with the "highest" ideals, and therefore as something outside the overall global system. It was on this basis that Americans acquired their patronizing attitude toward the rest of the world, which they seemed to view from afar, from the heights of the "ideals of liberty."

But since the United States had been chosen by providence or history to carry out this kind of "great plan," the national interest also acquired priority and turned into an interest sanctified by providence, to which all other countries had to submit. In the apt definition of Soviet researchers V. A. Kremen'yuk and G. A. Trofimenko, one of the characteristic features of American foreign policy tradition is "Americanomorphism," or, in other words, the desire to see the rest of the world established in the image and likeness of the United States.¹⁵ This is how the idea of America's "special mission" in the world took shape, uniting beliefs in the uniqueness and universality of its moral experience with a sense of its moral superiority. This is how the

entire chain of connecting links between the most abstract ideals of this type of morality and the physical sphere of foreign policy took shape.

It is also significant that the historical conditions of U.S. development largely predetermined the unique moralistic view of the outside world from a superior position. Until the beginning of the 20th century, the international position of the United States differed significantly from the external conditions of the majority of other countries. In the Western Hemisphere the United States immediately, from the moment of its birth, took the position of the leading power, superior in strength to all other countries of the region and secure in the knowledge of its complete invulnerability. As for the United States' relations with distant European countries, since it was a long time before this country felt the need for territorial conquests beyond the boundaries of the American continent and before it was actively involved in European diplomacy, it assumed the role of an uninvolved observer, only occasionally making certain foreign policy moves to maintain the most convenient balance of power. The geographic distance from the rest of the world and the political independence of the rest of the world, which determined U.S. foreign policy until the beginning of our century, gave Americans the illusion that their country could "rightfully" serve as a universal moral judge. It must be said that later, when the international position of the country changed radically and the incompatibility of its ideal view of international affairs with the actual sphere of international relations was revealed, the American foreign policy consciousness could not escape its inherent moralism (or idealism, as it is often called in specialized literature).

Therefore, the entire group of geopolitical, historical and sociocultural factors contributed to the tendency toward the moralist justification of the purely pragmatic and transitory goals to which U.S. foreign policy was committed during the earliest stages of American history. The same group of factors also contributed to the unrealistic and illusory foreign policy consciousness based on a fundamentally distorted view of the world and of the United States' place in it.

In its most consistent forms, the moralist view of the outside world is distinguished by something like bipolar extremism: There is the inclination to view the world as a global struggle between two mutually exclusive entities--absolute good and absolute evil, the first of which is naturally represented by the United States while the second is represented by any forces opposing it in any way whatsoever (in the beginning it was the "savage redskins" or the "European feudal-absolutist monarchies," and in the 20th century it was the "red menace"). The moralist does not simply point out this moral and ideological division of the world; he sees it as his duty to eradicate this unnatural division by means of will and, if necessary, by means of force, and to reduce the entire world to a common--in this case, American--denominator.¹⁶ In his actual behavior, the moralist of this type deliberately ignores reality, refuses to see all of the complexities of this reality and embarks on adventures in the name of a "crusade" against the "forces of evil."

This type of moralism displays this tendency even more clearly when new historical realities come into conflict with the characteristic dogmas and beliefs of this brand of moralism. In this case, its inherent rigorism and

absolutism turn into belligerent dogmatism and conservatism, and it tries, again by means of will or force, to prevent the establishment of anything new. It is here that a slightly different type of relationship between moralism and pragmatism in American policy, including foreign policy, is revealed. Moralism is a synonym for moral dogmatism, stubbornly opposing new political realities, moral subjectivism and ideologism, prepared to embark on adventures for the sake of customary beliefs and ideological aims, whereas pragmatism represents the American variety of political realism which might not completely deny these moral and ideological aims but does insist on a more precise analysis of its forces and of the possibility of achieving these aims during the planning of strategy and tactics.

It is not surprising that the U.S. politicians who were motivated by political realism to take a number of important steps in the direction of international detente in the early 1970's often called themselves pragmatists and contrasted their position to the idealism and moralism of the "cold war." It is also no coincidence that some moderate critics of Reagan's line of confrontation and the undermining of peace talks with the USSR in recent years, who regard this line as a variety of ideologism and moralism, have been called pragmatists in American literature. Whenever moralism and pragmatism are contrasted in theoretical works on the history of U.S. foreign policy, it is precisely this interpretation of the concepts that is often employed. In the words of famous historian A. Schlesinger, Jr., "two tendencies have always vied for supremacy in American foreign policy: One is empirical and the other is dogmatic; the first views the world from the historical standpoint, and the second from the ideological one; the first assumes that the United States could not be completely devoid of the imperfections, weaknesses and defects inherent in other societies while the second views the United States as the empire of goodwill, supreme wisdom and virtue, destined to save all mankind."¹⁷

Of course, the contrast between pragmatism and moralism in this interpretation is largely hypothetical. After all, pragmatism can presuppose the most diverse degrees of political realism, and even the very discussion of realism can be a way of expressing voluntarism and even adventurism. In exactly the same way, moralism, which is inclined to absolutize abstract moral ideals, can sometimes stimulate criticism of political pragmatism, cynicism and unscrupulousness. Quite often, moralism serves as a cover and a propagandistic justification for greed and egotism in politics.

The now traditional contrasting of moralism, as a position allegedly proceeding from universal and global moral principles, to pragmatism, interpreted as a point of view concerned only with the "national interest" and ignoring moral considerations, is even more hypothetical. As one of the founders of the school of "political realism," H. Morgenthau, commented, "the essence is not a choice between moral principles and the national interest, devoid of moral value, but between one set of moral principles, isolated from political reality, and another set of principles chosen in accordance with this reality."¹⁸

Actually, both the "pragmatists" and the "moralists" usually agree that U.S. foreign policy should be determined by the ideals and values lying at the basis of American national ideological and political traditions. They are more

likely to disagree over the extent to which these ideals and values should dictate specific foreign policy decisions. Nevertheless, we can agree with the authors who underscore the danger of the typically American variety of moralism in U.S. foreign policy that was so clearly displayed, although in different forms, during the years of the Carter and Reagan administrations.

It is completely obvious that moralism can lead U.S. policy into a dangerous impasse and, as an important and constant element of this policy, can prevent the practical resolution of specific foreign policy problems. Furthermore, displays of moralism in American foreign policy follow a certain cycle, and moralism itself can be of varying degrees.

S. Huntington believes, for example, that periods of moralism have a functional character, stabilizing the social system on the basis of traditionalism and conservatism.¹⁹

Other American authors have noted that the periodic reversals in U.S. foreign policy from moralism to pragmatism and vice versa have done much to impede the establishment of normal relations with other countries and have severely hampered the continuity of foreign policy. Sociologist S. Garrett, for example, writes that "Americans have never been able to find a satisfactory balance between their moral sense and their attitude toward political realities."²⁰

Therefore, on the one hand, moralism is organically unhampered by the imperatives of reality, but on the other it is quite deliberately utilized by certain segments of the U.S. ruling class to perform definite, and sometimes quite pragmatic, political functions. What is more, and this is quite important, moralism as a specific type of interaction between ideology and foreign policy is equally characteristic of virtually all groups involved in making and implementing foreign policy decisions under certain historical conditions. It is possible to speak of conservative and liberal moralism, or of rightist-radical or leftist-radical moralism, each of which produces essentially the same moralist view of the world, although with differing ideological and political content. Regardless of its specific ideological content, however, the moralist outlook can be described by and large as an obstacle and an impediment preventing the United States from acknowledging new realities in the world.

The typical American tendency to use moralism as propaganda support for a foreign policy completely alien to loudly declared moral standards and the ideals of "humanism and progress" is equally dangerous. It is no secret that abstract humanist moralist rhetoric is actively used in the United States as an instrument for the demagogic substantiation of the expansionist foreign policy line. In spite of the fact that moralism can take different forms, it leads to a lack of correspondence between unrealistic foreign policy goals and the existing means of their attainment, and this was proved by the Carter and Reagan administrations.

FOOTNOTES

1. S. Hoffman, "Dead Ends. American Foreign Policy in the New Cold War," Cambridge (Mass), 1983, p 77.
2. J. Kirkpatrick, "The Reagan Phenomenon--and Other Speeches on Foreign Policy," Wash., 1982, p 28.
3. S. Bialer and J. Afferica, "Reagan and Russia," FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Winter 1982/83, p 249.
4. Quoted in: B. Glad, "Black-and-White Thinking: Ronald Reagan's Approach to Foreign Policy," POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY, 1983, vol 4, No 1, p 43.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., p 33.
7. Ibid., p 47.
8. S. Hoffman, "Reagan Abroad," THE NEW YORK REVIEW, 4 February 1982, p 153.
9. Ibid.
10. N. Glazer, "American Values and American Foreign Policy," COMMENTARY, July 1976, vol 62, No 1, p 32.
11. S. Lipset, "The Paradox of American Politics," THE PUBLIC INTEREST, Fall 1975, p 143.
12. We should note that the hypocrisy of moralist rhetoric is clearly displayed here in the complete disregard for the tragic fate of the native inhabitants of the American continent, who certainly did not consider their land to be "unexplored."
13. R. Gabriel, "American Values, Continuity and Change," Westport (Conn)--London, 1974, p 5.
14. H. Commager, "The American Mind," N.Y., 1962, p 47.
15. V. A. Kremen'yuk and G. A. Trofimenko, "Foreign Policy Traditions," in the book "Sovremennaya vneshnyaya politika SShA" [Contemporary U.S. Foreign Policy], vol 1, Moscow, 1984, p 146.
16. "Protivorechiya sovremennogo amerikanskogo kapitalizma i ideynaya borba v SShA" [The Contradictions of Contemporary American Capitalism and the Struggle of Ideas in the United States], Moscow, 1984, p 89.
17. A. Schlesinger, Jr., "Foreign Policy and the American Character," FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Fall 1983, p 4.

18. H. Morgenthau, "American Foreign Policy: A Critical Examination," London, 1952, p 43.
19. S. Huntington, Op. cit., pp 62-64.
20. S. Garrett, "Morality at the Water's Edge," COMMONWEALTH, 18 March 1977, p 170.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1985

8588

CSO: 1803/13

U.S. ATTITUDE TOWARD ALL-EUROPEAN PROCESS

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 8, Aug 85 (signed to press 18 Jul 85) pp 44-55

[Article by Yu. P. Davydov: "The United States and the All-European Process"]

[Text] After the April (1985) CPSU Central Committee Plenum resolved to hold the next party congress, the 27th, in February 1986, it defined the main tasks connected with congress preparations and proceedings and stipulated the main areas in which this work should be conducted, including the area of party foreign policy activity. The need for the further development and reinforcement of the positive international processes noted in the preceding period was pointed out in this connection. The Politburo believes, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M. S. Gorbachev stressed in his speech at the plenum, "that intergovernmental documents of the period of detente, including the Helsinki Final Act, have not lost their significance.... In connection with the 10th anniversary of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, it would probably be useful for the states which signed the Final Act to meet in Helsinki to reaffirm their desire to avoid dangerous tension and to develop peaceful cooperation and constructive principles in international affairs."¹ The need for this kind of reaffirmation is also dictated by the present state of affairs in the world and in Europe and by the struggle to implement the Helsinki accords in recent years.

The fact is that the signing of the Final Act of the CSCE on 1 August 1975 opened up new possibilities in relations between states, and especially in East-West relations. From the standpoint of principle, it responded to Europe's main foreign policy problem: how the two opposing sociopolitical systems could cooperate in such a way as to simultaneously safeguard their security and their mutual interest in various spheres. The focal point of the Helsinki accords is the idea of peaceful coexistence by socialist and capitalist states and the acknowledgement of the natural sociopolitical and territorial realities existing in Europe since World War II. Their approval on the basis of a consensus confirmed the viability of the all-European process, essentially signifying that the resolution of intergovernmental problems, particularly those in East-West relations, should be sought not by imposing one's own will on others but by recognizing existing realities, cooperating and seeking mutually acceptable compromises. Strictly speaking, the

all-European process is the organization of this kind of cooperation (bilateral and multilateral).

This consensus was possible because the CSCE participants adhered to a number of principles pertaining to dialogue, especially the equality of partners, which gave rise to the desire to find a compromise; the concentration of states of different social systems on what unites them rather than on what divides them; the desire to understand one another instead of the attempt to redesign partners in one's own image and likeness.

The all-European process is multifaceted. Its development is taking place on various levels, but two are decisive: advancement toward stronger European security and the improvement of the political climate in international relations. The first presupposes the search for an optimal means of strengthening security on the continent, which is realistic, meets the interests of all states and leads to the reduction of military confrontation between the two sides. The Helsinki accords proceed from the belief that under present conditions--and this has been demonstrated by postwar experience--the security of Europe cannot be achieved by building up the military potential of individual states or groups of states but can be secured only through the concerted efforts of all states. Security can either be security for all or not exist at all. Later, this idea was precisely formulated and logically substantiated in the famous report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues under the Chairmanship of O. Palme.² The idea of guaranteeing common security, engendered by the diplomacy of the Soviet Union, is shared today by many sensible politicians and statesmen in the West as the only reasonable alternative to the arms race and the threat of nuclear war. It is too early to say, however, that this is a universal or unconditional realization: The idea has many opponents in the NATO countries who are capable of influencing the policy of their states. Nevertheless, within the framework of the all-European process the phrase "security and cooperation" is being interpreted more frequently as "security is cooperation."

The second level entails the creation of an atmosphere of greater trust in the interrelations of the participants in the Helsinki process and the acknowledgement of the mutual advantages of their cooperation. A healthy political atmosphere is important because many of the statements in the Final Act are worded flexibly, in the form of compromises. Under the conditions of detente, this facilitates the conclusion of agreements by socialist and capitalist countries in Europe, establishes the prerequisites for the resolution of disputes between European states, the United States and Canada and leads to the establishment and expansion of contacts between states on the political level and in the spheres of trade and industry, to the planning and organization of joint projects and to the determination of the most promising spheres of scientific and technical cooperation. In a state of tension, however, these compromise wordings are used by the opponents of the all-European process for arbitrary interpretation, for setting various countries in opposition to one another and for the exacerbation of their differences.

Advancement on these two main levels would contribute much to progress in other areas of the all-European process, because experience has shown that serious difficulties arising here immediately affect other spheres (trade, scientific and cultural contacts, etc.).

Ten years ago, when U.S. President G. Ford spoke on behalf of his country at the final session of the conference in Helsinki, he said: "History will judge this conference not by what we say today, but by what we do tomorrow."³ This is true, but the main thing is probably the specific criterion chosen for the historically accurate evaluation of the performance of various states, organizations and individuals. It is probable that the contribution of each state to the establishment, development and reinforcement of the all-European process would be a reasonable criterion. In other words, it would be the specific actions the state has taken to guarantee mutual security, establish an atmosphere of agreement and political trust in Europe and expand East-West cooperation in various spheres; the degree to which it would adhere to the principles of dialogue making the achievement of a "balance of interests" possible in Helsinki.

Many constructive initiatives of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community and many of their undertakings have been aimed at the development and reinforcement of the all-European process. In 1975, immediately after Helsinki, the USSR proposed the organization of multilateral cooperation (on the European scale) in environmental protection, power engineering and transportation. In February 1976 the socialist countries suggested the conclusion of an agreement between the CEMA states and the "Common Market" countries to establish strong commercial ties between them, expand mutually beneficial economic cooperation in Europe, eliminate obstacles in trade and begin joint projects in such spheres as standardization, statistics, environmental protection, economic forecasting, etc. In 1977 the 10 principles of intergovernmental relations in the Final Act were reflected in the new constitution of the Soviet Union. Between 1976 and 1979 many Soviet legal acts were amended in accordance with the Helsinki accords, particularly laws pertaining to the reunification of families, the presence of foreigners on Soviet territory and the relations of Soviet organizations and citizens with overseas partners.

The 1970's and 1980's were marked by the unprecedented growth of USSR industrial, scientific and technical contacts with Western partners. Long-range agreements and programs were concluded: for 10 years with France, Great Britain, Austria, Italy, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Greece and several other states; a program extending to 2003 with the FRG; a program extending to 1995 with Finland. Other countries of the socialist community became actively involved in Soviet initiatives and undertakings. Between 1975 and 1980 the GDR alone signed around 100 agreements and treaties with the majority of countries party to the conference, giving the principles and agreements of the Final Act concrete substance. All of these steps were taken to create a strong and lasting structure of all-European cooperation and establish an atmosphere of trust and goodwill between European states belonging to different social systems.

The Soviet initiatives and undertakings aimed at implementing the idea of common security in Europe were particularly important. Since this idea leads objectively to the rejection of blocs, the USSR proposed the simultaneous dissolution of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, with the disbandment of their military organizations as the first step in this process. On 26 November 1976

the Warsaw Pact countries proposed that all states which had signed the Final Act conclude a nuclear non-aggression treaty. In 1978 the USSR officially announced that it would never use nuclear weapons against countries refusing to produce and acquire them and not allowing them on their territory. On 18 June 1979 a USSR-U.S. treaty on strategic offensive arms limitation (SALT II) was signed in Vienna, but through the fault of the United States it was never ratified. In October 1979 the USSR asked the NATO countries not to deploy American medium-range missiles in Western Europe and expressed its willingness to reduce the number of its missiles of this category in the western regions of the USSR in exchange. To create a favorable atmosphere for the development of the process of military detente in Europe, the Soviet Union decided to withdraw 20,000 servicemen, 1,000 tanks and other military equipment from the GDR (the withdrawal was completed by 1 August 1980). The 26th CPSU Congress proposed a moratorium on the deployment of new U.S. and Soviet medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe (it was rejected by the United States and its allies). The Soviet Union announced its willingness to extend confidence-building measures in the military sphere to its entire European portion on the condition that the West extend its confidence-building measures accordingly. In March 1982 the USSR unilaterally announced a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the country and a slight reduction in their number. In June of the same year, at the second special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament, the Soviet Union pledged not to use nuclear weapons first and asked other nuclear powers to follow its example. On 6 June 1983 the USSR announced its willingness to discuss the conferment of nuclear-free status on the Baltic Sea with interested countries. On 16 June of the same year the Soviet Government suggested that all of the nuclear powers simultaneously freeze their nuclear potential in the quantitative and qualitative respects. This kind of freeze could first be exercised by the USSR and United States. A week later the statement of party and government leaders of the Warsaw Pact countries meeting in Moscow proposed that Europe be turned into a continent of peace, free of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. On 10 January 1984 the Warsaw Pact countries suggested to the NATO states that all chemical weapons be removed from Europe. On 7 May 1984 the USSR and other countries of the socialist community submitted a proposal at the conference in Stockholm regarding a treaty on mutual non-aggression and the maintenance of peaceful relations between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. At the end of 1984 the Soviet Government requested the U.S. administration to begin negotiating all of the problems pertaining to nuclear and space weapons. On 7-8 January 1985 the two powers reached an agreement in Geneva on the subject and aims of these new talks. The talks themselves began on 12 March 1985. On 7 April 1985 the USSR unilaterally instituted a moratorium (until November of the same year) on the deployment of medium-range missiles and suspended all other counter-measures in Europe.

The Soviet Union supported many of the initiatives of neutral and non-aligned countries aimed at solving the problems of European security. It had a positive response to Finland's proposal that a nuclear-free zone be created in northern Europe and expressed its willingness to consider taking certain measures in its territories adjacent to the projected nuclear-free zone. The USSR supported in principle the Swedish Government's idea of creating a zone

free of battlefield nuclear weapons along the line separating the NATO countries from the Warsaw Pact states and proposed that the geographic boundaries of the zone be expanded for the more effective reduction of the nuclear threat. In May 1984 the leaders of six states (India, Sweden, Argentina, Greece, Mexico and Tanzania) issued an appeal to the five nuclear powers for a freeze--representing a first step--on the production and deployment of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery. The Soviet Union supported their initiative.

All of these moves by the Soviet Union were intended to promote the development of the all-European process in complete accordance with the Final Act, which stipulates "the mutually supplementary nature of political and military aspects of security; the mutual relationship between the security of each participating state and the security of Europe as a whole."⁴

In spite of the loud anti-Soviet propaganda in the Western countries, many experts there have acknowledged the constructive nature of the USSR's position on the all-European process. American researcher R. Rand noted "Moscow's attempts to use the Helsinki process for the advancement of various peaceful initiatives." By proposing such undertakings, the Soviet Union "is strengthening its reputation as a responsible world power both within the country and abroad.... The Soviet approach to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is a positive and far-reaching one," he wrote.⁵

The approach of the West European states to the all-European process has been contradictory. In spite of the few positive moves mentioned above, several of the foreign policy actions of NATO countries have jeopardized the development of the process based on the Helsinki accords: These are the buildup of the nuclear potential of Great Britain and France, the agreement of several West European governments to the deployment of new American medium-range missiles on the territory of their countries, the "flirtation" of some of them with Washington in connection with Reagan's so-called "strategic defense initiative" (SDI), the decisions of the Western European Union (WEU) in 1984, which lifted the restrictions on the production of several strategic weapons in the FRG, etc.

The main factor impeding and deforming the development of the all-European process, however, was Washington's policy. Whereas it was merely unconstructive during the initial stages (under Nixon and Ford), when the principles of the Final Act were being worked out and negotiated, the Carter Administration was already trying to use the Helsinki document against the countries of the socialist community, and the Reagan Administration, judging by all indications, is trying to undermine the entire all-European process.

Throughout the past decade Washington did much to undermine the very idea of the common security of socialist and capitalist states, especially in Europe. Instead of striving for mutuality and compromise, the American leaders focused the efforts of NATO countries on the further augmentation of military preparations. In 1977 the Carter Administration convinced the NATO allies to accept a decision on an annual real increase of 3 percent in their military budgets. As a result, the expenditures of the bloc countries rose from

180 billion dollars in 1977 to 374 billion in 1984.⁶ The Reagan Administration is already insisting on an annual increase of 4-5 percent in the military spending of allies. In May 1978 NATO launched, at Washington's insistence, around 100 new military programs at a total cost of 80 billion dollars, projected for 10 years in advance and designed to make NATO superior to the Warsaw Pact countries in the sphere of nuclear and conventional weapons.

The destructive position of the NATO countries, especially the United States, has blocked the Vienna talks on mutual reductions of armed forces and arms in Central Europe for 12 years. What is more, the number of American troops in Europe increased by 40,000-50,000 while the talks in Vienna were in progress. Military exercises are being conducted on increasingly large scales. The annual Autumn Forge maneuvers involve 300,000 personnel or more and huge quantities of combat equipment.

In October 1978 the United States announced its intention to begin producing the main components of a neutron bomb for use in Europe, and in August 1981 President Reagan decided to begin the full-scale production of this weapon. In June 1981 Ronald Reagan put forth the idea of "limited nuclear war" in Europe, which exposed the U.S. attempts to put the allies under nuclear fire while deflecting it from U.S. territory.

In December 1979 the NATO Council decided to begin deploying 572 American medium-range nuclear missiles in a number of West European countries at the end of 1983. Washington rejected all of the USSR's constructive attempts to prevent their deployment, using the Geneva talks between the two powers on this issue as a screen to allay the fears of the Western public. The talks were broken off as a result of this.

The appearance of qualitatively new American nuclear weapons in Europe poses an additional threat to the states of the socialist community, which had to take countermeasures to restore the disrupted military balance in Europe in medium-range weapon systems and safeguard their own and their allies' security. The deployment of the new medium-range American missiles in Western Europe intensified confrontation on the continent and exacerbated differences between its eastern and western halves. The decision to begin deploying the missiles at any cost attested to Washington's desire to deprive the Europeans of any hope of solving security problems by means of cooperation by states with differing social outlooks.

The Pentagon concentrated huge quantities of chemical weapons on the territory of several of its West European allies (4 million liters of highly toxic poisons are kept just in American storage facilities in the FRG).⁷ The production of new chemical weapons, binary charges, has been planned, and they are also to be deployed in Europe. The "Rogers Plan" proposed in 1982 and adopted at a NATO Council session in 1984 envisages the re-equipping of bloc armies with weapons of the new generation, giving them the ability to reach targets 300 kilometers or more within the territory of Warsaw Pact countries. In this way, the offensive and aggressive potential of the bloc is being strengthened on the level of nuclear and conventional weapons.

In March 1983 Ronald Reagan announced a program for the creation of a broad-scale antimissile system with space-based elements. This program, called the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), is intended to extend the arms race into outer space. It will undermine the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of ABM systems and represents an attempt to secure the ability to deliver the first strike with impunity and to destabilize the strategic situation between East and West. In addition to all this, the SDI is intended to divide Europe and to undermine the all-European process. Washington is trying to impose the notorious "space shield" on the NATO allies (just as it once imposed the "nuclear guarantees" on them) and is trying to convince them that the new weapon is allegedly capable of guaranteeing their invulnerability (while the USSR and other countries of the socialist community will supposedly become more vulnerable), making cooperation (or negotiations) between East and West in the sphere of nuclear disarmament virtually unnecessary.

With its actions and "initiatives," the U.S. ruling elite is imposing a new round of the arms race on Europe, heightening the military confrontation between East and West, blocking the implementation of the idea of mutual security set forth in the Helsinki accords and trying to reinforce the bloc-related division of the continent.

President Carter actually launched a campaign of flagrant interference in the internal affairs of the USSR and other socialist countries on the hypocritical pretext of the "struggle for human rights." With a onesided interpretation of the issue of "human rights," making use of the natural differences in the definition and exercise of rights and freedoms in the socialist and bourgeois states, Washington hoped to contrast them to one another on the social (or ideological) level as well as on the foreign policy level. The Belgrade meeting of the CSCE participants (1977), which was supposed to map out specific ways of reinforcing and expanding the process begun in Helsinki, was turned into an arena of acute ideological confrontation between East and West through the efforts of Washington and some of its allies. As a result, it could not make the anticipated contribution to the development of cooperation on the continent.

The Reagan Administration's behavior at the Madrid conference (1980-1983) was even more destructive. Issuing ultimatums to the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, Washington tried to undermine and stop the all-European process. It was particularly opposed to the organization of a conference on confidence-building measures and on security and disarmament in Europe, which was insisted upon by the socialist states and even by some Western countries. "They will not be able to hold this kind of conference. The West is against it," said M. Kampelman, the head of the American delegation in Madrid.⁸

The flagrant interference, incompatible with the standards of the Helsinki act, by the U.S. administration and some of its allies in the affairs of other states was reflected quite clearly in their approach to the Polish situation at the beginning of the 1980's. The American ruling elite offered moral and material support--and on the official level at that--to counterrevolutionary forces committing anticonstitutional acts in Poland. Genuine psychological

warfare was waged and is still being waged against its people. Washington tried to tell the Polish Government what it could and could not do and whom it could regard as friends and enemies.

When President Reagan addressed the English Parliament in June 1982, he asked the West to launch a "crusade" against communism, actually excluding the possibility of reaching compromises with socialist countries. When U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz spoke at the conference on confidence-building measures and on security and disarmament in Europe in Stockholm in January 1984, he questioned the inviolability of existing borders on the continent, borders secured in international treaties and the Helsinki document. In another speech, in San Francisco on 23 February 1985, he went even further by stating that "the United States will never accept the artificial division of Europe" into socialist and capitalist halves. In this way, the U.S. secretary of state actually objected to the idea and the very bases of peaceful coexistence.

Obviously, such statements and actions by Washington cannot aid in the development of the all-European process. Ultimatums do not pave the way for agreement and trust. By issuing them, Washington is undermining the foundations of the Helsinki process.

For many members of Western ruling circles, the advantages of international detente were made tangible primarily by economic ties with the East. In the past decade they became a factor stabilizing economic conditions in a number of countries (Austria, Finland, the FRG, France, Italy and others). "In Bonn and Paris, contacts with Moscow have become a significant factor in foreign (including foreign economic) and domestic policy," commented Harvard University Professor S. Hoffman.⁹

The opponents of detente in the United States were afraid that the all-European process would acquire inner momentum and new qualities, bypassing America, if the existing level of East-West economic cooperation were to be left alone (or allowed to rise). For this reason, in spite of the Helsinki accords, Washington gradually took a more rigid approach to the development of commercial ties with the countries of the socialist community and imposed this same line on its West European allies.

In June 1977 the President of the United States prohibited the sale of the Cyber-76 computer for weather forecasts to the Soviet Union, and in July 1978 he extended the ban to the Sperry Univac computer. In 1980 Washington stopped issuing licenses for the export of machines and equipment to the USSR, restricted grain sales, prohibited the export of phosphates and superphosphoric acid and limited U.S. imports of Soviet ammonia. On 23 December 1981 President Reagan instituted economic sanctions against Poland, and in January 1982 they were partially supported by the United States' West European allies. On 29 December 1981 the White House announced that the USSR was involved in the declaration of the state of martial law in Poland and extended the economic sanctions to the USSR: Aeroflot flights to the United States were suspended, the talks on the new Soviet-American agreement on shipping were postponed, American companies were forbidden to sell the Soviet Union equipment for the extraction and transport of oil and gas, etc. In June 1982 the American

administration tried to stop the laying of a gasline from Siberia to Western Europe--and it is precisely this kind of program, representing the material basis of the all-European process, that creates the interdependence of the two halves of the continent that Washington finds so disturbing--by extending the embargo to the products of foreign branches of American firms and of foreign companies manufacturing this equipment with American licenses. The sanctions were in effect for 5 months and were then lifted because they did not produce the anticipated results. At closed sessions of the Coordinating Committee for the Multilateral Control of Exports to Socialist Countries (COCOM), the Reagan Administration repeatedly asked its allies to control exports of science-intensive products to socialist countries more strictly. The lists of restricted items were supplemented in July 1984 under American pressure, although this aroused the displeasure of the West European business community.

The American administration's approach to East-West economic relations in Europe is intended to reduce the material interest of countries (especially its own allies) in the development of the all-European process, erode the material foundation of trust, agreement and cooperation between countries of the continent and eventually stop the all-European process.

The line of U.S. ruling circles with regard to the all-European process in the past decade has been influenced by many external and internal factors, and sometimes they have been purely transitory. The decisive role, however, seems to have been played by three circumstances.

The first is that the American ruling elite is completely unaccustomed to viewing European security through the prism of cooperation by states with differing social aims. Washington's approach to this problem is based (in accordance with its overall view of the world) primarily and mainly on purely power (or military) factors: European security supposedly can be guaranteed only by the existence of strong Western military potential and the constant buildup and improvement of this potential. This implies that one's own "security" is guaranteed by weakening the security of the other side. American propaganda has made vigorous attempts to convince Western public opinion that only the existence of the NATO bloc has kept the peace in Europe for 40 years. The stronger the bloc, the more "secure" Europe will be. This leads to the conclusion that Europe will gain "absolute security" if NATO gains significant advantages over the Warsaw Pact countries. The logic of mutual security, of equal security for all, is unacceptable to the traditional American politician who thinks in terms of hegemonism.

The second concerns the overall context of East-West relations in Europe and the approach taken to it by a large segment of U.S. ruling circles. Their interests, emphasizing supremacy in today's world, are served well by a rivalry-ridden Europe. The increased desire of socialist and capitalist countries of the continent to expand mutual relations, particularly during the period of detente, did not please Washington. A Europe divided into two armed camps, regarding one another with suspicion, fits in best with the aims and goals of imperialist foreign policy in West-West relations and in East-West relations. In the first case, it guarantees, in the opinion of American

strategists, the maintenance and reinforcement of U.S. leadership in the resolution of military, political and economic problems by capitalist states. In the second, it can, in their opinion, keep the European socialist states in a constant state of tension over the hostile and powerful Western military group located near their borders. Another important factor is the general reaction of the conservative segment of the American establishment to detente, a segment extremely frightened by its effects on the international influence of the United States, especially in Europe.

The third was the change in the regional balance of political power in the United States itself: The northeastern establishment, traditionally more oriented toward ties with Europe, lost influence to representatives of the so-called "sun belt" and the "technological west," who believed that the United States should concentrate more of its efforts and resources in interaction with the Pacific region, where the economy is growing twice as quickly as in Western Europe. "The recent economic and demographic shift to the west and the 'sun belt' was partially due to the fact that more and more Americans no longer regard Europe as a close and vitally important ally," the English weekly *ECONOMIST* stressed.¹⁰ The result was a definite change in the U.S. ruling elite's approach to Western Europe. It gradually began to regard it only as a future theater of military operations and a field of possible battles (including nuclear ones) with the Soviet Union. This approach does not fit in well with the idea of European security based on mutuality and cooperation. Under these conditions, Washington does not want Western Europe to respond to the United States' "cooler" feelings for it by "leaving" it, and what is most important, it does not want it to have a closer relationship with its eastern neighbors. This is the reason for the constant references to the mythical "Soviet military threat" and the attempts to maintain tension in East-West relations.

Since the U.S. ruling elite regards European security primarily from the standpoint of military confrontation with the USSR and its allies, since it does not believe that mutually beneficial cooperation in Europe and the convergence of its two halves are in the U.S. interest and since it feels free to take any action in this area, Washington's approach to the all-European process has been distinguished by a tendency to manipulate this process for its own global purposes. As a result, American administrations have tried to direct it primarily into the channel of subversive activity against the countries of the socialist community and to use the Final Act not as a basis for cooperation by states with differing social systems but as a point of departure for their confrontation. This has objectively slowed down the all-European process.

Although the American elite's plans to undermine and discredit the all-European process, to give it a unilateral direction and to use it in the selfish interests of the U.S. ruling clique were carried out in certain areas, they were not carried out to the extent anticipated. Washington's anti-detente activities were countered first by the fundamentally peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. They were opposed by the West European states, including the United States' own allies, because they were disturbed by their overseas partner's tendency

to play increasingly irresponsible games with their future and to disregard their legitimate needs and interests. "For Washington," Director C. Bertram of the weekly ZEIT noted, "progress in East-West relations depended largely on the behavior of the Soviet Union, and cooperation with the other superpower was considered to be possible only as a reward for the good behavior of the latter. The European approach differed fundamentally from the American one: Cooperation between East and West seemed inevitable in the nuclear age; it was not a concession, but an obligation."¹¹

The firm stand taken by the West European governments (England, France and the FRG above all) on the construction of the pipeline from Siberia to Western Europe also revealed the limits of American influence on the allies and on the process of all-European cooperation primarily in the economic sphere. The interest of many members of West European ruling circles in the development of this process played its role. Reagan had to retreat. It is significant, however, that Western Europe's "own voice" (on the official level) has been extremely weak in matters of military detente on the continent. The Atlantic principle, and not the all-European one, prevails in this area of activity by several West European governments, although definite changes have also been seen here.

The so-called small countries of the continent have begun to play an active role in the development of the all-European process. By reducing the significance of military-political factors in international relations, this process did much to equalize their status with that of the larger states (not to mention the fact that the high price of the arms race affects them more severely than the great powers, and the fact that their interests will be sacrificed in any future conflict). It is possible that this is why Denmark, Greece and the Netherlands have sometimes objected to American plans for the intensification of military confrontation in Europe. The stronger positive influence of neutral and non-aligned countries--Finland, Sweden, Austria and Yugoslavia--on the development of the all-European process has also been important. In some critical situations, these countries have been able to suggest reasonable compromises acceptable to all sides.

And of course, the growth of the public movement for European security and cooperation, which cannot be ignored by any government today, has become a more significant factor. Committees for European security, with prominent public spokesmen, politicians, scientists, journalists and others among their members, have been formed in the Soviet Union, other socialist countries, France, England, the FRG, Italy, Finland and other countries.

The combination of all this has led to the continuous development, however slow it might seem, of the all-European process despite the impediments created by Washington. Surmounting the obstructionism of the American delegation, the Madrid meeting of the CSCE participants came to a successful conclusion. Its balanced and meaningful final document¹² included a number of ideas and agreements dictated by the new stage of development in the European situation, especially the decision to convene a conference on confidence-building measures and on security and disarmament in Europe. This was of fundamental importance. At a time of increased international tension, the positive decisions of the

Madrid conference unequivocally confirmed that the policy of detente had not depleted its resources, that it is deeply rooted in European politics and that talks in which the interests and positions of all partners are taken into account are still an extremely important means of intergovernmental communication. "The Europeans," noted K. Voight, the FRG Social Democratic Party's expert on foreign policy issues, "are not disappointed with the evolution of detente and its current possibilities."¹³

The political structure of all-European cooperation has displayed a tendency toward continued development after withstanding the serious upheavals resulting from Washington's line of confrontation. This is attested to by the intensification of contacts between politicians in Eastern and Western Europe on various levels, which generally culminate in the signing of documents stipulating specific cooperative undertakings. The conference on confidence-building measures and on security and disarmament in Europe has begun work in Stockholm.

Substantial progress has also been made in the development of mutually beneficial economic relations. The socialist and capitalist countries of Europe signed 271 commercial and technological agreements in 10 years. Trade between the West European states and the European CEMA countries rose from 41.1 billion dollars to 73.3 billion (between 1975 and 1983), or 1.9-fold. The volume of compensatory transactions between East and West reached 50 billion dollars. The gasline from Siberia to Western Europe is operating. In view of the fact that the "gas for pipes" contract is in effect for 25 years and that the service life of the pipeline has been estimated at 50 years, the economic and political effectiveness of this form of cooperation is self-evident. In 1979 an all-Europe conference on environmental protection was held in Geneva. As a result of this meeting, 35 participants signed a convention and resolution on trans-border air pollution over long distances. Cultural contacts have also been expanded. In the last 10 years, 38 million tourists have visited the Soviet Union, and there has been a particularly rapid rise (25-30 percent a year) in the number of tourists from Western Europe. Around 130 Soviet cities maintain contact with 280 cities in the capitalist countries. The publication of the "Library of American Literature" in 43 volumes has begun in the USSR. Each year the Soviet Union acquires and screens 50-60 foreign films; unfortunately, the number of Soviet films reaching the West is only half as high.

Therefore, despite the objective and subjective difficulties encountered by the all-European process, it apparently already has its own driving forces, its own inertia nurtured by the common desire of the continent's peoples for stability and peace.

The tendency toward the irreversibility of the all-European process is the objective result of several factors: First of all, there are the common interests of states of differing social aims, especially the desire to deflect the danger of nuclear catastrophe from Europe and lower the level of military confrontation on the continent; secondly, there is the realization that the continent's most complex problems can be solved only through East-West cooperation (and the experience in this kind of mutually beneficial cooperation

speaks for itself; thirdly, there is the current absence of problems requiring the use of military force for their resolution in relations between states, especially on the East-West level, just as there are no problems warranting unyielding confrontation on the continent.

Any comprehensive evaluation of the approach of U.S. ruling circles to the all-European process must take into account the fact that they cannot ignore the process or even the tendencies in its development, despite the negative attitude toward the process on the part of an influential segment of these circles. Attempts to derail the process could lead--and a tendency toward this was seen in Madrid--to the self-isolation of the United States from the mainstream of East-West relations. People in Washington are afraid of this. For this reason, Washington is participating in the process but is attempting to use it in its own global interests for confrontation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on the one hand, and for the maintenance of control over the development of relations between Western Europe and its Eastern neighbors on the other.

Even this policy is starting to fail, however, because it has been increasingly difficult for Washington to pursue a policy contrary to the basic principles of the process while participating in it; because this policy is being countered by the principled and constructive behavior of the socialist countries; because Washington is losing the support of its allies by pursuing it.

In addition to all this, the all-European process is also having a reciprocal effect on the United States. Washington does not want to exclude itself from the process and has therefore had to agree to compromises with socialist countries, with neutral and non-aligned countries and even with its own allies in some cases. This is probably the greatest significance of the interrelationship between the United States and the all-European process.

FOOTNOTES

1. PRAVDA, 24 April 1985.
2. "Common Security. A Program for Disarmament. The Report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues under the Chairmanship of Olof Palme," Moscow, 1982, pp 36, 40.
3. WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS, 11 August 1975, p 814.
4. PRAVDA, 2 August 1975.
5. R. Rand, "USSR Commitment to the CSCE Process in the Face of Western Criticism: Five Profitable Reasons," ATLANTIC COMMUNITY QUARTERLY, 1982, No 2, p 180.
6. Calculated according to data in "The Military Balance, 1984-1985," London, 1984, pp 31-48.
7. "Otkuda iskhodit ugroza miru" [The Source of the Threat to Peace], Moscow, 1984, p 51.

8. U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 9 February 1981, p 37.
9. S. Hoffman, "The Crisis in the West," THE NEW YORK REVIEW OF BOOKS, 17 July 1980, p 41.
10. THE ECONOMIST, 16 March 1984, p 79.
11. C. Bertram, "Europe and America in 1983," FOREIGN AFFAIRS, 1984, vol 62, No 3, p 628.
12. PRAVDA, 19 September 1983.
13. K. Voight, "Nuclear Weapons in Europe: A German Social Democrat's Perspective," in "Nuclear Weapons in Europe," edited by A. Pierre, N.Y., 1984, p 99.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1985

8588

CSO: 1803/13

WASHINGTON'S, PRETORIA'S ROLE IN NAMIBIA HIT

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 8, Aug 85 (signed to press 18 Jul 85) pp 65-68

[Article by Ye. A. Antonov: "The Plot Against Namibia"]

[Text] In April 1985 the racist South African regime announced its intention to create an "interim government with limited powers," made up of representatives of puppet parties, in illegally occupied Namibia. In this way, Pretoria took a step toward the declaration of Namibia's fictitious independence within the framework of an "internal settlement"--bypassing resolution 435 (1978) of the UN Security Council. The main purpose of South Africa's maneuver was to keep the South-West African People's Organization (SWAPO) out of the government. This organization is supported by the overwhelming majority of Namibians and has been recognized as their only real representative by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the movement for non-alignment.

At the same time, the racist government in South Africa tried to neutralize the international public's negative response to its actions by announcing the withdrawal of troops from the southern regions of Angola that were occupied by South Africa back in 1981. As we know, the rulers in Pretoria promised to liberate these regions in March 1984, but the occupation dragged on for more than another year in violation of this promise.

The attempt to "settle" the Namibian problem by racist means evoked a strong wave of protests in Africa and in many states on other continents.

After consultations, the UN Security Council issued the following statement on 3 May of this year: "The members of the council condemn and reject South Africa's new unilateral step toward an internal settlement without any regard for Resolution 435 (1978) as an unacceptable move and declare the so-called interim government to be invalid." This statement reflected the common position of the Security Council members on this matter, including the United States and other Western powers.

However, after hypocritically expressing disagreement with Pretoria's plans for the "interim government" in Namibia, Washington and its NATO partners--long-time patrons of the South African racist regime--did not display the slightest willingness to take effective measures to secure the implementation

of Security Council resolutions on Namibia. On the contrary, judging by an announcement by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz of 16 April, Washington is still linking the granting of independence to Namibia with the withdrawal of Cuban internationalists from Angola and is refusing to institute any sanctions whatsoever against South Africa.

It is completely obvious, however, that Pretoria would not dare to openly challenge world public opinion if it could not rely on the support of its Western patrons, especially the U.S. administration. By demanding this "linkage," the United States and South Africa deliberately caused a deadlock in the talks on Namibia's independence. It is indicative that Pretoria took its new action in Namibia right after U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs C. Crocker spoke with South African leaders in February and March 1985.

To understand the intricacies of the diplomatic games Washington and Pretoria are playing in connection with Namibia, we must remember that within the confines of the Reagan Administration's policy of "constructive interaction," American imperialism is hoping for the eventual establishment of its own economic, political and military-strategic control over the entire southern half of the African continent, which has been listed among the regions of U.S. "vital interests." With the aid of this policy, American ruling circles are trying to establish favorable conditions for unimpeded operations by U.S. monopolies and guaranteed access to the mineral resources of states in southern Africa, to use their territory for confrontations with the Soviet Union, to subjugate their domestic and foreign policies to U.S. interests, to sever their ties with the socialist community and to suppress the national liberation struggle of the people of southern Africa.

Namibia occupies a prominent place in the Reagan Administration's plans for southern Africa. This country is an important source of crude minerals, including uranium, diamonds and complex ores. American companies are engaged in the predatory exploitation of its natural resources with no regard for UN decisions, particularly "Decree No 1," adopted back in 1974 by the UN Council on Namibia. Since 1947 the Tsumeb Company, which belongs to U.S. corporations, has provided them with more than a billion dollars in profits on investments of only 103 million dollars. Namibia is also viewed by Washington and Pretoria as a convenient bridgehead for attacks on the progressive government of Angola and for pressure on other neighboring states--Zambia, Botswana and Zimbabwe. Besides this, during the talks on Namibia the United States insisted that these front-line states establish direct contact with South Africa, hoping to thereby disunite them and lead the racist regime out of its state of international isolation.

In addition, with the aid of the "linkage" the Reagan Administration was trying to turn Namibia into a hostage of its global anti-Soviet, anticommunist policy line in international affairs.

The new maneuvers undertaken by Washington and Pretoria in connection with Namibia are largely a reaction to their political and diplomatic failures in southern Africa in 1984. Pretoria gained some temporary political dividends

from the agreements concluded in February and March 1984 with Angola and Mozambique, from the trip Botha, the head of the racist regime, made to Western Europe in June 1984, and from the adoption of a new South African constitution. However, the entire structure which had been so carefully designed and built by American and South African diplomacy toppled like a house of cards under the pressure of the intense struggle of the people of South Africa and Namibia. In August 1984 the colored and Indian inhabitants of South Africa launched a sweeping campaign to boycott the elections to the chambers created for these minority groups in the South African Parliament and joined the African population in its demands for the eradication of apartheid. The racist regime, as always, responded by instituting mass-scale repressive actions and by firing on peaceful demonstrations. But it turned out that shots were also being fired at the myth, created by imperialist and racist propaganda, about some kind of changes in the system of apartheid in the direction of democratization. These events gave new and powerful momentum to the protest movement against apartheid in many countries, including the United States itself.

From the very beginning, the Reagan Administration's policy of "constructive interaction" was interpreted by the American democratic public as a policy of broad-scale cooperation with the racist regime and evoked definite protests, taking the form of a movement for the withdrawal of American capital from South Africa. During the 1984 campaign, the issues of American policy in southern Africa and attitudes toward apartheid first took a prominent place among U.S. election campaign issues. The Democratic Party platform, mainly as a result of pressure from representatives of the black community, included demands for economic sanctions against South Africa in the form of a ban on bank loans to this country, on transfers of new investments and on the sale of South African gold coins, Krugerrands, on the American market.

Protests against the policy of "constructive interaction" grew louder in the United States. For example, a demonstration organized by black leaders and conducted in front of the South African embassy in Washington on 21 November 1984 grew into a sweeping movement encompassing many states and cities in the nation. Several thousand people, including members of the House of Representatives and Senate and famous black leader J. Jackson, were arrested for demonstrating in front of South African consulates and the buildings of American companies connected with South Africa.

A wave of student demonstrations against the Reagan Administration's policy of helping the Pretoria regime swept through American universities in April and May 1985. Angela Davis, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, USA, was arrested during one of them. Demonstrations of solidarity with the struggle of the South Africans for equality are constantly growing.

On 7 March 1985 Senator E. Kennedy and Democratic Congressman W. Gray from Pennsylvania introduced bills in their respective congressional houses to ban the extension of new bank loans and the sale of computers to South Africa, limit American capital investments in this country and stop the sale of Krugerrands in the United States. In spite of their limited nature, the bills could have reduced American-South African trade considerably had they been

passed. For example, imports of Krugerrands alone amounted to 360-380 million dollars a year in 1981 and 1982, representing around 15 percent of all South African exports to the United States. People in Washington believe, however, that Reagan will not sign the bills.

In recent months, however, opposition to Washington's policy of "constructive interaction" with Pretoria has grown much stronger in the American Congress. It has even been displayed by neoconservatives, who have always been regarded as reliable supporters of the administration. On 5 December 1984, 35 Republican congressmen sent a letter to the South African ambassador in Washington to warn the South African Government of their intention to support the institution of certain sanctions against Pretoria if no fundamental changes are made in the system of apartheid (in response, Pretoria announced that mixed marriages would henceforth be allowed in South Africa; this has not, however, been legally secured in any way).

As a result of the widespread protests in the United States, the Reagan Administration had to justify its behavior and find a way of seizing the initiative or at least alleviating the pressure to which it was being subjected. The result was the advancement of the Namibian "settlement" for the purpose of diverting the attention of the international public and the population of the United States from the main causes of the military-political tension in southern Africa--the existence of the inhuman system of apartheid in South Africa, the racist regime's repressive actions against the African population and its aggressive actions against neighboring countries.

Judging by the previous diplomatic interaction of the United States and South Africa in connection with the Namibia question, we can expect the resumption of American activity in the role of an "honest broker" and the advancement of "compromise" proposals by Washington, which would be designed to involve SWAPO and the front-line states in another round of lengthy and unproductive talks, under the cover of which the "internal settlement" could be carried out.

The resumption of talks on the Namibian "settlement" should serve Washington as an argument to prevent the American Congress and the Security Council from instituting sanctions against South Africa. Besides this, the talks can be used by the Reagan Administration as a pretext for the establishment of contacts between South Africa and some front-line states.

In recent years, however, SWAPO and the front-line states have witnessed the duplicity and hypocrisy of the American imperialists and South African racists. They still object to the "linkage" that was the main obstacle in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). But as the abovementioned statement by G. Shultz indicates, the United States has no intention of giving up a demand condemned by the United Nations, the OAU and the international public.

In addition, Washington and Pretoria have other tricks up their sleeves, and they will use them to delay the resolution of the Namibian problem. The racist regime has long complained about the UN "bias" in the Namibian issue and has

demanded that the United Nations stop recognizing SWAPO as the only true representative of the Namibian people. Some important matters were left unsettled in the UN plan for Namibian settlement, particularly the question of the electoral system in the projected UN-sponsored elections in Namibia. The United States and South Africa could also find other pretexts to drag out the talks on Namibia. In this respect, the racists and their overseas patrons have displayed rare ingenuity on several occasions.

Although SWAPO and the front-line states regard negotiations and diplomatic means as an important instrument in the struggle for the liberation of Namibia, they have no illusions about the Reagan Administration's real intentions. Speaking on Zambian television on 8 April, SWAPO President Sam Nujoma stressed that armed struggle is the only way of forcing the apartheid regime and its Western patrons to implement resolution 435 (1978) of the UN Security Council. At the same time, he reaffirmed SWAPO's willingness to sign a ceasefire agreement with South Africa and to enter into negotiations on the condition that they be based on this resolution.

With their heroic struggle, the Namibian people have frustrated several attempts by the South African racists and their allies to impose a puppet regime on them. There is no question that the united efforts of SWAPO and the front-line states, supported by their friends throughout the world, will also bring about the failure of the new plot against Namibia.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1985

8588

CSO: 1803/13

MANAGEMENT, ORGANIZATIONAL CRISIS IN U.S. CORPORATIONS

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 8, Aug 85 (signed to press 18 Jul 85) pp 95-101

[Article by G. B. Kochetkov: "The Management of Companies During Periods of Organizational Crisis"]

[Text] An analysis of the theoretical bases of American management indicates that all of its leading schools place primary emphasis on the growth and development of capitalist corporations. Traditionally, their main function has consisted in a search for ways of surmounting difficulties related to growth. Such popular administrative decisions of recent years as goal-oriented and intensive forms of organizational structures, organizational development and so forth have the direct aim of expanding firm operations, increasing sales and taking over new markets.

The constant growth of the size of companies is viewed by the majority of prevailing theories of bourgeois management as the norm, and any cutback in commercial activity is a deviation from the norm. The growth of the organization has always been considered an indication of economic well-being and has been interpreted by the American public as proof of "good management," efficiency, competitive advantages, larger stocks of resources, higher profits, etc. For this reason, administrative decisions have essentially had the aim of "maintaining or heightening the degree of control over various processes under the conditions of continuous growth." Furthermore, it was sometimes assumed that capitalist firms could experience cutbacks and various difficulties, but the forms and methods of corporate management during these periods were of no interest to researchers.

There are reasons for this. Bourgeois management, as a specific field of the social sciences, has special ideological functions. The advocates of capitalist management have always underscored the superiority of "free growth," and concentration on commercial cutbacks has been inconsistent with these general ideological precepts. According to David Whetten, a well-known U.S. expert on management and a professor at Illinois State University, when growth is seen as a symbol of efficiency and when the financial status of the firm depends on this, particularly its credit rating, managers have no interest in advertising adverse conditions and make every effort to conceal them, particularly since public opinion equates cutbacks with poor management. Consultants

and experts on management have also avoided this subject because there has been no social demand for this kind of research, and firms experiencing difficulties usually do not have the funds to pay for costly scientific analyses of the causes and mechanisms of stagnation and decline.¹

In the second half of the 1970's and the beginning of the 1980's, however, theorists and practitioners of bourgeois management had to consider the well-known fact that the majority of even large firms experience lengthy phases of decline and commercial cutbacks in their development. Many researchers began analyzing the ways in which firms adapt to these conditions. A new field of specialized literature, which could be called "cutback or contraction management" or "management of organizational decline," came into being. In both cases, the subject was the state of affairs in specific firms, and not the overall state of the economy.

There are several reasons for this reversal in the theory and practice of management. Above all, there is the fact that the United States has encountered serious difficulties and upheavals since the middle of the 1970's, including structural crises and inflation, declining growth rates of labor productivity and production efficiency, a severe energy crisis and many others.

For the first time since the "great depression" of the 1930's, American management encountered the need to curtail and reorganize commercial operations in virtually all spheres of economic activity. Both government agencies and enterprises in the private sector began to suffer from a chronic shortage of resources (the most famous examples are the financial crises of New York, Detroit and other American cities, the colossal U.S. federal budget deficit, the pitiful state of such pillars of the business community as Chrysler and Pan Am, the difficulties of General Motors, etc.).

American literature on management issues now contains admissions that the philosophy of organizational growth and expansion, lying at the basis of all contemporary theories of management, no longer meets changing requirements, and that the task of "reindustrialization"--that is, the industrial regeneration of America--will be impossible without "organizational regeneration." This implies the reorganization of the administrative bases of modern corporations with a view to the limited supply of resources, the need to intensify production processes, etc. This reorganization seems all the more necessary in view of the fact that the main decisions on corporate management were made at a time when economic and organizational growth seemed to be the only possible development strategy. The striving for unlimited growth has now been replaced in American management by considerations of zero organizational growth, a search for the optimal dimensions of firms and their subdivisions and appeals for the maximum use of internal reserves.

The Capitalist Firm at a Time of Cutbacks

"Cutback management" covers such problems as the reduction of the personnel staff of organizations of various types and cuts in financing, the scientific substantiation of the cancellation of the least effective programs and projects and the gradual curtailment of the operations of specific subdivisions. For

the first time in the history of the American science of management, a primary objective is the orderly curtailment of organizational activity and retreat to a fortified position, so that firms can wait out the bad times and then regroup their forces for a new assault on the market.

It must be said that researchers had little practical material at their disposal: Few firms allow outsiders a look behind the scenes. Most statistics are provided by government agencies, the curtailment of whose operations is regarded in the United States as a positive part of the struggle against bureaucracy. Nevertheless, even this scanty information is being carefully studied and is serving as the basis for generalizations.

The causes of the decline and curtailment of firm operations were analyzed. The following were singled out as the most important: poor management and mistakes in planning; the miscalculation of the firm's life cycle; defects in organizational structures; unfavorable outside influences. Researchers agree that organizational decline is the result of the complex interaction of internal and external factors.² Managers and businessmen, however, are inclined to believe that all firms operate under the same external conditions and that any cutback is the result of mistakes in management. In particular, a survey of the executives of leading U.S. corporations indicated that the main cause of company difficulties and the curtailment of corporate activity was poor management in 7 out of 10 cases, a combination of internal and external factors in 2 out of 10, and external causes in only 1 out of 10.³

All of the works on "cutback management" mention the fundamental difference between companies in a state of stagnation and the growing company, and the need to use recommendations based on principles of growth. For example, administrative innovations at a time of growth are always associated with the expansion of the organizational pyramid and with the hope of advancement for middle-level management. In firms undergoing contraction there are no prospects for growth and, as D. Whetten points out, administrators realize this before anyone else and move to other companies.⁴ This compounds the problems of these firms and complicates their recovery.

Organizational growth guarantees companies certain advantages, resulting in agreement on internal goals, the elimination of conflicts, etc. Under the conditions of contraction, resources previously used to maintain effective management gradually disappear. Individual "power centers" within the firm fight over personnel, funding and information, the number of conflicting goals increases and the ability to solve problems decreases.⁵ The same internal processes lead to different results in developing and contracting companies. In the developing firm, for example, competition between departments accelerates development, but in the firm undergoing contraction it heightens mutual suspicion, destroys internal interaction and eventually has an adverse effect on organizational processes.

In a state of decline, the capitalist firm loses its ability to respond correctly to internal and external changes. This can be the result of increased conflicts, a defective structure, weak adaptive mechanisms, etc. Companies grow less receptive to change and lose contact with the outside environment.

One of the most serious problems of these firms is the deterioration of the organizational climate. In these firms, various rumors spread quickly and contribute to the destruction of the work environment and the creation of an atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust. This was confirmed by special studies conducted at plants of the U.S. automobile companies during the crisis of 1980-1982.⁶ In particular, it was noted that production decline is accompanied by an increased number of conflicts, diminished interest in overall results, etc. The behavior of an organization in a state of decline, according to American sociologists, is similar to the behavior of a person in a stressful situation. For this reason, they suggest the use of a special term to describe it--organizational stress.⁷ In the same way as a person, they believe, the company cannot respond correctly to outside influences when it is in a stressful situation, and this is the reason for deviations from rational patterns of behavior.

To reduce possible losses during this period, firm managers try not to make decisions on long-range problems and display less flexibility, but they also make more frequent attempts than before to hide behind the screen of collective management (boards, committees, etc.), thereby excluding individual responsibility. The management of these companies is distinguished by cuts in planning and a reduction in the number of corporate goals. Furthermore, the possibility of economizing on resources by making fuller use of internal reserves is the top priority.⁸ All of this gives rise to an acute need for changes in the style and methods of management.

Studies indicate that the administrative load (the management-labor ratio) increases during periods of decline and decreases during periods of growth. Furthermore, the curve of this parameter during periods of growth and contraction represents a loop, similar to the hysteresis loop in physics.⁹ There have been similar studies of other organizational parameters (number of levels, administrative range, centralization, etc.). The results were used as the basis for hypotheses regarding possible changes in the forms and methods of managing enterprises in a state of crisis.

Decentralization, the formation of divisional structures and expansion in related markets are considered to be the most effective ways of surmounting external problems in modern American management. In fact, however, companies experiencing cutbacks are more likely to resort to centralization, the choice of short-range strategies, the reinforcement of formal decisionmaking mechanisms, the extensive use of standards, the establishment of stricter control, etc. On the one hand, prerequisites for administrative reforms are created objectively in these firms, but on the other hand the companies undergo changes diminishing their ability to accept and incorporate innovations. For this reason, innovations which have been widely publicized in specialized literature, such as the Levine-Schein and Hammond models and others, are virtually inapplicable under these conditions.¹⁰

"Cutback management" requires different methodological approaches, and these have not been worked out in American management as yet. Literature contains only the most general descriptions of the behavior of firms in a state of crisis with the use of elements of the theory of natural selection, the theory

of catastrophes and analogies with some biological and physico-chemical phenomena. For example, American researchers propose two possible models of organizational behavior under the conditions of crisis. The first proceeds from the assumption that the organization itself has no significant defects and that the cutbacks are the result either of extremely strong deviations in external conditions (embargos, the energy crisis and other resource crises, abrupt and unpredictable changes in consumer tastes, etc.) or of the appearance of a new situation never before encountered by the given firm. In the second model the emphasis is on the determination of the reasons for the firm's inability to respond correctly to external and internal changes.¹¹

From the organizational standpoint, business cutbacks are a complicated problem in American business. As the works of R. Zammuto from the National Center for Higher Business Education showed, business schools have always trained their students to think in terms of the unlimited growth of companies. The graduates of these schools have neither the knowledge nor the experience required for "cutback management." In the 1980's the need to revise the system of managerial training for a more balanced view of organizational growth was considered for the first time in the history of American management. In proposed programs, zero growth and reduction are also regarded as a normal situation for the firm, as one of the stages of its life cycle.¹² This could be the beginning of the lengthy job of changing the priorities of the majority of professional managers.

Administration Reactions to Crisis

American researchers have noted that companies and government organizations react to new unfavorable conditions in two ways.¹³ Some take a defensive position and try to survive the period of negative developments without changing anything, sometimes curtailing operations across the board to avoid disrupting existing structures and relationships. Sometimes these companies divest themselves of branches operating at a loss while making virtually no changes in central structures. Others make an active attempt to adapt to changing conditions, revise their strategy, reorganize the personnel staff and change forms and methods of work. The latter have a better chance of survival and of future success. In works by American experts on "cutback management," the following are singled out as the main methods used by capitalist firms in a state of crisis: changes in administrative personnel, revisions of economic strategy, the introduction of new systems of motivation, and staff cuts.

The administrative reaction to crisis is usually connected with changes in top corporate executives. Managers in American business like to say that the company is an extension of its leader, his "elongated shadow." It is true that the largest U.S. firms--Ford, duPont, IBM, Exxon and others--were strongly influenced by the personality of their founders during the period of their establishment. Later, however, these firms often encountered difficulties when the departure of their leader led to the disintegration of the nucleus of the administrative system.

The balanced representation of individual functions in the upper echelon of corporate power is an equally important part of company management. The

domination of the firm by financiers or marketing experts can have just as negative an effect on the long-term results of economic activity as excessive concentration on scientific and technical functions. In particular, American specialists believe that one of the reasons for the difficulties experienced by the Chrysler company in the late 1970's was the domination of corporate decisionmaking by technical specialists.

Changes in the upper echelon of management, however, do not signify its total renewal. Today's modern firm is generally managed by three people: the chairman of the board of directors, the top administrative executive and the top executive in charge of operations. Together, they make up a collective managerial body which almost never undergoes a total change. According to the data of D. Bibeault, an American expert on crisis management, top executive positions are filled by the firm's own employees in 56 percent of all cases, and by outsiders in only 44 percent.¹⁴ Managers specializing in "salvaging" firms experiencing difficulties have made their appearance in the United States in recent years. They include such famous businessmen as R. Ash, R. Wilson, T. Wilcox and others.

Changes in management are usually accompanied by changes in firm strategy. Under the conditions of increasing economic instability, the correct determination of the main areas of economic policy and the concentration of limited resources in these areas are of decisive significance for the existence of many firms. These purposes are served by the new system of forms and methods known as strategic management. The system is based on the definition of economic strategy as a group of measures to solve certain problems and attain the firm's objectives.¹⁵ Economic strategy is carefully planned and elaborated. Its goal-oriented nature is underscored because it is aimed at specific goals--for example, the introduction of a new product, the conquest of a new market, etc. In strategic management the limits of planning are not defined in terms of time, but the development cycles of the company and the industry as a whole, and are closely coordinated with the life cycles of the main products.

For example, in computer engineering the life cycle in the production of basic computers is close to 10 years and that of microcomputers is 1 or 2 years. In line with this, the strategy of economic behavior should be planned in 10-year periods for some firms and in periods of 1 or 2 years for others. If a company has divisions producing different types of computers, their strategic plans will have different time limits. These plans are based on the assumption that each specific product manufactured by the firm will exhaust its market potential at a specific time and that the product will either have to be replaced or the division will have to be liquidated.

In general, the methodology of strategic management was worked out in the expectation of further growth, although with limited resources. Later, however, the possibility of using this set of methods successfully under the conditions of curtailed commercial activity became apparent. A distinctive feature of the use of strategic management in this kind of situation is the change in the criteria used in evaluating the performance of firm subdivisions. Whereas these were usually the profit margin and the degree of market expansion in the past, under present conditions the decisive criteria are the

stability of market positions and of relations with major clients and the overall effectiveness of the production process. Managers of subdivisions are granted complete autonomy, and their activities are judged only by final results--gross sales volume, profit, etc. In intraorganizational administration, the manager is completely free to choose his own means and methods. The procedure of strategic management envisages periodic comparisons of the results of the activities of all subdivisions and the determination of areas warranting development, even at the cost of withdrawing resources from others.

It must be said that changes in firm strategy are described in different ways in the abovementioned models of firms in a state of crisis. Within the framework of the first model, the type of strategy is closely coordinated with an analysis of the internal causes of the crisis. In the case of the disruption of interrelations between the organization and the outside environment, organizational changes are usually recommended for the restoration of the previous situation. Many firms did this in response to changes in the mechanism of government regulation in some industries under the Carter and Reagan administrations.

As American researchers have pointed out, a frequent cause of crisis is the large size of the company and the related bureaucratization of the administrative staff. In this case, the new managers usually try to reinforce the mechanisms of internal coordination and control and simultaneously decentralize economic activity. Many giants of American business have resorted to this tactic. For example, IBM, General Electric and several other firms made structural changes to decentralize many operations in the 1970's. Finally, if the crisis is connected with unfavorable changes in markets or in the economy as a whole or with the introduction of new forms of regulation--that is, with changes outside the firm--and if they cannot be influenced by internal means, the use of the methods of strategic management is recommended.

In the second model, the crisis situation is mainly due to internal factors, and organizational changes become the focus of attention. For example, in the event of a drop in sales volume, all internal processes must be made more economical first, and the search for new markets can only begin after this has been accomplished.

Within the framework of "cutback management," the personnel problem is divided into two separate problems--the problem of establishing an efficient administrative structure and the problem of personnel cuts. In the first case, specialists base their recommendations on the theory of the corporate life cycle, in which the reduction of activity is viewed as a natural stage of development. The most detailed descriptions have been provided of the experience accumulated by federal agencies in reorganization in connection with Reagan's program to "debureaucratize" the American civil service. The measures to reduce its size and cost were among the basic elements of his economic program. Although they were a continuation of earlier measures to some extent, they had their own distinctive features. For example, the Republican administration resolved to reduce the operational volume of the federal government, associating this less with heightened efficiency than with the need to curtail many of the government's civilian functions, particularly

regulative ones. The Office of Management and Budget--one of the leading bodies of the executive branch--drew up a long-range program for the reduction of the civil service by 13 percent, or by 163,000 people, by 1986. The program is being carried out with maximum rigidity.

At first the administration tried to use the simple method of making equal cuts of 10 percent in the staff of each department and agency. This measure, however, was pointedly criticized by Congress and the business and scientific communities as an oversimplification of the problem. For this reason, the Reagan Administration soon gave up this tactic and began reducing the civil service on the basis of a more careful analysis, reducing or eliminating certain functions and heightening the importance of personnel certification and evaluation.¹⁶

To this end, the creation of new government bodies (especially various councils and committees) has been put under strict control, and closer attention is being paid to the dissolution of temporary bodies completing their assignments.¹⁷ A special task force headed by Vice-President G. Bush oversees the dissolution of superfluous government agencies.

As for American firms, they make either simultaneous or sequential cuts. The first method is considered to be preferable from the administrative standpoint because it allows for the fundamental reorganization of the company. From the standpoint of the overall impact, however, the answer is not that simple, as sequential cuts can sometimes be made at a lower cost due to the natural departure of workers (relocation, illness, death and other reasons).

In general, the group of problems connected with the practice of "cutback management," as American experts have pointed out, require further study. The categorization of "cutback management" methods used in the public and private sectors has been named as one field of research in this area. For example, American experts have noted that simple personnel cuts do not usually solve the complex problems giving rise to the crisis. Cuts must be more selective: Some subdivisions must be maintained at their previous level while others can be completely eliminated. Only a functional analysis of the operations of individual offices can serve as the basis for this approach. On this basis, for instance, decisions can be made on the decentralization of certain functions in branch headquarters and the consequent elimination of the central office, or vice versa.

But cuts in themselves are not the firm's final goal. This, as mentioned above, is a temporary retreat to a fortified position. Any company wants to "rise" in the future, to return to previous indicators of sales volume, profits, market share, etc. For this reason, "cutback management" should, in the opinion of experts, evolve organically into "turnaround management."¹⁸

An analysis of the new field of bourgeois management indicates that companies which are unable to influence the spontaneous nature of economic development in general strive for maximum adaptation to current changes and try to surmount periods of decline, without suffering large losses, by using various forms and methods of management. But not all of them are able to do this, and this is

attested to by the significant increase in the number of bankruptcies, mergers and takeovers in the 1980's. Many of the large firms on the list of the top 500 published annually by FORTUNE magazine have had to declare bankruptcy. Therefore, the heightened interest in studying the processes of cutback management provides more evidence of the fierce struggle tirelessly waged by firms for survival, and it is also an admission of the fact that such phenomena of economic life as recessions, liquidations and financial ruin are natural in the capitalist system of economic organization.

FOOTNOTES

1. ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT REVIEW, 1980, No 4, pp 577-588.
2. JOURNAL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, 1978, No 1, pp 114-137.
3. D. Bibeault, "Corporate Turnaround," N.Y., 1982, pp 35-48.
4. ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT REVIEW, 1980, No 4, p 580.
5. W. Scott, "Organization Theory: A Reassessment," *ibid.*, 1974, No 2, pp 242-254.
6. THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, 2 February 1980, pp 1, 14; 27 July 1981, pp 1, 14.
7. D. Whetten, "Sources, Responses and Effects of Organizational Decline," in "The Organizational Life-Cycle," San Francisco, 1980, pp 377-374 [sic].
8. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW, March-April 1979, pp 179-183.
9. ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT REVIEW, 1980, No 4, pp 589-598.
10. For a description of these models, see Yu. A. Ushanov, "Ekonomiko-matematicheskoye modelirovaniye v amerikanskikh korporatsiyakh" [Economic-Mathematical Modeling in American Corporations], Moscow, 1980, pp 122-149.
11. EXCHANGE: THE ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR TEACHING JOURNAL, 1982, No 3, pp 5-12.
12. *Ibid.*
13. MANAGEMENT REVIEW, March 1982, pp 9-14.
14. D. Bibeault, *Op. cit.*, p 135.
15. See, for example, D. Cleland and W. King, "Strategic Planning and Economic Policy," Moscow, 1982.
16. See A. N. Isayenko, "The 'Civil Service' Reform," SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA, 1980, No 3.

17. G. Brewer, "Termination: Hard Choices--Harder Questions," PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW, July-August 1978, pp 338-344.
18. D. Bibeault, Op. cit., pp 11, 83. For a review of D. Bibeault's book, see issue No 6, 1984, pp 125-127.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1985

8588

CSO: 1803/13

U.S. BOOK ON NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION REVIEWED

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 8, Aug 85 (signed to press 18 Jul 85) pp 111-113

[Review by V. F. Davydov of book "Nuclear Proliferation Today. A Carnegie Endowment Book" by Leonard S. Spector, New York, Vintage Books, a Division of Random House, 1984, XV + 478 pages: "The Danger of the Growth of the 'Nuclear Club'"]

[Text] The real danger of the continued proliferation of nuclear weapons on the planet is the cause of growing anxiety throughout the world. American research centers are now paying close attention to these matters and are trying to map out an effective policy of nuclear nonproliferation. The Carnegie Endowment has begun publishing a series of special annual reports for this purpose. The subject of this review is a book written by Leonard Spector, senior research associate at the endowment, who worked on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for a long time and was the main adviser to the Senate Subcommittee on Energy and Nuclear Proliferation. He analyzes the development of the programs of the main candidates for membership in the "nuclear club," such "threshold" countries as South Africa, Israel, Pakistan, Argentina, Brazil and others, as well as international policy in the sphere of nonproliferation from 1983 to 1984.

Assessing the nuclear potential of the "threshold" countries, Spector proceeds from the indisputable fact that "the proliferation of nuclear weapons is one of the gravest dangers of our time and could become one of the probable detonators of a future nuclear catastrophe." Even if the countries of the world are able to avoid a nuclear holocaust, he states, the "use of nuclear weapons in a regional conflict could cause unprecedented destruction" (p 3). In his opinion, new nuclear states will be able to intimidate and blackmail neighboring non-nuclear states. In turn, this could motivate the latter to take preventive actions to destroy the nuclear facilities of the countries opposing them, and this will unavoidably increase the danger and probability of military operations involving conventional weapons (p 4).

The further proliferation of nuclear weapons also entails the sinister prospect of their use by terrorist groups. The author recalls that such groups have already attempted the "nuclear blackmail" of the inhabitants of such American cities as Boston, Orlando, Los Angeles and Spokane and that their threats seemed completely credible at first but fortunately turned out to be a bluff (p 4).

A rise in the number of nuclear states will also increase the danger of the unauthorized or accidental use of these weapons. "Today there is no 100-percent reliable system for the command and control of nuclear forces" (p 4), L. Spector writes.

All of this dictates the urgent need to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to give this matter top priority.

The Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons has now been signed and ratified by 129 states. In Spector's opinion, this testifies that "the renunciation of nuclear weapons is gradually becoming the norm in international behavior" (p 14). But two nuclear states--France and the PRC--and around 40 non-nuclear countries are still not party to the nonproliferation treaty. Furthermore, such countries as Pakistan, South Africa and Israel have reached the point of building nuclear weapons, and according to some estimates they already have them. In connection with this, the author believes, more intense international efforts are needed to restrain the ambitions of these countries and give them no chance to test nuclear devices, since they could motivate other "threshold" countries to redirect civilian nuclear programs into military channels and give rise to a chain reaction of global nuclear proliferation (p 15).

In an examination of the situation in the sphere of nonproliferation in Asia, Spector pays special attention to Pakistan's rapid advancement in 1983 and 1984 toward the development of its own nuclear weapons. The statement made by Pakistani nuclear physicists in the beginning of 1984 about the possibility of producing highly concentrated uranium testifies, in his opinion, that Pakistan could build a bomb in the future: "The very fact that three Pakistanis were arrested in the United States in June 1984 for trying to steal...elements of the explosive mechanism of a nuclear installation leaves no doubt that General Zia has already decided to build this kind of weapon" (p 104).

Besides this, the author points out the fact that Pakistan might not need to conduct tests: Some American specialists believe that the PRC has given Pakistan information about the workings of the nuclear device.

Another "threshold" state, South Africa, reached the point of building nuclear weapons with the aid of Western countries, especially the United States, France and the FRG. According to Spector's estimates, by the middle of the 1980's it will be able to produce around 50 kilograms of highly concentrated uranium a year beyond the control of the IAEA--the International Atomic Energy Agency. This is enough to build two or three nuclear devices. Since the time the uranium concentration plant in Walindabe began operating in 1975, 375 kilograms of fissionable material has been accumulated--enough for the production of 15-25 nuclear devices. In view of South Africa's plans for the substantial enlargement of uranium concentration facilities, Spector assumes that they will give Pretoria the ability to produce from 40 to 100 nuclear devices a year (p 305). "South Africa's refusal to put its uranium concentration plant under international control, its preparations for the testing of nuclear devices in 1977 and the continuous hints of some leaders that the

country will begin producing nuclear weapons if necessary, testify to South Africa's de facto possession of the means of nuclear intimidation. Even if the nuclear weapons are unassembled and have not been integrated into the armed forces, few informed experts doubt that Pretoria has the ability to quickly assemble them and put them in commission (pp 305-306), the book says.

It is also obvious, however, that the author tries to whitewash the Reagan Administration's nuclear flirtation with South Africa in spite of the compromising nature of U.S. ties with South Africa in the nuclear sphere and of the annual UN General Assembly resolutions requesting the Western countries to stop all nuclear cooperation with the racist regime. The fact that Washington was able to convince Pretoria to put its nuclear exports to other countries under international control could, according to U.S. assertions, become "a valuable model which should be urged on new supplier states not party to the nonproliferation treaty" (p 304). This approach essentially means that the countries of the world should reconcile themselves to the existence of nuclear facilities and materials not subject to IAEA control in South Africa, which it could also use for military purposes.

Spector is pessimistic about the prospect of stopping Pretoria's nuclear preparations, and with good reason. The policy of the United States and other leading Western countries on "constructive cooperation" with South Africa in the military, political and economic spheres creates a favorable framework for the further reinforcement of the racist regime's nuclear ambitions.

The nuclear program of Israel, America's ally, is being developed under similar circumstances. Spector stresses that "experts agree that Israel is capable of deploying nuclear forces consisting of 10-20 nuclear devices" (p 142). Tel Aviv's efforts to maintain a nuclear monopoly in the Middle East led to an armed attack on the research reactor in Iraq. Spector writes that this action supposedly aided in the temporary reduction of the danger of nuclear proliferation in the region (p 113). In fact, however, it strengthened the determination of several Arab countries to acquire nuclear technology and materials. Israel's continuous threats to take similar "preventive action" against Arab countries developing civilian nuclear programs can severely weaken the nonproliferation framework in the Middle East and hasten the start of a nuclear arms race here. Spector believes that it is convenient for Israel to keep its "bomb in the cellar," without openly declaring itself a nuclear state, as this would arouse countermeasures in Arab states and a negative reaction in Western countries. This policy is also convenient for the United States, which is giving its ally colossal economic and military assistance.

The author, just as other American experts, is now most disturbed by the civilian nuclear technology of the Arab countries--Egypt, Libya and Iraq (pp 113-115). But these countries have signed the treaty on nonproliferation and all of their activity in this sphere is under IAEA control. It is a different matter in Israel, which is accumulating and planning the expanded production of fissionable materials suitable for use in nuclear weapons and not subject to the agency's control.

Analyzing the situation in the sphere of nuclear nonproliferation in Latin America, Spector concludes that Argentina and Brazil are on the threshold of producing fissionable materials in the quantities needed to start building nuclear weapons. Argentina, for example, already has large facilities for the concentration of uranium and the regeneration of plutonium from the spent fuel of nuclear power plants and, as the author writes, it has "an adequate research and industrial infrastructure for the development of nuclear weapons" (p 228). The situation is similar in Brazil, although this country is still behind Argentina in mastering the technology of uranium concentration and plutonium production.

Summing up his findings, Spector remarks that although the policy of nuclear nonproliferation has been successful in some areas, "the danger...still exists and will be with us forever. An analysis of trends in 1983 and 1984 indicates that at least eight states are acquiring the potential to build nuclear weapons." They could be followed by other countries "if circumstances permit" (pp 339-340).

In the face of this threat, Spector advises the nuclear powers to pursue a policy of constructive cooperation and interaction in the sphere of nuclear nonproliferation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1985

8588

CSO: 1803/13

REVIEW OF U.S. BOOK ON NUCLEAR THREAT, PUBLIC OPINION

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 8, Aug 85 (signed to press 18 Jul 85) pp 113-116

[Review by M. M. Petrovskaya of book "Voter Options on Nuclear Arms Policy. A Briefing Book for the 1984 Elections," New York, The Public Agenda Foundation, 1984, IV + 91 pages: "The Issue of the Nuclear Threat Reflected in Public Opinion Polls"]

[Text] One of the main functions of the Public Agenda Foundation, a non-governmental organization founded in 1975, is the preparation of special analytical reports to inform Republican and Democratic presidential candidates, government leaders, businessmen and the mass media of public feelings and attitudes. The subject of this review is one of these reports, based on a study conducted by this organization in conjunction with Brown University (Providence, Rhode Island).

It is a study of U.S. nuclear arms policy, and it reflects various tendencies in public opinion over the past 40 years.

The most interesting part of the report, in our opinion, is an analysis of new and extremely interesting trends in U.S. public opinion, revealed in a study of American attitudes toward the issue of nuclear arms. They attest to significant changes in the assessment of the nuclear factor in international politics. These changes are connected with a major reordering of priorities in the American public mind in response to the new imperatives of the nuclear age, which have destroyed many traditional beliefs about war and peace.

People in the United States, as the report testifies, are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that there can be no winners or losers in a total nuclear war and that the "old rules of the game," according to which war was an extension of policy, are obsolete.

There is a fairly stable consensus on many problems connected with U.S. nuclear arms policy (in all of the American demographic groups). This applies above all to the issue of the nuclear threat. The public views nuclear arms as a reality of our age: Now that man has acquired the knowledge needed for their production, there can be no return to safer times, even if these weapons are destroyed (this was the opinion of 85 percent of the respondents). In the

opinion of the majority of Americans (90 percent), both the United States and the USSR can now destroy one another many times over. Furthermore, they believe that the United States has lost its nuclear superiority (84 percent) and that there is no hope of regaining it; there is no chance of winning the arms race because the USSR can always catch up with the United States (92 percent); the creation of new weapon systems as "bargaining points" with the USSR is unproductive because the Soviet Union is capable of developing the same systems (84 percent, p 22).

The report says that although the average American, recognizing the reality of the nuclear threat, wants to stop the arms race, many members of the political establishment (who do not deny the existence of this threat in principle) are trying to provide a "rational" explanation for the need to continue it.

Something else is also indicative. Although the Americans realize that the policy of confrontation with the Soviet Union can be lethal for the United States, they do not have any precise ideas about the appropriate U.S. policy line in relations with the USSR in the nuclear age.

Changes in people's ideas about the implications of nuclear war are connected largely with the reassessment of the relative strength of the two great powers. In 1955, 78 percent of all respondents believed that the United States had more nuclear weapons than the Soviet Union. Today only 10 percent believe in the nuclear superiority of the United States. The majority agree that both sides have approximately equal destructive potential and that the effects of a military confrontation "could be terrible" (p 18).

An acute sense of fear for their own lives also lies at the basis of the profound and sweeping changes in Americans' opinions. In 1949 and 1955 many Americans still believed that the use of nuclear weapons against the USSR would be a justifiable response to the USSR's use of conventional weapons. In 1984, 77 percent expressed the opinion that the United States should not resort to nuclear weapons, and 74 percent suggested that the United States should completely renounce the use of tactical nuclear weapons (p 19).

At the same time, and this is an extremely important conclusion of the authors of this report, less noticeable but potentially quite serious changes have taken place in American attitudes toward socialist countries. The American researchers note that the belief that coexistence with socialist states is possible and necessary in the nuclear age is becoming increasingly popular, and this is another important reversal in U.S. public opinion.

Although many Americans are still trapped within the confines of "cold war" stereotypes and believe in the "Soviet threat," they are increasingly likely to agree that the Russian people "are not our enemies." Now 76 percent of all respondents admit that the United States is to blame for the bad relations with the USSR (p 23).

War has ceased to be an alternative, and the United States and USSR must never resort to war--this is the opinion of 85 percent; problems must be

solved peacefully (96 percent); questions of national security and problems connected with nuclear arms should not be resolved exclusively by the President or by military experts, but must be dealt with by the public, which is completely capable of understanding these matters (77 percent).

The overwhelming majority of Americans, as the report stresses, are seriously interested in stopping the slide toward nuclear confrontation with the USSR, and this, in the opinion of many experts, is creating a new atmosphere and new favorable conditions for the development of relations with the Soviet Union. It is true, the report says, that Americans still do not identify "normal relations" with the USSR as "friendly relations." But they are also obviously skeptical about the idea of "deterrence." The experience of the war in Vietnam, the report says, showed that U.S. strength has its limits. The majority of Americans now adhere to a relatively "non-ideologized, pragmatic" approach to the USSR, and this could be instrumental in the normalization of relations between the two powers, the authors of the report conclude.

American public opinion does not display this kind of agreement, however, on all matters of U.S. foreign and military policy. The most obviously divergent views were expressed on the following matters: the degree of nuclear danger, the presence or absence of ideological hostility toward the USSR, the support of belligerent or conciliatory policy toward our country, and the practical or religious aspects of a conflict between the United States and the USSR.

The authors of the report divide the respondents into four groups. The first are distinguished by a desire to reduce the danger of nuclear war. The group represents 23 percent of the population. The people in this group, just as virtually all respondents, believe that it is impossible to win a nuclear war. In contrast to the majority of Americans, however, they do not believe that the danger of nuclear war is real, and for this reason they feel that it is necessary to take a great risk--that is, to continue building up military strength--and oppose "conciliatory moves toward the USSR." Demographically, the group consists mainly of men (69 percent) and senior citizens with high incomes. Politically, it is a largely conservative group.

The second group, representing 21 percent of the population, adheres to diametrically opposed views. These Americans feel that the nuclear danger is real and close. They believe in reconciliation, and not confrontation, and want the United States to take the initiative in reducing nuclear arms. The people in this group feel the least hostility toward the USSR. Just as in the first group, there are more men than women in this one (56 percent and 44 percent respectively), but these are people whose views are more likely to be liberal than conservative.

The third group (the largest--31 percent) consists of Americans who believe that the countries of the socialist community pose a threat, but they are also worried about the possibility of nuclear war. They believe that the United States has not made enough effort to reach serious American-Soviet agreements on arms control and advocate peaceful coexistence with the USSR. The majority of members are women (60 percent); the group also includes many young people with a secondary education and middle-of-the-road political views.

The fourth group (25 percent of the population) is made up of people who view conflicts between the United States and the USSR from a religious standpoint. They believe that the USSR is threatening American moral and religious values. The majority feel that "their faith in God will guarantee their survival" in the event of a nuclear catastrophe (pp 38-39).

The authors cite interesting facts testifying to the evolution of American views (the report reflects the opinions of average Americans and of public and political leaders). They conclude the report with the statement that two new factors might have a serious effect on American foreign policy. The first is the changing approach of Americans to the effect of nuclear arms on U.S. "national security," and the second is the new way of viewing the Soviet Union, which is no longer merely "black and white." The facts presented in the report testify that many new shades of opinion with far from negative implications are now part of American attitudes toward the Soviet Union. The political options expressed in responses to the questions of the Public Agenda Foundation are distinguished by a realistic approach and are reinforcing the position of the U.S. forces advocating cooperation in international affairs.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya",
1985

8588

CSO: 1803/13

MEMOIRS OF SOVIET DIPLOMAT IN BEIJING, NEW YORK REVIEWED

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 8, Aug 85 (signed to press 18 Jul 85) pp 119-120

[Review by A. V. Zotov of book "Ot Pekina do Nyu-Yorka. Zapiski sovetskogo uchenogo i diplomata" [From Beijing to New York. Memoirs of a Soviet Academic and Diplomat] by L. N. Kutakov, Moscow, Nauka, 1984, 271 pages: "An Eye-Witness Account"]

[Text] This is probably one of the most complex literary genres. The person who takes up his pen to share some of his experiences with his contemporaries sets himself an extremely difficult task. Above all, he must be as accurate as possible. After all, memoirs interest readers because they allow them to learn about events "at first hand." The genre of memoirs is complex in itself, but the author's task is complicated even more if he tries to interpret the events he has witnessed instead of merely confining himself to a description of his personal impressions. This is precisely what L. N. Kutakov has tried to do in this book.

It was the author's destiny to take a direct part in events which we today can certainly call historic. He worked in China as the chief adviser of the director of the Beijing Diplomatic Institute from 1955 to 1957, he then worked in the Soviet embassy in Tokyo, and finally he spent 8 years in New York, where he first worked in the USSR mission to the United Nations and was then the UN under secretary general for political and Security Council affairs.

The author had several direct encounters with American diplomats during the years he worked in the United Nations. Periods of calm are rare in the activity of this organization, reflecting all of the intricacies of contemporary international relations. The Israeli aggression in the Middle East, the war American imperialism started in Vietnam, and the struggle of the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America for the eradication of racism, apartheid and colonialism--all of these events gave rise, and are still giving rise, to heated "diplomatic battles" in the conference rooms of the skyscraper on the East River. But regardless of the item on the agenda, the author remarks, two opposite approaches to its resolution were clearly apparent. The Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community consistently favored the progressive reorganization of international relations. These efforts were countered by the foreign policy line of the United States and its allies, emphasizing the escalation of international tension.

The author also provides detailed descriptions of the heated struggles in the United Nations over the liquidation of the racist regime in Southern Rhodesia and the restoration of Panama's sovereignty over its territory, the so-called "Panama Canal Zone." There is a particularly vivid description of the UN Security Council session in Panama, where the issue of the future of the "zone" was discussed. This session put American imperialism on trial in the fullest sense of the term.

While L. N. Kutakov was working in the United Nations, he continued to keep track of the development of American-Chinese relations. Here he was able to observe how U.S. policy toward China began changing at the end of the 1960's.

There is no question that L. N. Kutakov's memoirs will become an important part of Soviet political literature. In this book, the author talks about many important international problems that are still pertinent in our day.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1985

8588

CSO: 1803/13

- END -