

286205

JPRS 84050

5 August 1983

USSR Report

USA: ECONOMICS, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY

No. 5, May 1983

19990624 080

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

1
73
A04

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

JPRS REPORTS

Japan Report
Korean Affairs Report
Southeast Asia Report
Mongolia Report

Near East/South Asia Report
Sub-Saharan Africa Report
West Europe Report
West Europe Report: Science and Technology
Latin America Report

USSR

Political and Sociological Affairs
Problems of the Far East
Science and Technology Policy
Sociological Studies
Translations from KOMMUNIST
USA: Economics, Politics, Ideology
World Economy and International Relations
Agriculture
Construction and Related Industries
Consumer Goods and Domestic Trade
Economic Affairs
Energy
Human Resources
International Economic Relations
Transportation

Physics and Mathematics
Space
Space Biology and Aerospace Medicine
Military Affairs
Chemistry
Cybernetics, Computers and Automation Technology
Earth Sciences
Electronics and Electrical Engineering
Engineering and Equipment
Machine Tools and Metal-Working Equipment
Life Sciences: Biomedical and Behavioral Sciences
Life Sciences: Effects of Nonionizing Electromagnetic Radiation
Materials Science and Metallurgy
Meteorology and Hydrology

EASTERN EUROPE

Political, Sociological and Military Affairs
Scientific Affairs

Economic and Industrial Affairs

CHINA

Political, Sociological and Military Affairs
Economic Affairs
Science and Technology

RED FLAG
Agriculture
Plant and Installation Data

WORLDWIDE

Telecommunications Policy, Research and Development
Nuclear Development and Proliferation

Environmental Quality
Epidemiology

FBIS DAILY REPORT

China
Soviet Union
South Asia
Asia and Pacific

Eastern Europe
Western Europe
Latin America
Middle East and Africa

To order, see inside front cover

5 August 1983

USSR REPORT

USA: ECONOMICS, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY

No. 5, May 1983

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

Yu. V. Andropov's Replies to the Questions of a PRAVDA Correspondent (pp 3-5) (not translated)	
American Opinions of Reagan Administration Policy (p 6).....	1
Washington's Anti-Cuban Policy Is a Threat to Peace and Security (pp 7-15) (B. I. Gvozdev).....	3
Labor Unions and the Administration: Increasing Tension (pp 16-26) (S. A. Yershov).....	14
American Management in the 1980's (pp 27-39) (L. I. Yevenko) (not translated)	
Conclusion of John Updike's Trilogy (pp 40-46) (A. S. Mulyarchik) (not translated)	
U.S. Government Protection for Ex-Nazis Alleged (pp 47-51) (M. N. Rogov).....	27
Antiwar Movement in Canada (1980's) (pp 52-59) (Ye. V. Israelyan) (not translated)	
U.S. Chemical Industry: Reconstruction Problems (pp 60-69) (T. G. Chuvakhina) (not translated)	
Liberal Influence in Congress Seen Increased After 1982 Elections (pp 70-74) (Ye. M. Silayeva).....	33

CONTENTS (Continued)

Domestic Opposition to Reagan Policy Toward USSR Seen Growing (pp 75-78) (Yu. P. Babich, Ye. B. Meshkova).....	39
On a Clear Day You Can See General Motors (pp 79-88) (J. Patrick Wright) (not translated)	
Role of Small Firms in Scientific-Technical Innovations (pp 89-98) (A. O. Monfor) (not translated)	
Gromyko Book on Export of Capital Reviewed (pp 99-106) (V. M. Kudrov, G. A. Trofimenko).....	44
Book Reviews	
Review of "The Hidden Election. Politics and Economics in the 1980 Presidential Campaign" edited by Thomas Ferguson and Joel Rogers (pp 107-108) (I. O. Bykova) (not translated)	
Review of "Women, Race and Class" by Angela Y. Davis (pp 109-111) (V. A. Voyna) (not translated)	
Review of "U.S. Foreign Policy and the Third World" by Roger D. Hansen and Contributors for the Overseas Development Council (pp 111-114) (A. V. Nikiforov) (not translated)	
Review of "Thai-American Relations in Contemporary Affairs" edited by Hans Indorf and "Economic, Political and Security Issues in Southeast Asia in the 1980's" edited by Robert Scalapino (pp 114-117) (Yu. A. Shvedkov) (not translated)	
Review of "Pages in Diplomatic History" by V. M. Berezhev (pp 117-118) (B. R. Izakov) (not translated)	
Book on U.S. Debate on Military vs. Social Spending Reviewed (pp 118-119) (Yu. V. Katasonov).....	55
U.S. Information, Telecommunications Policy Criticized (pp 120-127) (M. V. Ven'yaminova).....	57

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : USA: ECONOMICS, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY
No 5, May 1983

Russian title : SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : N. D. Turkatenko

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo Nauka

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : May 1983

Signed to press : 15 April 1983

Copies : 30,897

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika,
politika, ideologiya", 1983

AMERICAN OPINIONS OF REAGAN ADMINISTRATION POLICY

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 5, May 83 (signed to press 15 Apr 83) p 6

[Text] In his replies to the questions of a PRAVDA correspondent, Yu. V. Andropov laid special emphasis on the following when the discussion turned to Ronald Reagan's statements of 23 March about U.S. foreign policy: The Americans' views on what the President said are their own business. But what do the Americans have to say? The information printed below, which was transmitted to us by the Washington division of TASS, testifies that the President's speech aroused grave worries and pointed criticism in the United States.

The Democratic Party quickly issued an official rebuttal to President Reagan's belligerent speech. The party's statement, which was published in the United States, stresses that President Reagan is deliberately distorting the balance of U.S.-Soviet forces in order to gain congressional approval of the astronomical military budget, to fuel the fears of Americans, to convince them of the inevitability of nuclear war and to divert public attention away from the failure of the administration's economic policy. Speaker of the House T. O'Neill, Senate Democratic Minority Leader R. Byrd and Senators E. Kennedy and A. Cranston condemned the U.S. President's attempts to intensify war hysteria in the nation, intimidate Americans with the "Soviet threat" and misinform them about the actual state of affairs. When Senator G. Hart was interviewed by ABC television, he said that the plans to create a new missile defense system, which were discussed by Reagan in his speech, would be a destabilizing factor, would diminish U.S. security and would lead to an even more dangerous arms buildup.

This is also the opinion of many prominent members of the academic community. Brookings Institution researcher W. Jackson remarked that the Soviet Union would be completely justified in viewing Reagan's proposed program as evidence of Washington's preparations to deliver the first nuclear strike. Professor F. Panofsky, a well-known American researcher, called the plans for a new ABM system with the latest weapons on earth and in space "extremely dangerous from the strategic standpoint" and said that the President was actually trying to involve U.S. scientists in the most dangerous of adventures.

Other renowned American researchers, G. Rathjens and J. Ruina, wrote an article for the NEW YORK TIMES in which they conclusively proved that the creation of

the new weapon systems discussed by the President can only escalate competition without strengthening U.S. security in the slightest.

An appeal for the rejection of the administration's plans to put an ABM system in space was voiced by a group of 17 authoritative experts, including Nobel prize-winners Professors H. Bethe and I. Rabi, renowned astrophysicist J. Van Allen and former Director of the National Security Agency N. Gayler. They declared in a petition to the White House that the planned testing and deployment of weapons in space would radically increase the danger of nuclear war on earth.

The PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER called Reagan's plans "an act of madness" and an unprecedented "act of instigation on the part of the American administration." Other major American newspapers, such as the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR and the LOS ANGELES TIMES, remarked that the Reagan Administration's belligerent policy line is contrary to the American majority's demands for cuts in military spending and the curtailment of the development of new types of nuclear weapons.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1983

8588

CSO: 1803/10

WASHINGTON'S ANTI-CUBAN POLICY IS A THREAT TO PEACE AND SECURITY

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 5, May 83 (signed to press 15 Apr 83) pp 7-15

[Article by B. I. Gvozdev]

[Text] The Cuban people's historic achievements in the construction of a new society, Cuba's truly internationalist relations with countries and peoples fighting for freedom and independence and its resolute support in conjunction with the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community for the cessation of the arms race, the conclusion of international agreements on major problems in the consolidation of security and peace, the reorganization of international economic relations on a democratic basis and lasting peace and security have led to the considerable augmentation of Cuba's role in world politics and the growth of its prestige in the international arena.

Upset by the Cuban revolution's effect on the Latin American countries and peoples, U.S. imperialism has been conducting a policy of blockades, isolation, blackmail and threats against Cuba for more than two decades now in an attempt to smother the first socialist state in the western hemisphere.

As justification for its anti-Cuban policy, Washington has tried to blame Cuba for the aggravation of Cuban-American relations, accusing it of "aggressive actions" posing a "threat to peace," of "inciting regional conflicts," of "creating tension on the Latin American continent" and even of "endangering stability and peace throughout the world." The facts, however, testify to the opposite: The United States has repeatedly not only threatened the security of the Cuban people but has even chosen the line of direct armed intervention. As University of Pittsburgh Professor K. Blaser, an expert on Latin American affairs, acknowledged, "it would be difficult to find another society in history that has been the target of more flagrant, brutal and deliberate attacks (by the United States--B. G.) in peacetime than Cuba."¹ W. Smith, who headed a department protecting U.S. interests in Havana in 1979-1982 and was previously the head of a State Department office in charge of Cuban affairs and is therefore quite knowledgeable about U.S.-Cuban relations, wrote in an article entitled "Near-sighted Diplomacy": "No American administration has even worked out a constructive approach to Fidel Castro's Cuba. The original American position, which was formulated at the beginning of the 1960's in an atmosphere of profound hostility, has undergone few changes."²

Even when disagreements have arisen within U.S. ruling circles about tactical matters in the choice of means and methods of struggle against revolutionary Cuba, the views of all persons involved in the engineering of Washington's Latin American policy have almost always been unanimous with regard to the need to eradicate the achievements of the Cuban people.

The support of the decayed anti-people Batista regime with weapons and military equipment; the reduction of Cuban sugar import quotas after the triumph of the revolution; the establishment of a total economic blockade of revolutionary Cuba, which was an act of overt economic aggression; the rupture of diplomatic relations; the imposition of an anti-Cuban resolution on the OAS and the illegal exclusion of Cuba from this organization; the armed aggression on Playa Giron; the American military establishment's provocative behavior in connection with the Guantanamo naval base, located in Cuba and illegally held by the United States; the military training of Cuban counterrevolutionaries under CIA and Pentagon auspices; the repeated seizure of Cuban fishing vessels by U.S. naval ships in international waters; the infiltration of Cuba by spies and saboteurs for the assassination of Cuban revolutionary leaders; the slanderous anti-Cuban campaigns that are constantly being launched in the United States--this is far from a complete list of American imperialism's aggressive, unlawful actions against revolutionary Cuba.

All of this constantly corroborates V. I. Lenin's statement that the United States--"an idealized democratic republic"--turned out to "actually represent the most frenzied form of imperialism and the most shameless oppression and suffocation of small and weak nations."³

The hostile anti-Cuban policy conducted by the United States for more than 20 years was given new momentum at the start of the Reagan Administration. The provocative campaign of blackmail and threats against Cuba is not an isolated incident in American administration policy. The present American leadership is striving to escalate tension in various parts of the world and on the global scale. Disregarding the interests of the world public, U.S. ruling circles are irrationally continuing to rely on the policy from a position of strength that, as history demonstrates, has repeatedly caused Washington to suffer the most serious political defeats.

As early as May 1980 the so-called "Committee of Santa Fe" prepared a document for the ultra-conservative "Council for Inter-American Security," outlining Washington's future policy in Latin America. The authors (a group of Ronald Reagan's closest advisers) recommended broad-scale psychological warfare against Cuba. Despite its "small size" and "negligible resources," the document said, Cuba has become the United States' "chief enemy" in this hemisphere and "deserves special punishment" for its anti-imperialist struggle. Several specific "punitive measures" were listed in the document: the expulsion of Cuban diplomats from Washington, the resumption of reconnaissance flights over Cuban territory and the cancellation of the 1977 fishing treaty which supposedly gave "the Cuban fleet exceptional advantages." "The Cuban Government must be made fully aware," the Committee of Santa Fe strategists wrote, "that if it does not give up its present line, other measures of an appropriate nature will be taken against it," including the threat of a "liberation (!) war against Castro."⁴

In other words, the advisers of the Republican Party's presidential candidate believed that direct armed intervention should be launched against the Island of Freedom.

When Ronald Reagan took office, his administration attempted the consistent implementation of the most extremist proposals of the report's authors (he appointed some of them, such as General G. Sumner, to important positions in the State Department). In April 1982, for example, Washington informed Cuban representatives that it would not renew the 1977 fishing agreement ("whose financial impact was negligible," W. Smith commented. "Cuban fishing in American waters was not particularly active, but this agreement was the result of the first American-Cuban negotiations and was, to some degree, a symbol of detente in the relations between the two countries"),⁵ prohibited any kind of financial transactions by American citizens in connection with Cuban tourism and later even prohibited all travel to Cuba by U.S. citizens ("the U.S. Government is not presently allowing tourists, businessmen or college and high school students to enter Cuba. This also applies to participants in the majority of international conventions and conferences,"⁶ jurist J. Zorn wrote in the NEW YORK TIMES).

In reference to the situation that had taken shape in the region as a result of Washington's aggressive policy, the second congress of Cuban Communists (December 1980) stated that "American imperialism refuses to accept the democratic and social changes accomplished by the Latin American and Caribbean people through their struggle for their independence and has responded to the victory of the Sandinist revolution in Nicaragua and to the revolutionary uprising in El Salvador with attempts to re-establish its own dominion in Central America and the Caribbean by brazenly declaring them a zone of U.S. 'special interests.'"⁷

Washington attaches primary significance to attempts to discredit socialist Cuba as a propagandistic cover for its own counterrevolutionary intrigues in Latin America. The tone of the anti-Cuban campaign is set by American administration officials on the highest level, including the President. At the beginning of June 1981, when Vice-President G. Bush addressed the Council of the Americas, whose members include huge American corporations with capital invested in Latin America, he described the region as "the crucially important southern flank of the United States" and unequivocally suggested that Washington intends to carry out expansion south of the Rio Grande through military force and broader shipments of weapons to pro-American military regimes in Latin America and the Caribbean. He chose Cuba as the main target of his attacks and called it "the principal threat to the United States in the region." Another speaker, Assistant U.S. Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs T. Enders, told the millionaires from the Council of the Americas that Cuba hopes to use Nicaragua as an "advance base" in Central America.⁸

The U.S. mass media have been literally inundated with insinuations of this kind against the Republic of Cuba and progressive Central American countries.

In October 1981 Bush traveled to several Latin American countries and made some pointedly anti-Cuban remarks attesting to Washington's intention to continue

exerting pressure on Cuba. On 19 October 1981 the WASHINGTON POST published a provocative article with the groundless statement that "500-600 Cuban soldiers were sent to El Salvador through Nicaragua." This lie marked the beginning of the latest extremely loud and fierce round of attacks on Cuba. Soon afterward, as the American press reported, plans for a "show of strength" near the Cuban coastline and for an armed blockade of the island and direct military intervention began to be made in the Pentagon.

The Cuban Government resolutely exposed the latest provocative insinuation. "This falsification and lie," a letter from Fidel Castro to the WASHINGTON POST said, "represents another attempt to justify possible future actions against our country, for which the U.S. Government is preparing, according to published reports."

The U.S. administration did not reply to this letter. And this is not surprising, as President Reagan himself has repeatedly made slanderous remarks about Cuba and has implied in a threatening tone that Washington is prepared to use armed force against it. In January 1982, for example, in his State of the Union address to the Congress, he accused Cuba, without any proof, of "exporting terrorism and subversive activity to the Caribbean" and repeated all of the old threats.⁹

"The Yankee imperialists," Fidel Castro said from the rostrum of the 26th CPSU Congress, "are also trying to equate the national liberation movement and the struggle of people for social changes in the world with terrorism. For them, the revolutionary who is simply a progressive individual or a fighter for democracy is a terrorist. By spreading such false rumors and lies, they have completely thrown off the figleaf of human rights protection and are once again quite shamelessly assuming the role of world policemen."¹⁰

The slanderous lies about "Havana's intrigues" and its "intervention" in the internal affairs of El Salvador, Nicaragua and other Latin American countries have been refuted by prominent American researchers. For example, in an article in FOREIGN AFFAIRS, R. Feinberg from the Council on Foreign Relations argued, supporting his arguments with facts, that the roots of the social processes occurring in Central America could be found in the uneven economic development and "growing abyss between the rich and the poor" and that these processes were engendered by the antidemocratic rule of the military-oligarchic juntas sponsored by Washington. He directly accused the Reagan Administration of using the discussion of "Cuban intrigues" as a way of diverting public attention from "the real roots of the crisis in Central America" and said that this administration was "taking a great risk."¹¹

Many political and public spokesmen in Central and South America have also refuted Washington's interpretation of events in this region. Speaking in Caracas in November 1981, former President of Venezuela C. Perez stressed that the problems of the Central American countries are the result of their exploitation by transnational corporations and the age-old brutality of oligarchic dictatorships. In his opinion, the conflicts in this part of the continent "are not connected in any way with the activities of international communism."

This is also the opinion of many European NATO countries, which are less and less inclined to support Washington's interventionist policy in Latin America because it, in their opinion, could lead to even greater tension in this region.

The groundless and absurd accusations about Cuba's association with "international terrorism" are a mockery of the truth and the height of political cynicism and hypocrisy, as it is precisely Washington that has taken and is still taking so many terrorist actions against the Island of Freedom. There are more than enough concrete facts attesting to this. In October 1981 a book was published in the United States, entitled "The Fish Is Red. The Story of the Secret War Against Castro."¹² Its authors, SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE reporter W. Hinckle and former FBI agent W. Turner, used documented data and the personal accounts of participants in the "secret war" against Cuba to prove that the CIA was planning a massive operation against the revolutionary government of Cuba even during the first days after the victory of the Cuban revolution. The plan was called "Project Cuba" and envisaged a variety of subversive actions.

The CIA's terrorist actions during the entire postrevolutionary period have been conducted with the knowledge of each successive American administration and even on the direct orders of these administrations. "It is certainly no secret," Fidel Castro said at the Sixth Conference of the Heads of State and Government of Non-Aligned Countries, "and in the United States it is an officially acknowledged and published fact, that the rulers of this country made regular attempts for years to organize the assassination of the leaders of the Cuban revolution with the aid of the most sophisticated instruments of conspiracy and crime."¹³

Under the Reagan Administration the terrorist groups made up of Cuban counter-revolutionaries have become much more active in the United States. In militarized camps and training centers on U.S. territory, equipped with modern weapons and materiel, counterrevolutionaries perfect the methods of day and night combat and the techniques of grenade-throwing, the assault of sentry posts and the forced march. Their instructors include former American servicemen from the "Green Berets"--the special troops responsible for mass reprisals in Vietnam. The terrorists' mentors include CIA agents. With Washington's official support, the Cuban emigrant group "Omega-7" takes terrorist actions against Cubans abroad and against Americans who advocate normal relations with Cuba. The "service record" of the "Omega-7" gangsters includes the assassination of Felix Garcia Rodriguez, an attache of the permanent representative of Cuba to the United Nations, in September 1980; the attempted assassination of Raul Roa Couri, Cuba's permanent representative to the United Nations; several attempted bombings of the Cuban mission's building in New York and more than 40 bombings of the buildings of the Cuban airlines "Cubana de aviacion," Cuban embassies, news agencies and trade missions abroad.

Other terrorist gangs, including the well-known Alpha 66 group, have also been engaging in more energetic criminal anti-Cuban activity. According to reports in the American press, the militarized "Yumuri" camp is operating in a Southern California desert under the protection of government officials for

The training of Somoza's former executioners and the Cuban counterrevolutionaries known as "gusanos"; the flag of the terrorist Alpha 66 organization, which is teaching this counterrevolutionary rabble, flies over the camp; the professional assassins from Alpha 66 are training their wards in the use of various weapons, terrorist activity and sophisticated methods of torture and murder.

In this undeclared war against Cuba, the United States has not balked at the use of the most barbarous and antihumane methods, right up to the point of germ warfare.

The Reagan Administration, the Cuban magazine BOHEMIA reported, cannot refute the evidence submitted by the Cuban Government to prove that the Central Intelligence Agency is waging criminal biological, chemical and even meteorological warfare against the socialist island in the Caribbean. Irrefutable facts testify that the United States is directly to blame for five devastating epidemics in Cuba in recent years, which have destroyed farmland, livestock and even people. For example, 273,000 cases of tropical dengue fever were reported in Cuba before the middle of July 1981. This is a virus infection. At the height of the epidemic, 11,721 people fell ill on a single day. Thousands of Cubans were suddenly stricken by a peculiar form of so-called "Brazilian fever," which also took human lives.¹⁴ What is more, Washington took every opportunity to compound the injuries inflicted by the epidemics and epizootics by imposing an embargo on medicines and insecticides sold by companies controlled by American capital.

The U.S. administration is insistently seeking congressional approval of funds for a special subversive radio station transmitting broadcasts to Cuba, the establishment of which was also recommended by the Committee of Santa Fe. In fiscal years 1982 and 1983 this radio station, which hypocritically calls itself "Radio Free Cuba," is to receive 17.7 million dollars. The appropriate personnel have been hired for the subversive center, most of whom are Cuban counterrevolutionaries who have taken refuge in the United States. President Reagan appointed a man named J. Mas, a rabid anticommunist and inveterate enemy of socialist Cuba, to serve as one of its administrators. It is the duty of these radio terrorists to flood Cuba with new misinformation and slander.

In January 1982 Washington decided to prohibit U.S. imports of Cuban periodicals. This discriminatory ban was part of the Reagan Administration's anti-Cuban policy. People and organizations wishing to receive Cuban newspapers and magazines must gain the special permission of the Federal Bureau of International Operations. In other words, the names of all those who display an interest in life in socialist Cuba will be kept on file.

In April 1982 the U.S. administration closed down an American air freight company making direct flights to Cuba, American Airways Charters, on the basis of a law prohibiting "trade with the enemy." On the pretext, the U.S. Department of the Treasury instituted additional limitations on the use of American currency or credit cards to pay for travel expenses in Cuba on 15 May 1982. The department announced that violations of this regulation would be punishable by a prison term of up to 10 years and a fine of 10,000 dollars.¹⁵

The militaristic provocations of the White House and Pentagon, the constant buildup of U.S. military potential in the Caribbean and the open discussion of plans for a military blockade of Cuba and direct armed intervention against it pose a grave threat to Cuba and to world peace.

As early as November 1981, a decision was made to create a regional U.S. armed services command in the Caribbean, with headquarters in Key West and with extensive authority to organize operations in the region. It can enlist the services of part of the U.S. Navy, Air Force and Marines for combat operations on the islands and in the waters of the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico, as well as the part of the Pacific Ocean adjacent to the Central American coast.

The Pentagon regularly holds provocative large-scale combat maneuvers close to Cuban shores. For example, 17,000 American servicemen, dozens of ships, hundreds of airplanes and military contingents from several Latin American countries took part in naval exercises codenamed "Ocean Venture-81" in fall 1981. There was an even more ostentatious "show of muscle" in the "Ocean Venture-82" maneuvers at the beginning of May 1982. They involved 45,000 servicemen, 350 planes of various types, including strategic B-52 bombers, 60 ships and large subunits from the "rapid deployment force." A landing on the Guantanamo Base was perfected during these maneuvers and was vehemently protested by Cuba and the governments of some other states.

More than 450 modern U.S. Air Force bombers are always located close to Cuban shores, the waters of this region are patrolled by three American naval aircraft carriers, and airborne espionage is being carried out on an unprecedented scale with the aid of the SR-71 plane.¹⁶ Citing official sources, the NEW YORK TIMES reported that "several proposals of direct military actions against Cuba have been submitted to President Reagan and his senior national security advisers."¹⁷

In light of these facts, all the talk in Washington about the "Cuban threat," the "unprecedented rearming of Cuban armed forces," the presence of "new strategic combat planes" in the Cuban Air Force and so forth seems incredibly hypocritical. Sweeping aside all of these insinuations, Fidel Castro announced from the rostrum of the 10th World Congress of Trade Unions in Havana on 11 February 1982 that "imperialism has recently resorted to an awkward, flagrant and cynical pretext for the escalation of tension and the justification of insidious aggression. We," Castro stressed, "hereby issue a definite warning that we will not give in to any kind of threat, blackmail or ultimatum. Our opponents cannot frighten us with saber-rattling, arrogant statements or cynical slanderous campaigns."¹⁸

The aggressive anti-Cuban line is part of Washington's broad-scale "new Caribbean policy," which was announced to the world by President Reagan on 24 February 1982 when he spoke in OAS headquarters in Washington.

"The Caribbean region," the President said, "represents a vitally important strategic and commercial artery of the United States."¹⁹ Reagan's subsequent statements suggested that the Washington administration intends to secure U.S. imperialist interests in this region by means of organized sabotage, military ventures and the offer of all-round assistance to counterrevolutionary

and repressive regimes. To camouflage the plans for subversive operations against Cuba, Nicaragua, El Salvador and other countries, the American President repeated the Washington lies about the so-called "export of violent revolution" for the purpose of establishing "Marxist-Leninist dictatorships of the Cuban type."

He had to admit that many Caribbean countries are experiencing an economic catastrophe, which is known to be a result of the shameless way in which American monopolies have thrown their weight around in these countries in the attempt to preserve and consolidate the dominion of American capital at any cost. Ronald Reagan declared: "If we do not take immediate and decisive action, new Cubas will rise out of the ruins of today's conflicts."²⁰

Therefore, the main purpose of the "new Caribbean policy" is to stop the development of the revolutionary process in the Central American and Caribbean countries, destabilize progressive regimes, immobilize socialist Cuba in the fetters of a blockade and diminish the strength of the Cuban example for the people of Latin America by any means possible.

Washington's attempts to involve other states of the continent in its anti-Cuban actions have failed. Despite the fact that Colombia and Jamaica broke off diplomatic relations with Cuba and Costa Rica severed its consular ties with this country under pressure from the United States, 17 Latin American countries have maintained diplomatic, trade and cultural relations with Havana. The Bolivian Government recently decided to restore diplomatic relations with Cuba. The majority of countries on the continent, including the leaders in the region, object to U.S. interference in the affairs of Cuba, Nicaragua and other states. Brazilian Foreign Minister S. Gueirreiro announced that crises in Central America should be resolved by "peaceful and political means." Mexico has consistently taken a peaceful and constructive stance, based on strict adherence to the principle of nonintervention.

Cuba has been supported by many democratic organizations in Mexico, Venezuela, Peru and other Latin American countries and the more farsighted statesmen and public spokesmen in the region. General Secretary R. Prieto of the Permanent Congress of United Latin American Workers resolutely condemned the aggressive and militaristic U.S. policy. "The laborers belonging to our congress," he stressed, "have declared that if imperialism dares to attack Cuba, the popular masses of the continent will defend the Island of Freedom."²¹ Many such examples of fraternal solidarity with Cuba could be cited.

The Reagan Administration's chauvinistic anti-Cuban line has evoked mounting criticism and dissatisfaction even in the United States. "We must," wrote Ohio State University Professor D. Schultz, for example, "seriously reassess our view of the Cuban 'threat'.... The problem is that the American perception of Cuba is a stereotype and suffers from an evil syndrome. American politicians are inclined to automatically interpret Cuban activity in other countries as something hostile to U.S. interests. But this is a mistake. In most cases, Cuban foreign policy is constructive and praiseworthy."²² "We must not think it is impossible to deal with Castro," W. Smith agreed. "Sooner or later, Washington will have to do this--not because we like him, but because

it is in the American interest."²³ "In order to solve our problems in relations with Cuba, we have no other reasonable alternative than the eventual discussion of these problems with Castro."²⁴ This is also the conclusion of D. Newsom, former under secretary of state and now the director of Georgetown University's Diplomatic Institute.

But the Reagan Administration, as one of the leading engineers of Washington's "new" foreign policy line declared, has decided that "its predecessors did not look deeply enough into the possibilities for exerting pressure" on Cuba,²⁵ and it therefore intends to continue adhering to the line of blackmail and threats.

Washington's intrigues against Cuba and other Latin American countries represent the most flagrant violation of such fundamental principles of international law as nonintervention, sovereignty, territorial integrity, the right of self-determination and peaceful coexistence. The behavior of U.S. imperialist circles is contrary to the UN Charter, the UN declarations on the impermissibility of intervention in the internal affairs of states, the protection of their independence and sovereignty and the consolidation of international security, and the resolutions of several UN General Assembly sessions aimed at the reinforcement of legal standards in international relations. Many of these have been signed by a representative of the United States.

Under the conditions of the increasing aggressiveness of U.S. imperialism, the Communist Party and Cuban Government are particularly concerned about strengthening the country's defensive capability. The Revolutionary Armed Forces (FAR) represent a modern army of the socialist type. Making extensive use of the experience of the Soviet Armed Forces and the armies of other countries of the socialist community, they have turned into a well-trained and technically equipped army, whose personnel are distinguished by boundless loyalty to the Communist Party and the people and are prepared to perform the sacred duty of defending their motherland. The creation of territorial militia formations, made up of male and female volunteers, has been completed in the country, so that not a single inch of Cuban territory will be devoid of armed cover in the event of a landing by aggressors. More than half a million Cubans have volunteered for this service and have undergone the necessary training. They are prepared to join the FAR in repulsing any aggressor.

The Republic of Cuba seeks peace and peaceful coexistence. The Cuban Government has repeatedly announced its interest in the normalization of relations with the United States, but this interest certainly does not mean that Cuba will depart from the fundamental principles of its foreign policy. "Cuba recognizes the worldwide historic need for normal relations between all countries, relations based on mutual respect, the recognition of the sovereign rights of each country and nonintervention in internal affairs. Cuba believes that the normalization of relations with the United States would help to improve the political climate in Latin America and the Caribbean and to develop the process of detente in the world. This is why Cuba has not refused to settle its past differences with the United States, but no one should try to force Cuba to change its position or to go against its principles. Cuba is and will continue to be a friend of the Soviet Union and all socialist states.

Cuba takes and will continue to take an internationalist stand. We will not give up our principles!"²⁶ This is the position of the Communist Party, government and people of Cuba.

The Cuban people's determination to defend their achievements, the militant solidarity of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community with the heroic Cuban people, and the support of these people by all progressive forces in the world constitute an obstacle to U.S. imperialism's aggressive plans against Cuba.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Cuba in the World," Pittsburgh, 1979, p 41.
2. FOREIGN POLICY, Fall 1982, No 48, p 157.
3. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, pp 192-193.
4. "A New Inter-American Policy for the Eighties," Prepared by the Committee of Santa Fe (F. Bouchey, R. Fontaine, D. Jordan, G. Sumner and L. Tambs) for the Council for Inter-American Security, Wash., 1980.
5. FOREIGN POLICY, Fall 1982, No 48, p 167.
6. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 26 February 1983.
7. "II s"yezd Kommunisticheskoy partii Kuby. Gavana, 17-20 dekabrya 1980 g." [Second Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba. Havana, 17-20 December 1980], Moscow, 1982, p 135.
8. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 4 June 1981.
9. VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY, 15 February 1982, p 261.
10. PRAVDA, 25 February 1981.
11. FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Summer 1981, pp 1121-1122, 1124.
12. W. Hinckle and W. Turner, "The Fish Is Red. The Story of the Secret War Against Castro," N.Y., 1981 ("the fish is red" is the code phrase the CIA agent said on radio to signal the beginning of the intervention on Giron Beach in 1961).
13. "VI Conferencia de Jefes de Estado o de Gobierno de los Países No Alineados," La Habana 3-9 de septiembre de 1979. Discursos," Havana, 1980, p 5.
14. BOHEMIA, 5 March 1982, pp 64-65.

15. THE WASHINGTON POST, 20 April 1982.
16. GRANMA, 11 March 1982.
17. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 18 March 1982.
18. Fidel Castro, "Discurso en la Sesion Inaugural de X Congreso Sindical Mundial," Havana, 1982, p 31.
19. VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY, 15 March 1982, pp 323, 325.
20. Ibid., p 325.
21. PRAVDA, 10 January 1982.
22. ORBIS, Fall 1981, p 699.
23. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 7 September 1982.
24. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, 2 April 1982.
25. FOREIGN POLICY, 1982, No 48, p 163.
26. "II s"yezd Kommunisticheskoy partii Kuby," p 159.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1983

8588

CSO: 1803/10

LABOR UNIONS AND THE ADMINISTRATION: INCREASING TENSION

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 5, May 83 (signed to press 15 Apr 83) pp 16-26

[Article by S. A. Yershov]

[Text] The events of the last 2 years--half of Ronald Reagan's term in the White House--can help us sum up some of the results of the activity of his Republican administration in the sphere of relations with labor unions. This was a period of increasing instability in the country's economic development and increased overt confrontation between bourgeois ruling circles and organized labor.

Big capital took advantage of this situation to exert additional pressure on labor, striving to transfer most of the burden of the economic crisis and the administration's unprecedented military preparations to its shoulders. The situation was complicated by the overt persecution of the labor movement, launched for the purpose of undermining the influence the working class had won as a result of a hard struggle, disuniting its ranks and stifling its opposition to the onslaught of the monopolies.

The Beginning of the 'Cold War' Against Labor Unions

A few days after Ronald Reagan's inauguration, the heads of leading American unions paid him a "courtesy call." President L. Kirkland of the AFL-CIO said that they had come as "representatives of the working class to express the worries about the administration's intention to cut budget allocations for social needs." Reagan interrupted him, saying: "You do not represent the workers. I represent them."

The current federal administration's allegations that the American people have given it a "mandate to govern" are known to be untrue. Reagan received only 27 percent of the vote in the November 1980 election.¹ The present master of the White House could not win the support of labor unions: According to some estimates, he was supported by 44 percent of the 12 million organized workers who voted.² According to the general consensus in the American press, the voters had learned through their own experience that the previous President's policy was hopeless and were voting less for Ronald Reagan than for the hope of a better future. Most of them were people who were taken in by the bombastic rhetoric of the Republican candidate's campaign speeches.

But the rosy glow of Ronald Reagan's promises, reinforced by references to the prosperity he had supposedly given the state of California, where he had been governor, quickly disappeared. The events of just the first months of the new President's term in office revealed, in merciless detail, the real essence of his "strategy of national revitalization." One of the main slogans of this strategy was "economy at the expense of the poor." Instead of the promised reduction of the workers' load, an even heavier burden was placed on their shoulders: The scales of unemployment grew dramatically, sharp cuts were made in social allocations and the real wages of much of the laboring public continued to decrease. The real income of most farmers dropped and bankruptcy indicators broke all records. The conditions of life for the laboring masses underwent absolute deterioration.

When Ronald Reagan was elected, the monopolies made a more energetic effort to eradicate the working class' social and economic achievements of recent years. This was seen, and not without good reason, as a real opportunity to increase big capital's profits substantially.

The very first negative reaction of American labor unions to the ruinous implications of the measures the administration planned to take within the framework of "Reaganomics" exacerbated relations between the AFL-CIO leadership and the White House.³ The administration, whose assets now included the reduced influence of labor unions in the U.S. Congress as a result of the Democratic Party's defeat, refused to adhere to the postwar tradition of consultations by Republican administrations with labor leaders--a practice instituted under President Eisenhower. In particular, the unions' ties with the Department of Labor were broken when the size of its staff and its sphere of activity were radically reduced.

Ronald Reagan has not concealed his desire to put an end to even the pretense of liberalism that existed in relations between the administration and the unions and was engendered five decades ago by F. Roosevelt's "New Deal." This is completely consistent with the general intensification of antilabor policy, one sign of which was the appointment of proteges of monopolies to responsible positions in important government agencies involved in relations with labor. For example, D. Dotson, the former legal counsel of the Westinghouse, Western Electric and Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corporation monopolies on matters pertaining to the struggle against labor, became the head of the National Labor Relations Board (an agency which is largely responsible for the regulation of union activities and the arbitration of labor conflicts).

Relations between the Washington administration and the unions are more tense today than they have been since the passage of the Wagner Act in 1935, which strengthened the position of labor unions to some degree. Kirkland turned down a request to serve on the Presidential Commission on Productivity, which is headed by W. Simon, former secretary of the treasury in the Carter Administration and a prominent member of the right wing. Some members of the federation's executive committee, including President W. Winpisinger of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers and President G. Watts of the Communications Workers of America, declined Ronald Reagan's invitation to meet with him, declaring that they had "nothing to discuss with the President."

What is more, the AFL-CIO executive committee adopted an unprecedented decision not to invite the President of the nation and the secretary of labor to the federation's 14th congress (in November 1981).

The reinforcement of AFL-CIO ties with the Democratic opposition is also evidence of the exacerbation of relations with the Republican administration. The LOS ANGELES TIMES even called this policy an attempt by the unions "to become part of the Democratic Party." Democratic leaders were invited to the AFL-CIO congress--Senator E. Kennedy, former Vice-President W. Mondale and Speaker of the House T. O'Neill--where they pointedly criticized Reagan's program for national economic development. The AFL-CIO has its representatives in the highest executive organs of the Democratic Party--the national and executive committees, where their number has risen from 15 to 25 in the last 2 years. The AFL-CIO leaders have promised to campaign for Democrats in the primaries and to support them more actively during the entire campaign, including financial support.⁴

As events transpired, it turned out that the administration derived an advantage from this confrontation. The campaign launched by the AFL-CIO against Reagan's proposed federal budget was unsuccessful. The 97th Congress did not pass any of the bills in which unions had a direct interest in 1982. Despite their persistent demands, the investigation of a raise in the overtime pay of engineering and administrative personnel at enterprises working on federal contracts was postponed. Instead of the 22.6 billion dollars the AFL-CIO leadership felt would be needed to solve employment problems in 1983, only 4.6 billion was allocated for this purpose by Congress. It also cut the funds for unemployment compensation and the subsidization of people who had lost their jobs as a result of foreign competition. The maximum raise in the salaries of federal employees was cut in half and constituted only 4.8 percent in 1982. Finally, the Davis-Bacon Act, which had been signed in 1931 by President Hoover and had aided in keeping wages on government-financed construction projects relatively high, was repealed.⁵

In the hope of alleviating the mounting dissatisfaction connected with the huge scales of unemployment and the mounting tension in relations with labor unions, Ronald Reagan proposed the creation of experimental "zones of enterprise" in several parts of the country, which were supposedly intended to attract industrial companies to small towns and rural areas and create new jobs there with a guaranteed minimum wage for young people with government funds. The unions subjected this plan to harsh criticism, correctly pointing out the impossibility of the simultaneous implementation of this plan and the dramatic reduction of federal allocations to states.⁶

Reagan has made some attempts to play up to the unions and to find supporters among labor leaders. It was for this purpose that he addressed 4,000 delegates at a conference of construction workers in Washington in April 1982 and presented Mayor E. Koch of New York with a check for 85 million dollars in September of the same year for a construction project in that city, which the WASHINGTON POST called a "smart move."⁷

'Reaganomics,' the Technological Revolution and the Unions

The economic policy of the Reagan Administration, which has been complicated by a new crisis, has greatly harmed the development of many industries. For example, steel mills, according to L. McBride, the president of the steelworkers' union, were operating at less than 60 percent of their capacity in 1982, and imported steel accounted for more than 25 percent of the steel sold in the domestic market.⁸ A huge army of unemployed individuals has taken shape in the country, and their number (according to the data of labor unions) is almost equivalent to the number of union members. This is the first time this has happened in an industrially developed capitalist country.

People who lose their jobs lose contact with labor organizations and the membership of unions decreases. Many of the branches of even the largest unions are closing. The automobile workers union alone has lost more than 300,000 members since 1979 due to mass lay-offs at automobile plants located in the United States. The teamsters union has lost 100,000 members for the same reason. The level of employment and, consequently, the level of labor organization are dropping in the coal and rubber industries and on the railroads--that is, the very fields where the unions have always been strongest. American labor unions had a total of 22.4 million members at the end of 1982, or less than 21 percent of the economically active population. This is the lowest indicator of the postwar period.

High rates of inflation cause blue- and white-collar workers to doubt the ability of unions to improve hiring conditions.

Unions are encountering more difficulties in the strike struggle, the scales of which (counting demonstrations motivated primarily by economic reasons) have decreased slightly in the last 2 years. This was particularly apparent in 1982, when a record number of collective contracts, affecting more than 3.7 million people, were renegotiated.⁹ The number of strikes usually rises appreciably during years of labor contract renewal in the United States and in other capitalist countries. The administration made a massive effort to find ways of reinforcing the antistrike mechanism, primarily through the further augmentation of the President's emergency powers. In addition, bourgeois propaganda intensified the ideological brainwashing of the masses in the spirit of the notorious "community of labor and capital." Employers have artificially intensified the competition for jobs and a guaranteed wage.

In this atmosphere, the labor unions of even a number of key branches had to make serious concessions to monopolies during the renegotiation of contracts. In 1981 the Chrysler Corporation was able, by means of blackmail and threats, to force workers to accept a 13-percent decrease in wages, the cancellation of the "sliding scale" to counteract the effects of inflation and the reduction of rest periods for assembly line workers. In 1982 alone, 85 contracts with poorer conditions for workers than before were signed in the United States. For the first time in many years a rise in the nominal wage was not envisaged in the labor contracts of automobile workers with the leading monopolies of this industry, General Motors and Ford. In all, the latter will receive around 5 billion dollars in additional profits as a result of this generous

"gift." The workers and employees the Consolidated Rail Corporation, slaughterhouse workers in Baltimore and the employees of Pan American World Airways and other companies gave up the struggle for a higher wage under the same circumstances.

In March 1983 a collective agreement between the steelworkers union and the leading metallurgical monopolies was signed with huge concessions in the area of wages. It is indicative that General Motors, the main consumer of steel products, joined the struggle against the workers in the steel industry. The chairman of the board of General Motors, R. Smith, warned metallurgical workers that their failure to accept lower wages would lead to larger purchases of cheaper steel from Japanese monopolies, and this would result in mass lay-offs.

The difficulties encountered by American unions are also due to factors that are not directly connected with the activities of the Washington administration. Some are due to the inability of the reformist union leadership to work out a strategy corresponding to the economic and social changes engendered by the technological revolution.

The negative effects of the gradual transfer of U.S. industry to the new technological production method of comprehensive automation, which were first seen during the crisis of the early 1980's, demonstrated the extremely limited nature of the measures traditionally used by unions to protect workers against the consequences of the capitalist use of new technology. This is attested to by the dramatically larger scales of chronic unemployment and the constant rise in labor intensity.

The unions have been unable to attract most of the skilled workers engaged in the maintenance of modern computers, whose number is rising with each year in all branches of the economy, including the service sphere. Union membership in the United States is now being augmented primarily with white-collar workers, whose total number in the American economy rose from 26.8 million to 52.8 million, or 97 percent, between 1958 and 1982.¹⁰

The higher percentage of white-collar workers in the labor unions and the increase in their overall influence on the thinking of rank-and-file members have had contradictory effects. People engaged primarily in mental labor, whose labor is worth more than that of production workers, generally receive higher wages. For a long time this reduced their class activity and kept them from acquiring experience in the protection of their own economic interests. At the same time, the augmentation of the labor movement with an educated contingent of hired workers, whose interests are gradually merging with the interests of the factory and plant workers, has introduced more conscious protests against exploitation into the ranks of the latter. The inability of the unions to make proper use of this reserve considerably diminishes the impact of their daily class struggle.

The unions also failed in their attempts to organize the workers at some old and new enterprises in the rapidly developing, technologically advanced industries. Chemical, instrument-making, aerospace and radioelectronic

monopolies, du Pont de Nemours, IBM, Grumman, Polaroid, Eastman Kodak and others have been able to block the development of union activity at their enterprises. The influence of the unions is also undermined by stronger international monopoly competition: Big capital is striving to force the unions to moderate their wage demands on the false pretext of "saving American business." The unions have essentially retreated in many cases when they have encountered the "concessions or lay-offs" ultimatum.

The Purpose of Anti-Union Repression

Although most of the U.S. unions have moved to the defensive, the administration has shown no sign of laying down its weapons. On the contrary, the scales and intensity of its struggle against organized labor are growing. The main thrust of this struggle is aimed at unions in the public sector.

The first serious test of strength was the federal government's battle against a relatively small segment of the workers in civil aviation--the air traffic controllers union (officially called the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization--PATCO)--in which President Reagan was personally and directly involved. In August 1981 PATCO, representing the interests of 17,500 employees of the Federal Aviation Administration, announced a nationwide strike after lengthy and unproductive talks with the administration on the renegotiation of their collective contract, in spite of the ban on strikes by government employees. Within a few hours Reagan had signed an ultimatum: Strikers who did not return to their jobs without delay would lose them.

By an irony of fate, the main thrust of the government repressive system was aimed against a union that had supported the Republican candidate in the presidential election in November 1980. At that time Ronald Reagan thanked the air traffic controllers for putting their trust in him and assured them that his administration would work with them "closely, in the spirit of cooperation and harmony."

The validity of the demands made by PATCO in the negotiations was not questioned even by the bourgeois press. These demands concerned a slight rise in wages and, what is most important, a lower level of labor intensity, which had reached the maximum. In 1974, 8,347 controllers in transit flight control centers performed 22.9 million operations, but in 1980 the number of operations was 30.1 million, or 41 percent more, and the number of controllers had decreased by 7 percent. The workload of controllers in the main airports increased even more dramatically. All of this, combined with the obsolete computer equipment in use, not only posed a serious threat to the health of the controllers,¹¹ but also endangered the lives of passengers on domestic flights.

When PATCO refused to give in to the President's categorical order to stop the strike, 11,500 people were fired. They were issued "lone wolf tickets"--documents depriving them of their right to seek jobs in U.S. government establishments and informing them of the loss of all their retirement and medical benefits. The mass lay-offs were accompanied by court proceedings against 72 leaders of the strike and even the arrest of some. The union strike fund was impounded and large fines were imposed for the "damages" incurred by the airlines. These repressive actions also affected many workers in related

occupations, particularly the ground and flight personnel of airlines. Some airlines took advantage of the situation to lay off more than 25,000 people.

After 2 months of continuous persecution, the union stopped the strike. The National Labor Relations Board then decided to officially dissolve PATCO-- an unprecedented incident in the history of the American labor movement. An appellate court in Washington upheld this decision, countermanding the stop-order of a lower court.

The reactionary press applauded the reprisals against the rebellious union. For example, U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT remarked: "The administration...must not allow its authority to be undermined; strikes against the government are intolerable."¹²

None of the controllers who had been blacklisted by the administration could find jobs in this field, and many are still trying to make ends meet by doing odd jobs. As for the conditions of the work, which PATCO members were trying to improve, they have "become even worse," according to THE DISPATCHER, the union newspaper. "In some cases," this paper reported, "controllers (the ones who took the place of those who were dismissed--S. Ye.) work 48 hours a week and serve even more flights than before the strike."¹³

The collapse of PATCO signaled the beginning of a frontal attack by the authorities and the monopolies on the union liberties of American labor. In summer 1982 a strike by workers of meat combines in Dakota City was broken with the aid of the National Guard and strikebreakers. A few months later, in September, a nationwide strike by 26,000 railway mechanics was declared illegal by the U.S. Congress under pressure from Ronald Reagan. A priority bill submitted by the administration to the Congress literally repeated the 1981 ultimatum issued to the air traffic controllers. This document was discussed in congressional committees and approved by the Congress in record time, with the entire process completed in less than 48 hours. The new law not only envisaged the immediate return of the railwaymen to work, but also prohibited their participation in any strike in the next 2 years. The union leadership had to announce the end of the strike 5 days after it began.

In January 1983 the administration launched a new series of anti-union actions. This time the target was the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE). It all began when the leadership of the Environmental Protection Agency refused to conclude a new collective agreement with 12 local branches of this union, uniting 5,000 people. The attack was then directed against the workers of a large federal agency, the National Archives. The pretext was the union's intention to renegotiate the labor agreement in the interest of the workers. A protest rally organized by the employees of the National Archives at the entrance to the building led to the institution of court proceedings against D. Donne, the leader of the union local. A few days later he was arrested in Washington in a building where he was attending a shop stewards convention and was led away to the police station in handcuffs (in an exact repetition of the scenario of the struggle against the air traffic controllers!).

"The arrest of the president of local 2578 of the AFGE during a shop stewards convention," declared Vice President C. Blaylock of the AFL-CIO, "means that freedom of assembly, if it is the assembly of union members, is in grave danger under the Reagan Administration. The handcuffs were a Gestapo-like tactic to create the impression that the AFGE local president was a dangerous criminal. The administration's behavior is intended to intimidate union workers and the members of unions in general and to undermine public faith in labor unions. This is a horrifying and shameful stain on the policy of the Washington administration."

The Struggle Continues

The 73-day nationwide mine workers' strike, which was called in March 1981, marked the beginning of the mass resistance of administration economic policy by American labor. The main reason for this demonstration was the administration's refusal to comply with the labor safety laws for which the miners had fought for many years. Besides this, the strikers demanded the right to organize the workers of new mines and to negotiate a single industrywide collective contract.

The miners' strike was accompanied by huge demonstrations, rallies, a march on Washington by 10,000 people and the picketing of mines by around 150,000 people. As a result of this tremendous pressure and the threat of another general strike in February 1982, the mine owners' association had to give in to many of the demands of the United Mine Workers, and the government had to countermand its decision to reduce compensation for miners suffering from silicosis.

Inspired by the miners' victory, other segments of the working class broadened their own protest demonstrations against the deterioration of working conditions and the drop in the standard of living. They included railroad workers, who organized a march on Washington by 40,000 people, textile workers and West Coast seamen.

These demonstrations prepared the soil for the main social event of recent years in the nation--Solidarity Day on 19 September 1981. This protest against the policy of ruling circles was unprecedented in scale in the entire postwar period and was probably the most massive protest since the time of the "hunger strikes" and marches of the unemployed in the early 1930's. Hundreds of thousands of people, representing virtually all U.S. labor unions, including the AFL-CIO, and more than 200 other labor organizations, took part in the demonstrations and meetings held in Washington on that day.¹⁴ The slogans of Solidarity Day took in the broadest spectrum of demands--from messages to Ronald Reagan to "Go back to Hollywood" to appeals for the cancellation of the order to dissolve PATCO, for the cessation of the arms race and for the recall of American military advisers from El Salvador. This day proved that laborers could unite in the struggle against the further deterioration of living conditions.

The mass marches, which have been organized during periods of serious problems in the United States, have now become commonplace. They are mobilized by

forces that might not represent the interests of only the working class but always oppose government domestic and foreign policy. And this is not surprising. "Reaganomics" has led to an absolute decline in the standard of living of millions of hired laborers and the large social stratum of small urban businessmen--craftsmen and merchants--as well as farmers. Its devastating impact has affected many medium-sized and even large companies connected with the manufacture and sale of products for civilian use. This created favorable conditions for the growth of the anti-Reagan coalition, which is broader than the antimonopoly movement.

An antiwar demonstration and rallies with over a million participants were held in New York on 12 June 1982 on the wave of the anti-Reagan feelings in the nation. It was the largest political demonstration in U.S. history. Its participants included union members and representatives of many states and even other capitalist countries.

In less than 5 months, on 24 October, the teamsters and warehousemen of the West Coast, supported by several related unions, held a protest demonstration in San Francisco against the federal government's economic policy. There were 70,000 demonstrators. The executive secretary of the California State Federation of Labor, J. Henning, made a speech at the rally and declared: "Since Reagan entered the White House, he has put 3.5 million people on the streets. We have had enough. We demand that he and his henchmen get out of the government."¹⁵

The formation of a new air traffic controllers union, the U.S. Air Traffic Controllers Organization (USATCO), in place of the dissolved PATCO in January 1983 was a direct challenge to the Reagan Administration. Its president, G. Eads, who had also headed PATCO, said that the new organization would represent the interests of the air traffic controllers dismissed in 1981 and would continue their struggle for better working conditions for controllers. The AFL-CIO leadership supported the creation of USATCO and ordered all unions to give it material and moral support.

All of this fits into the framework of the unions' struggle in defense of the interests of workers, is increasing the scales of the struggle and is making it more purposeful. Never before has the American labor movement engendered as many protest organizations or held as many campaigns against federal administration policy as in the last 2 years.

The movement of the rank-and-file union membership and union locals acquired new momentum. In February 1981, a conference was held in Detroit at the suggestion of the Coalition of Union Members for Jobs to work out a strategy of struggle against unemployment. A year later, representatives of 75 unions, including such large ones as the automobile workers' and steelworkers' unions and the teamsters and warehousemen of the West Coast, held a constituent conference in Washington to launch a nationwide campaign of action for a just federal budget. This move was taken to heighten the effectiveness of the efforts of the budget coalition of public organizations, founded under union auspices in 1981.

It is extremely significant that American unions, after many years of self-isolation, are gradually entering the arena of the international labor movement. Representatives of some sectorial unions attended the 10th World Congress of Trade Unions (Havana, February 1982), the World Labor Conference on the Socio-Economic Aspects of Disarmament (Paris, December 1981), a series of meetings and discussions by representatives of Soviet and U.S. unions in Denmark (December, 1982) and the Fifth International Consultative Conference of Printing Industry Workers (Budapest, May 1981).

The successes of some unions during the renegotiation of collective contracts were a serious moral factor in the general struggle against administration policy. One of the most significant was the labor agreement of electrical workers with the largest monopoly in this industry, General Electric, signed in July 1982. It contained statements which became a point of departure for other segments of the laboring public, including the need to inform the union of the closure of an enterprise or the transfer of production to another location 6 months in advance and of the introduction of robots or automated equipment 2 months in advance; the payment of compensation to dismissed workers, with the amount to be dependent on seniority, the assistance of these workers in finding other jobs and the financing of their retraining; the payment of workers who are transferred to lower-paying jobs as a result of technical innovations their previous salary for half a year.¹⁶

The mounting difficulties in battles with employers have made noticeable changes in the strategy of the U.S. labor movement. The main area of struggle has objectively become opposition to the entire state-monopoly program of socioeconomic development and the drafting of alternative measures in the workers' interest.

Another clear sign of this is the fact that American unions are joining--although comparatively late in the game--the movement against the arms race. When the program for Solidarity Day was discussed at a meeting of the AFL-CIO executive committee, the direct connection between the administration's aggressive foreign policy and rising military costs on the one hand, and the cuts in social allocations on the other, was first acknowledged by the federation.¹⁷

The unions' participation in the movement against the militarization of the economy has given them more constructive aims. More pacifist demands and the slogans of various mass movements are being added to the more specific objectives of labor unions. The labor unions were the first to suggest the partial conversion of the military industry for the manufacture of civilian goods and to draw up the appropriate program. It was through the unions' efforts that the monopolies in the military-industrial complex became one of the main targets of the entire antiwar movement.

The unions are introducing their own methods of action, perfected during years of struggle against capital--strikes, boycotts and picketing--and these have considerably heightened the impact of the movement. By associating the possibility of solving the socioeconomic problems of workers with the reduction of military spending, the unions essentially opened a new and important front of struggle against the arms race.

The present tendency of the union movement to gradually move beyond the narrow framework of primarily economic demands, addressed to individual enterprises, to the level of a fight against the policy of the dominant class is objectively strengthening the political nature of the entire labor movement.

The new strategy also calls for new tactics. For the first time in many years the AFL-CIO leadership has assigned priority to the recruitment of as many new union members as possible, including the incorporation of so-called independent unions, especially the teamsters and mine workers.

The structure of union demands is also undergoing changes and is increasingly likely to combine the workers' short- and long-term interests. Within the context of the struggle against unemployment, the unions want a shorter work week with no reduction in pay and the organization of mass public works, including the construction of public schools and affordable housing. To uphold the material standard of living of workers, the unions want larger government contributions to the social security system, the reorganization of federal health programs and their financing by means of a national tax rather than local taxes. The AFL-CIO has suggested the exemption of people with low incomes from the payment of income tax with the simultaneous elimination of all the loopholes that allow monopolies to escape the payment of taxes. Union demands are increasingly likely to suggest nationalization (particularly in the case of the largest enterprises in the automobile and electrical industries) and participation by the workers in the management of production on the level of the individual job.

Despite the fact that part of the working class is striving for antimonopoly reforms, certain strata of this class are still influenced by bourgeois ideology, and labor unions are inclined to take a reformist, conciliatory stance. "Reagan is not playing by the rules"--this is the underlying theme of the intense confrontations between the AFL-CIO leadership and the administration. The AFL-CIO leaders are even afraid that "the masses might go too far." This keeps various segments of the working class from uniting their efforts and working out effective tactics of struggle against "Reaganomics."

Although the AFL-CIO leadership has done everything within its power to encourage anti-Reagan demonstrations, it has not given up its traditional line of "class peace." One sign of this policy is the participation by representatives of the federation's highest administrative link and a number of independent labor unions in the work of all types of committees that essentially defend the interests of big capital. For example, L. Kirkland, along with members of the boards of Exxon, General Motors, Citicorp, the Union Pacific Railroad and other corporations, is a member of a group, organized on his initiative, of representatives of labor and management who are working out a coordinated approach to key problems in U.S. sociopolitical development. He recently became the co-chairman of the Committee on Economic Recovery and a member of the Committee for a Free World, which agitates for more intense ideological struggle against socialism and the national liberation movement. In essence, Kirkland does not disagree at all with Ronald Reagan on trade and economic relations with the Soviet Union and, incidentally, on various aspects of Washington's expansionist foreign policy.

Recent events testify, however, that the American workers, despite all of the zigzags in the activity of the union leadership, have learned through their own experience of the defects of Reagan Administration policy and are resolutely joining the ranks of its active opponents. It is only in light of this tendency, which is the prevailing one in the nation's social life today, that the real picture and immediate prospects of the class struggle in the United States can be seen.

FOOTNOTES

1. Of the 160.3 million Americans eligible to vote, 47 percent did not even go to the polls, 22 percent supported the Democratic Party leader J. Carter, and 4 percent supported independent candidate J. Anderson (ECONOMIC NOTES, November-December 1980, p 3).
2. BUSINESS WEEK, 28 June 1982, p 63.
3. The headquarters of the AFL-CIO is located a few hundred meters from the White House. Since the time when F. Roosevelt was elected President in 1932, AFL-CIO leaders have had special access to the White House, regardless of the President's party affiliation. Relations between the union bosses and the executive branch were developed intensively in the early 1960's, when J. Kennedy was President. At that time an advisory committee was set up as part of the President's office to take charge of relations with labor unions and employers, the Conciliation Committee (envisaged in the Taft-Hartley Act but virtually defunct since 1949) resumed its work, etc. Although these and other institutions tried to work out a single coordinated policy for the administration, employers and unions, which was consequently contrary to the vital interests of the workers, their existence sustained the illusion in the labor movement that the unions were involved in making government policy on the relations between labor and capital.
4. The U.S. labor unions contribute huge sums to the Democratic Party fund; in 1982, for example, these contributions represented almost one-fifth of the total fund (ECONOMIST, 16 January 1982, p 40).
5. U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 17 August 1982, p 67; INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 28 February 1983, p 3.
6. AFL-CIO NEWS, 30 January 1982, pp 1, 8.
7. WASHINGTON POST, 17 September 1982.
8. AFL-CIO NEWS, 1 May 1982, p 5.
9. BUSINESS WEEK, 21 December 1981, p 46.
10. The increase in the number of blue-collar workers, or production workers, was much lower, amounting to only 30 percent (from 23.4 million to

30.4 million), while the number of workers in the service sphere rose 80 percent (from 7.5 million to 13.5 million). U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 26 April 1982, p 53.

11. According to the union newspaper, as a result of excessive workloads, air traffic controllers suffer from hypertension and other occupational diseases; almost 90 percent of them have to leave their jobs long before retirement age (U.E. NEWS, 28 October 1981, p 2).
12. U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 17 August 1981, p 17.
13. THE DISPATCHER, 5 November 1982, p 5.
14. SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA, 1981, No 11, p 59.
15. THE DISPATCHER, 5 November 1982, p 6.
16. Ibid., 6 August 1982, p 10.
17. AFL-CIO NEWS, September 1981, pp 3-4.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1983

8588

CSO: 1803/10

U.S. GOVERNMENT PROTECTION FOR EX-NAZIS ALLEGED

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 5, May 83 (signed to press 15 Apr 83) pp 47-51

[Article by M. N. Rogov, member of the USSR Procuracy Collegium: "War Criminals at the Service of the 'Crusaders'"]

[Text] The facts that came out after the Bolivian authorities turned Klaus Barbie, a man who was called the "Butcher of Lyon," is guilty of the murder of 4,000 French patriots and was living on a CIA salary for a long time, over to the French courts provided new proof that individuals of this type are still not only finding a refuge in the United States and several other capitalist countries but are also being actively used in the "crusade" against communism and against all progressive forces and movements.

American reactionary circles included the Nazi war criminals in the arsenal of their aggressive policy long ago, made them their allies and enlisted their services for energetic anti-Soviet activity. Hitler's depraved proteges and their stooges are the ones who are now babbling about "human rights" through the microphones of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, stations controlled and financed by the CIA. They are the ones who are being actively used by American and other special services in their dirty subversive activities as "sources of information" and even as paid employees of the CIA.

There is nothing new about today's sponsors and protectors of Hitler's depraved proteges; they inherited the shameful banner of cooperation with the Hitlerists from the "crusaders" of the late 1940's and early 1950's. At that time the Nazi rabble rallied round the notorious American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism (now Radio Liberty) and the National Committee for a Free Europe (now Radio Free Europe), which were funded by the CIA. Even then the chairman of the Crusade for Freedom was the well-known Lucius Clay, a retired general. Incidentally, one of the active members of this committee was the man who is now President of the United States, Ronald Reagan. Then and now, Washington was not and is not reluctant to spend dollars on the "subversion of communism from within." A network of various types of "research centers," which gave yesterday's Nazis and their stooges shelter and work, was created and has since been dramatically enlarged. One of these centers was the operational research department in the Pentagon, where Nazi methods of choosing and utilizing traitors and collaborators were studied. The staff of this department included hundreds of people who had previously worked in Hitler's intelligence service.

In 1978 the General Accounting Office of the U.S. Congress published a report with the admission that the CIA had been using Nazi war criminals for its own purposes throughout the postwar period. As we now know, Barbie was one of the people on the payroll of the American intelligence community. This is how he was able to escape just punishment. But this one of Hitler's proteges is more the rule than the exception in the practices of Washington administrations, including the present one. We could list hundreds of Hitlerist murderers who found refuge in the United States as well as in Canada, Chile and other capitalist countries. Thousands of them are at liberty in the FRG. All of them not only escaped the severe punishment they deserved and are not only at liberty but have acquired powerful sponsors and can feel completely secure. This is understandable. In all of these countries, especially the United States, they did more than just hide from the courts. The war criminals were actively used and are still being used by reactionary forces in the struggle against forces for peace, progress and socialism. As for the present American administration, it has increased the funds for this struggle several times over and has declared "psychological war" on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The Nazi war criminals are active participants and weapons in this struggle. In this sense, the extradition of the criminal Barbie by the Bolivian Government is just an isolated incident and does not change the essence of the problem, which consists in the fact that former Hitlerists in the United States and in several other capitalist countries are brought to trial reluctantly and only at the dictates of transitory political considerations. Furthermore, the courts have ignored the main aspect of these cases--the international nature of the evil crimes these men have committed and their fascist essence. Fascist atrocities are equated with ordinary crimes on which the statute of limitations has run out. As a rule, the trials are deliberately prolonged and many of the executioners are acquitted. Every effort is made to absolve these criminals of guilt and vindicate them.

It has been 38 years since the end of World War II but, despite the persistent efforts of the Soviet Union and many other countries to apprehend and punish the Hitlerist murderers, several Western states, primarily the United States of America, are trying by hook or by crook to prevent their prosecution in the courts. Thousands of Nazis whose hands are stained with the blood of anti-fascists and civilians still lead a serene life under the wing of their protectors, despite the repeated requests of the governments of the USSR and other countries that these criminals be turned over to the courts in the countries where they committed their crimes.

We should recall that the countries of the anti-Hitlerist coalition took a pledge during the war to try the criminals and punish them without delay. This pledge was recorded in several important documents of international law. In the Moscow Declaration of 30 October 1943 on the responsibility of the Hitlerists for the atrocities that had been committed, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States pledged to go "even to the ends of the earth" to find those who had stained their hands with innocent blood and to turn them over to prosecutors "so that justice can be done." On 24 March 1944 President F. D. Roosevelt declared: "This is a good time to reaffirm our determination that not one of the people who participated in these atrocious acts will escape punishment."

The obligation of all states to prosecute crimes against humanity is also recorded in the Potsdam agreements and in the international agreement of 8 August 1945 which was signed by 23 states and defined war crimes and crimes against humanity. The United Nations reaffirmed this principle in several of its documents. In particular, the UN General Assembly resolution of 13 February 1946 on the extradition and punishment of war criminals recommended that "all necessary steps be taken without delay so that the war criminals responsible for the abovementioned crimes and those who participated directly in these actions be arrested and extradited to the countries where they committed their horrifying deeds, for prosecution and punishment according to the laws of these countries."

The Soviet State has always adhered firmly and unswervingly to international commitments in all areas, including the punishment of Nazi war criminals and their accomplices. Competent Soviet agencies have rendered a great deal of legal assistance to foreign judicial bodies in the accumulation of evidence against Nazi war criminals in other countries. In the last 5 years the Soviet Union has sent more than 3,000 depositions by witnesses and victims and many German war documents to other countries, including the United States, the FRG, Austria and Holland. The USSR has allowed 397 foreign jurists to come to the Soviet Union to hear the testimony of around 600 witnesses, and 189 Soviet citizens have traveled overseas to testify in court.

Foreign judicial bodies have commented more than once on the objective and conclusive nature of the evidence submitted by the Soviet Union. For example, the 30 July 1981 decision of a New York federal district court on the case of the fascist brute Linnas said that "the defense could not cite a single case from the practice of any Western court in which the Soviet Union had submitted distorted, forged or false evidence to a court or government agency."

At the same time, in violation of international law and of their own commitments, several Western countries, especially the United States, have hypocritically argued that the problem of war criminals no longer exists and that legal standards in these countries supposedly preclude the extradition of war criminals to other countries.

Any argument that might be cited in these cases has no legal or moral validity. Regardless of the formal arguments used to cover up this position, it essentially consists in the actual concealment of war criminals, the refusal to honor international commitments and an expression of contempt for the memory of the millions of victims of Nazism. This is precisely why only 7 of the more than 140 people for whom irrefutable proof of the grave crimes they committed in our country has been turned over to U.S. judicial bodies in the last 6 years have lost their American citizenship, and not one of them has been extradited to the Soviet Union.

This is certainly not a coincidence. Even at the height of the struggle against Hitler's Germany, at a conference convened by the War Department and State Department on 27 July 1943, Colonel Winlock, a Pentagon spokesman, said, with no regard for international commitments or the statements and declarations of the President of his country: "We have been assigned the task of training

German personnel who might be used to strengthen America's prestige.... The National Socialists can and will be more useful and more accessible than various types of antifascists and democrats in general.... We need many personnel who are close to us in spirit and conviction."

American reactionary circles included Nazi war criminals in the arsenal of their aggressive policy long ago by making them their allies. The number of Nazi refugees living in the United States is probably surpassed only by their number in the FRG and in Argentina. Many of them live in Canada. All of them are "fighting for the liberation of the enslaved people of the Soviet Union." They have been given shelter and they are repaying their benefactors.

For example, an active participant in this "struggle" is a man named Maikovskis who lives in New York. This SS man, a former captain in the "Latvian Auxiliary Security Police" created by the Hitlerites, was awarded Fascist orders by the Hitlerites for razing the Latvian rural community of Audrini to the ground and shooting all of its inhabitants. He personally killed hundreds of Jews. His accomplice in this and other evil crimes, a man named Eikhelis, also escaped the punishment he deserves.

In 1947 the First U.S. Military Tribunal convicted a group of bigoted SS physicians of crimes against humanity, including a life sentence for a man called Rose and a lengthy term of imprisonment for Doctor Oberheuser from the Ravensbruck concentration camp. Within a few years, however, they were set free and were living comfortably in the FRG. Oberheuser was working as a...pediatrician, and Rose moved to Oberkirchen where he was president of a firm and was a member of the British Royal Society of Tropical Medicine.

Butchers from the Sachsenhausen concentration camp were also sentenced to long prison terms: Gustav Sorge, or "Iron Gustav," who personally killed, tortured and shot thousands of prisoners; Wilhelm Schuber, who was distinguished by inordinate brutality and personally shot 30 Germans, 33 Poles and 636 Soviet citizens and participated in the shooting of 13,000 prisoners-of-war; Heinz Baumketter, a "physician" who was implicated in the torture of thousands of people. Along with other war criminals who were not eligible for amnesty, they were turned over to the FRG Government by the Soviet authorities to serve their sentences. In West Germany, however, they were immediately set free and each was given a stipend of 6,000 marks. Baumketter was given a job in a hospital. The vehement protests of the German public compelled the authorities to order the arrest of Sorge and Schuber.

Heinz Lammerding, an SS lieutenant-general who was sentenced to death in absentia in Bordeaux for crimes against humanity and war crimes and was responsible for the deaths of the 700 inhabitants of Oradour, including more than 500 women and children, was able to settle down peacefully in Dusseldorf and is managing the affairs of a construction firm. Josef Mengele, the Auschwitz "doctor" who is guilty of the murder of 400,000 prisoners and of performing cruel experiments on live people, escaped punishment and is living in Paraguay. Walter Rauff, the former head of the Department II-D of the Main Imperial Security Office, in charge of "technical and transport affairs," invented the "gasvans," the murderous vehicles in which the Nazi criminals

killed 97,000 women, children and old people just between December 1941 and June 1942. On 19 October 1945 Rauff was interrogated by American investigators but he was not tried because he was helped to escape "somewhere" in December 1946, and Bishop Hudal then arranged for his transfer to South America. Rauff settled first in Ecuador and then in Chile. Pinochet gave him shelter and made him his adviser on political affairs.

In March 1977, J. Eilberg, then the congressman from the state of Pennsylvania, asked the Pentagon for information about 48 suspected Nazi criminals, including former Burgermeister Yasyuka of the Belorussian city of Kletsk, who was implicated in the murder of civilians. The Pentagon replied that his name was absent from the army files. But Yasyuka's file was actually kept in the Pentagon and stamped "Classified information, not subject to congressional investigation."

These are not the only facts attesting to the criminal protection of the German Fascist criminals by U.S. ruling circles and their cooperation with the Fascists. New evidence is constantly being unearthed to shed light on the scales and nature of this cooperation. Here are just a few of the latest discoveries. This year Charles Higham's book "Trading With the Enemy. An Expose of the Nazi-American Money Plot 1933-1949" was published in New York.* The author, a former NEW YORK TIMES correspondent, was able to gather and collate facts which prove irrefutably that the Nazi military-economic machine was created and was supported throughout World War II with the direct aid and participation of American big business. This is the first time many of these facts have been made public.

Here is just one of the examples cited in the book. Although IT&T was not among the leading companies investing capital in the economy of Nazi Germany, it was nevertheless, in Higham's opinion, "actively conspiring with the enemy in this alliance. Suffice it to say that Walter Schellenberg, the head of Nazi intelligence, was a member of the company's board of directors and one of its shareholders." This naturally brings to mind the fact that it was precisely International Telephone & Telegraph, which Higham is accusing of the "most scandalous dealings with the enemy," that was directly involved in the organization and accomplishment of the fascist coup in Chile. The Chilean junta, the reactionary fascist regimes in several other Latin American countries and South African apartheid are all clients of the same U.S. big business with war criminals on its payroll. Prominent American historian and journalist G. Seldes had good reason to call Higham's book "a warning to the civilized world" in his review of the work.

A book by another author, John Loftus' "The Belarus Secret,"** published in New York in 1982, is also of interest. He describes the American city of South River, close to New York, where many Nazi criminals have taken refuge.

* C. Higham, "Trading With the Enemy. An Expose of the Nazi-American Money Plot 1933-1949," N.Y., 1983.

** J. Loftus, "The Belarus Secret," N.Y., 1982.

Under public pressure in connection with the Barbie affair, the U.S. Department of Justice announced in March of this year that it would conduct a full-scale investigation into the allegation that the U.S. Government had helped Barbie take shelter in Bolivia after World War II. The department also announced its "grave concern" over this allegation and said that a preliminary investigation of government papers indicated that available information is "sufficient to warrant a full-scale investigation" and, finally, declared that "Congress and the public will be informed of the results of the investigation." Blessed are they that believe.... The American authorities have made statements like this numerous times, but this has not kept Nazi criminals from feeling secure in the United States.

The responsibility for war crimes and crimes against humanity is not only a judicial matter but also an international political issue. It is directly related to the struggle for peace, progress and democracy. The fact that the crimes were committed long ago does not diminish the need to punish the Nazi criminals. The prosecution of war criminals, their public exposure and their just punishment constitute a substantial part of the struggle against the danger of a new war, a danger posed by today's neofascists and militarists. All progressive mankind, striving to keep the peace, will never forget the monstrous crimes of the Nazis. The Barbie case and the exposure and prosecution of other criminals who are still at large are not only the debt we owe to the countless victims of fascism, but also a warning to those who are rattling sabers today because they have forgotten what happened yesterday. The prosecution and punishment of war criminals represent one of the important issues of our day.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1983

8588

CSO: 1803/10

LIBERAL INFLUENCE IN CONGRESS SEEN INCREASED AFTER 1982 ELECTIONS

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 5, May 83 (signed to press 15 Apr 83) pp 70-74

[Article by Ye. M. Silayeva: "What Is New in the 98th Congress?"]

[Text] The 98th Congress began working in January 1983.

The economic crisis, the unprecedented level of unemployment and the record federal budget deficit testify that the recipes of "Reaganomics" are not working. Under these conditions, the unity of Republicans on Capitol Hill is being shaken while the Democrats are consolidating their ranks and hope to represent a solid opposition force in the Congress.

In the House of Representatives the leadership of the Democratic faction made a number of procedural changes to increase the influence of the speaker and penalize the southern Democrats who supported Ronald Reagan's legislative program for their disloyalty by not appointing them to the most important committees. This was done on the basis of the 1975 rules calling for the re-election of all committee chairmen and appointment of new members at the beginning of each session. This is one of the few ways in which the faction leadership can exercise disciplinary power and penalize refractory members. For the first time in many years the faction leaders enforced these rules and excluded Texan Democrat P. Gramm from the Budget Committee for his support of Reagan's budget. Other southern Democrats, D. Barnard from Georgia and J. Breaux from Louisiana, were also defeated in their bid for seats on the influential appropriations and budget committees. In place of them, liberal Democrats G. Miller from California and H. Wolpe from Michigan received appointments. The list of these examples could be continued. Judging by all indications, the Democrats are preparing for future battles on Capitol Hill by strengthening party discipline and overcoming dissension within their ranks.

On the very first day of the session, the nuclear freeze resolution and the Equal Rights Amendment were resubmitted to the 98th Congress. It is no secret that the administration does not support these legislative measures and once made a considerable effort to defeat them. But Congress must reconsider these matters.

The atmosphere in which the 98th Congress began its work already reflected changes after the midterm elections. What were these changes?

On the whole, the congressional elections are viewed as a definite success for the Democratic Party. Although the Republicans retained the majority in the Senate and there was no change in the party ratio (54 Republicans and 46 Democrats), in the House of Representatives, where the Democrats held the majority even before the elections, this party was able to take another 26 seats away from the Republicans and thereby reinforce its numerical superiority. Now the Democrats have 269 seats and the Republicans have 166. This has made the House of Representatives an opposition center, and the alignment of forces in the House is therefore of particular interest.

The 1982 elections spelled defeat for the extreme conservative wing of the Republican faction in the House. The conservative onslaught here, which had constantly grown stronger, was stopped for the first time since 1976. Of the 26 Republicans who lost the race, 22 are politicians with extremely conservative views. They include 14 Republicans from the "New Right" who were elected in 1980 "on the coat-tails" of Ronald Reagan. These are E. Johnston (North Carolina), D. Staton (West Virginia), J. Napier (South Carolina), A. Smith (Alabama), J. LeBoutillier (New York), C. Roberts (South Dakota) and others. The prestige of the administration was seriously injured by the defeat of Republican E. Atkinson (Pennsylvania), a former Democrat whose conversion to Republicanism was heavily publicized by the White House. Finally, in 1982 some conservative Republicans of the older generation were defeated: D. Clausen and J. Rousselot (California), A. Erdahl (Minnesota), T. Evans (Delaware) and others.

The elections proved that the conservative wave had already peaked and that the influence of the extreme right wing of the Republican faction in the House had decreased. The election defeat has dashed this group's hopes of pushing the main elements of the "New Right" program through Congress, namely constitutional amendments banning government-funded abortions, instituting prayer in public elementary schools and so forth.

Some words should be said about the position of the liberal wing. It has not been able to amass much influence as yet. This is due to the reaction left over from previous years, when the very word "liberal" became a synonym for the squandering of taxpayers' money, the compounding of deficits, the escalation of inflation, etc. The tone of liberal campaigns has changed considerably in the 1980's. They focus on criticism of Ronald Reagan's economic policy and advocate environmental protection and a nuclear freeze. Some of the Democrats who were elected on this platform are B. Boxer (California), R. Torricelli (New Jersey), R. Mrazek (New York) and E. Feighan (Ohio). After suffering a defeat in 1980, R. Carr (Democrat, Michigan) returned to the Congress. He actively supports the cessation of the arms race and the ratification of the SALT II Treaty and is now participating in the movement for the nuclear freeze. The election results increased the size of the black caucus in the House (from 17 to 21 members) and the Hispanic caucus (from 6 to 9). This bloc of votes can give these groups more influence in the 98th Congress. There was a slight increase in the number of women as a result of the elections, and the number reached 21 in the House.

Let us take a closer look at the position of the House conservative coalition in the 98th Congress. The election defeats of Republicans undermined its influence and robbed it of its dominant position. This coalition consists of two elements--the group of conservative southern Democrats ("boll weevils") and the backbone of the Republican faction, in which the Reagan Administration was originally able to maintain unity and discipline. This unity gradually eroded in the 97th Congress, however, and the group began to fall apart. The main reasons for the erosion were the failure of "Reaganomics" and the failure of the Republicans to keep campaign promises.

An opposition group, made up of the moderate-liberal flank of this coalition, took shape even before the 1982 elections. The members were called "gypsy moths" and were Republicans from the northeastern and midwestern states. They were supported by the voters who had suffered most from the cuts in social spending. The "gypsy moths" began to suggest, timidly at first and then with increasing determination, a balanced approach to military spending and social needs and to advocate the reduction of the former and the retention of social programs. Of the 30 Republicans in this group, 24 were re-elected and 6 were defeated. The unity of the Republican faction was dealt another blow in August 1982, when the splinter "New Right" group, headed by Congressman J. Kemp, voted against the administration's bill for a tax increase of 98.2 billion dollars.

It is clear, therefore, that the coalition on whose support the administration was relying was already disintegrating, and the 1982 elections simply accelerated the process. This weakened the Republican right wing, and although most of the southern Democrats supporting this faction kept their seats in the Capitol, their influence has decreased considerably. The first weeks of the session's work proved this. In general, the conservative coalition has lost its dominant position in the House and can no longer guarantee the successful passage of the President's legislative program through this chamber.

The collapse of the conservative coalition consolidated the conservative center, which had remained separate from the coalition and was made up of Democrats and Republicans. Its growing strength became evident by the end of the second session of the 97th Congress, when it pressured the administration into raising taxes, even though this went against the basic postulates of "Reaganomics." The elections strengthened the bipartisan group of conservative-centrists even more because most of the new members of the House, according to observers, are moderate conservatives rather than liberals or ultra-rightists. The majority take a pragmatic approach to economic problems and advocate changes in the administration's policy on these matters.

When we assess the overall impact of the elections on the alignment of forces in the House of Representatives, we can say that the balance has shifted in favor of the conservative center.

Now let us look at the leadership of the party factions and the House committees. There was no change in the Democratic and Republican faction leaders. The Democratic faction unanimously re-elected Speaker of the House T. O'Neill (Massachusetts) for a fourth term. Democratic Majority Leader J. Wright

(Texas) and Majority Whip T. Foley (Washington) were also re-elected. The Republicans also voted to keep the old leadership at a general meeting of the faction. Minority Leader R. Michel (Illinois) and Minority Whip T. Lott (Mississippi) were re-elected.

The most significant change in the committee leadership was connected with the retirement of the chairman of the Rules Committee, R. Bolling (Democrat, Missouri), who will be succeeded by C. Pepper (Democrat, Florida). This is one of the most influential committees although it does not take part in the actual drafting of bills. It determines the procedure for the passage of bills through the House, comments on amendments to them and can shelve any bill or amendment or slow down their passage. The 82-year-old C. Pepper, a New Deal liberal of the old school, decided to accept this position primarily to prevent cuts in social security funds.

According to the rules of the House, when a party increases its number of mandates it also increases its committee representation. In the new House there will be more Democrats on all committees without exception. Furthermore, the stronger position of the Democrats is particularly evident on all of the committees where the Republicans suffered the greatest losses (due to retirements and election defeats). These are the committees on the armed services, agriculture, foreign affairs and government operations.

The situation in the Senate has changed less. Some 33 senators campaigned for re-election in 1982--20 Democrats and 13 Republicans. The Democrats were able to hold on to 20 seats. The only Democrat who was defeated was H. Cannon (Nevada), who lost his seat to Republican C. Hecht. The Republicans also lost one seat--in New Mexico, where H. Schmitt was defeated by Democrat J. Bingaman. Senators S. Hayakawa (Republican, California), H. Byrd (Independent, but siding with the Democrats, Virginia) and H. Williams (Democrat, New Jersey) retired. The two defeats and three retirements brought new faces into the Senate.

Three of the five new senators are Republicans (C. Hecht from Nevada, P. Tribble from Virginia and P. Wilson from California)--conservatives who support the Reagan Administration. Two new senators--Democrats F. Lautenberg from New Jersey and J. Bingaman from New Mexico--will probably join the moderate-liberal group. Since the political positions of the five senators who left were approximately the same, the balance of forces in the Senate has also remained the same. The Senate in the 98th Congress will remain a primarily conservative body.

Here are some brief descriptions of the new senators.

Pete Wilson, a Republican from California, was born in 1933. He studied law. Prior to his election to the Senate, he was the mayor of San Diego. He began his political career as a moderate Republican but gradually moved over to the conservative wing. When G. Ford and R. Reagan were contending for the presidential nomination, he supported the former but later took the side of the present master of the White House, who repaid Wilson last fall by supporting him in his Senate campaign. He fully supports the foreign policy of the administration, advocates a tough line in relations with the USSR and opposes the nuclear freeze. He has also taken a conservative stand on domestic issues.

Paul Tribble, a Republican from Virginia, is a conservative who supports the President's economic policy. He stressed this repeatedly during his campaign. He received substantial support, financial and political, from the Republican Party and the chief executive. He was born in 1946 and holds a law degree. He has been a member of the House of Representatives since 1975 and worked on its budget and armed services committees. As a congressman, he faithfully served the Pentagon's biggest contractors in his state and agitated for higher military spending. He voted in favor of the quickest possible deployment of the MX missile and against the nuclear freeze.

Chic Hecht, a Republican from Nevada, is a conservative and a supporter of the administration. Prior to his election to the Senate, he was the minority leader in the senate of his state legislature and worked with Senator P. Laxalt when the latter was governor of Nevada. He was supported in his campaign by the administration and the National Conservative Political Action Committee. He was born in 1929, studied law and served as an army intelligence officer in Berlin in the 1950's. He has been a state legislator since 1966. He owns two large clothing stores and has a considerable fortune, which he used to finance his campaign.

Frank Lautenberg, a Democrat from New Jersey, is a liberal and an opponent of Ronald Reagan's economic policy. In his campaign, he focused on the social injustices of the administration's present line. He is an active supporter of Israel and will probably join the pro-Israel group in the Senate. He has not held any elective offices in the past. He is the founder and executive officer of Automatic Data Processing, a firm which manufactures electronic equipment. He is a multimillionaire and has a great deal of political influence. In the 1970's he was one of the leaders of the United Jewish Appeal and the American Jewish Committee; he was one of the people President Carter consulted before the Camp David talks. He has contributed heavily to the campaigns of liberal politicians (particularly G. McGovern's presidential campaign). He opposes the MX missile and the B-1 bomber and supports cuts in military spending, higher corporate taxes and the repeal of the new income tax cut for people with higher incomes. He actively supports the nuclear freeze.

Jeff Bingaman is a Democrat from New Mexico with moderate-liberal views. According to his own description, he is a middle-of-the-road Democrat. He has criticized the Republican administration's economic policy. Prior to his election to the Senate, he was the attorney general of the state of New Mexico. In his Senate campaign, he was supported by environmentalists and the AFL-CIO. He was born in 1943 and holds a law degree from Harvard University.

Changes in personnel, however, are not the only factor determining the situation in the new Senate. The gap between the positions of the Senate and the House of Representatives, which widened after the midterm elections when the Senate retained its primarily conservative stance and the House made a shift toward the center, will be of great importance. This means the administration will have to rely on the Senate for the passage of its legislative program and will try to mitigate opposition in the House with the aid of conference committees, which work out compromises when the two chambers cannot agree on matters. This will increase the influence of the top-level Republicans in the Senate,

who will play the key role in the conference committees. This means that the administration will be more dependent on the leadership of the Republican Senate faction.

The 1982 elections did not make significant changes in the leadership of the Senate Republican and Democratic factions. The leader of the Republican majority is still H. Baker (Tennessee), T. Stevens (Alaska) is the majority whip, J. Tower (Texas) is the chairman of the political committee and J. Garn (Utah) is the secretary of the faction general assembly. The only change in the Republican leadership was the replacement of R. Packwood (Oregon) with R. Lugar (Indiana), one of Reagan's closest associates, as chairman of the party committee on Senate elections.

Robert Byrd (West Virginia) will remain the minority leader, A. Cranston (California) will be the minority whip and D. Inouye (Hawaii) will be the secretary of the Democratic general assembly.

There were no changes in the Senate committee leadership either. The main changes were made on the level of subcommittee chairmen. The only noteworthy change was in the Armed Services Committee, which will now include E. Kennedy (Democrat, Massachusetts) and J. Bingaman (Democrat, New Mexico).

This is the political makeup of the 98th Congress, which began its work in 1983.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1983

8588

CSO: 1803/10

DOMESTIC OPPOSITION TO REAGAN POLICY TOWARD USSR SEEN GROWING

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 5, May 83 (signed to press 15 Apr 83) pp 75-78

[Article by Yu. P. Babich and Ye. B. Meshkova: "In Search of a Way Out"]

[Yu. P. Babich]

[Text] The aggressive militaristic line of the present Republican administration, which is based on hardheaded anti-Sovietism, has not only undermined the development of Soviet-American relations but has also seriously complicated the international situation in general and has given rise to a deep rift between the United States and its allies; and it is not surprising that this line is giving rise to increasingly vehement arguments within the ruling circles of the United States itself.

The conflicts arising from administration policy in the international arena have affected even the particular American political groups that were inclined to support this policy until recently. An article by William Hyland, a well-known conservative political scientist who served as the President's deputy national security adviser in 1975-1977 and has been working for the Carnegie Foundation--one of the main conservative "think tanks"--for the last few years, published in the influential journal FOREIGN POLICY (No 49, 1982/83), is of interest in this connection.*

Like many of his colleagues, Hyland takes an approach to Soviet-American relations that is still encumbered by certain concepts which have apparently become compulsory in American bourgeois political science. These concepts are intended to denigrate the nature and essence of the Soviet social order, Marxist-Leninist ideology and the fundamental bases of Soviet foreign policy, although everyone knows that concepts of this kind are nothing other than an ideological frame for the widespread anticommunist, anti-Soviet biases within the U.S. ruling class. Hyland's article is noteworthy, however, because the author feels no need to conceal his critical view of Reagan Administration policy when he analyzes the relations between the leading states of the two opposing systems in the international arena.

* W. Hyland, "Clash With the Soviet Union," FOREIGN POLICY, No 49, Winter 1982/83, pp 3-19.

He justifiably describes the present state of Soviet-American relations as a "political impasse" (p 6). We can also agree with his statement that "Western Europe and the United States itself are now suffering from the fear of war" (p 3). But what is the cause? What are the reasons for the present serious friction in Soviet-American relations and in all international affairs? Closing his eyes to the dual, inconsistent approach of all previous Washington administrations to the policy of detente and to relations with the Soviet Union, the author blames both "superpowers" equally for the pronounced deterioration of the international political climate (pp 3, 6). He approaches the process of detente from a fairly primitive standpoint, examining it only within the context of the "settlement of certain problems" in Soviet-U.S. relations, and not with a view to the vital need for the reorganization of relations between countries on the basis of the same principles of peaceful coexistence that have been recognized by the United States itself. It is therefore not surprising that Hyland sees the main reason for Washington's departure from the policy of detente in the "failure of the superpowers to find the correct approach to their competition outside Europe and East Asia. They did not want to employ the traditional method of settling international problems by establishing spheres of influence" (p 6).

By stating the matter in this way, Hyland, like many other bourgeois political scientists, unavoidably traps himself in his own errors. Despite the allegations of these researchers, the Soviet Union is not "the same kind of superpower" as the United States. It does not claim any special rights in the international community of states, and its policy has nothing in common with the policy of the imperialist powers. The Soviet Union has resolutely opposed any kind of division of the world into "spheres of influence" and has never done anything to warrant this opinion of its foreign policy goals. It categorically rejects the idea that some kind of "rules of behavior," based on American recipes, can be instituted in various parts of the world, because it has no intention of acting as imperialism's partner in the international arena in the struggle against the world revolutionary process and for the maintenance of conditions benefiting imperialism, primarily in the developing countries.

In spite of his subjective interpretation of the essence of detente, however, Hyland still arrives at the conclusion that both of the great powers have no other reasonable or acceptable alternative than "the restoration of the atmosphere of detente" (p 8). But in order to actually begin the normalization of Soviet-American relations, the author of the FOREIGN POLICY article stresses, "the United States must realize that this possibility exists" (p 15). This remark essentially represents an appeal to the present administration for recognition of the need to put an end to all forms of rabid anti-Sovietism and to acknowledge objective reality. Hyland frankly points out the futility of all types of intrigues and speculative operations against the USSR, including the senseless hope for the "collapse of the Soviet economy." The Soviet Union, Hyland stresses, is not the "colossus with feet of clay" that members of the administration want it to be. Its economy is strong enough to secure Soviet national interests (p 15). Considering the nature of administration views and, in general, the prevailing mood in Washington, the author writes, it is obvious that "Washington will have to have the imagination and courage to introduce an element of compromise" into Soviet-U.S. relations (p 15).

According to W. Hyland, the necessary prerequisites for the normalization of these relations already exist. He feels that the most important of these is the fact that "an approximate balance of power now exists between the United States and the USSR and will most probably continue to exist for a long time. If we approach the matter realistically, we can see that neither superpower can hope to attain a superior position" (p 4). This "provides strong arguments in favor of the regulation of Soviet-American relations rather than indefinite and unlimited competition" (p 11).

Hyland regards the changes in the international balance of power as another prerequisite for the normalization of Soviet-American relations. He makes the interesting statement that all of the talk in Washington about the notorious "Soviet expansionism," which is supposedly the main source of difficulties in the development of international detente and of complications in Soviet-U.S. relations, is not supported by fact and is therefore unsubstantiated and suspect.

Finally, another prerequisite for the normalization of Soviet-American relations, in Hyland's opinion, is the "common interest in the stabilization of the situation in Europe" (p 14). Although the author's arguments and analogies are faulty and radically contradict the principles of Soviet foreign policy, he makes the significant recommendation that Washington reject the "nightmare" plan for the neutralization of Western Europe and reconcile itself to the growing political independence of the West European states. The result of this, Hyland believes, will not be "neutralism," but "the natural evolution that accompanies changes in the balance of power" (p 14).

On the level of practical policy, the arms limitation talks provide the best opportunity for the normalization of Soviet-American relations, according to Hyland. But these talks must be approached quite seriously. America, he writes, should not expect the USSR to make unilateral radical changes in its strategic forces. Here the author obviously realizes that the Soviet Union cannot accept the American proposals that were first set forth in a speech by the U.S. President in Eureka (Illinois) on 9 May 1982 and were then officially submitted at the Geneva Soviet-American talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons. In the opinion of the author of this article, it would be more reasonable to strive for a broad and mutually acceptable agreement on strategic arms (p 16).

He is just as critical in his approach to the Reagan Administration's position on the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe. Hyland believes that the United States should give up the notorious "zero option" with regard to medium-range weapons, which was proposed by Ronald Reagan on 18 November 1981 and would essentially signify the unilateral disarmament of the USSR. Hyland advises Washington to put forth another option, a compromise. This, he writes, could prevent an impasse in the Soviet-U.S. talks and could also "prevent a potential extremely dangerous battle over this issue in the Western alliance" (p 16).

Although the author is essentially in favor of the normalization of Soviet-American relations in general, he cannot rid himself of some old political precepts. For example, he declares that the United States should maximize its

military strength and that "this should be the focus of any American foreign policy in the 1980's" (p 15), although it is obvious that it is precisely the arms race that is undermining the process of international detente and has an unavoidable effect on the state of Soviet-American relations. And this is not all. He believes that the normalization of Soviet-American relations would be more advantageous for the United States if it could find means of political and military "leverage." As one means of this "leverage," he would like to see a "differentiated approach" to the countries of the socialist community in order to "weaken the bonds between Moscow and some of its Warsaw Pact allies" (p 17). This kind of program has repeatedly proved to be completely futile and it is hardly likely that Hyland or any of his colleagues has any reason whatsoever to anticipate its success at any time in the future.

As another means of "leverage," the author of the article in FOREIGN POLICY recommends the continued use of the "China card," although he admits that it "can no longer be played openly" (pp 18-19) and that the United States will have to establish a "more precise" relationship with China.

Hyland also attaches importance to the use of regional conflicts and problems in the so-called "Third World" for the purposes of American strategy. He does, however, advise Washington not to view events in the developing countries solely from the standpoint of direct confrontation with the USSR.

On the whole, as we can see, W. Hyland's position is contradictory and inconsistent, but it is also quite evident that, despite his fidelity to the ideas and concepts of "Sovietology," he is still quite aware of the dangers of U.S.-Soviet confrontation and favors a search for ways of normalizing Soviet-American relations, the channeling of these relations in the right, constructive direction and the resumption of cooperation between the two powers in various fields, primarily the prevention of thermonuclear war. He is trying to find a way out of the blind alley into which the Reagan Administration has led American policy.

[Ye. B. Meshkova]

The search for a way out is being conducted even more energetically by members of the particular groups that have been able to take a more or less sober approach to world events in recent years. For example, the 25 January 1982 issue of the NEW YORK TIMES contained an article by T. Watson and M. Harrison (the former was the U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union in 1979-1981 and is now the honorary chairman of the executive committee of International Business Machines; Harrison also occupied an administrative office in the U.S. embassy in Moscow in 1978-1980 and is now the director of Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Analysis). In this article, they stress that there is one question of primary significance in U.S.-Soviet relations: How can nuclear war be avoided and American vital interests be defended at the same time? As the authors point out, the use of nuclear weapons would destroy not only adversaries but also the United States.

The United States, according to these authors, already has enough nuclear weapons to stop all of the "senseless arguments" about which weapon systems it should develop and about how and where they should be deployed.

The people who are playing with nuclear war scenarios still believe that the United States can either intimidate the Soviet Union or force it to surrender by spending more on military projects. "Deliberately or not, these people are leading us into a catastrophe," the authors declare.

Former U.S. Secretary of Defense R. McNamara has appealed for the rejection of the delirious "nuclear war scenarios." In an article in the 2 February 1983 issue of the NEW YORK TIMES, he logically concludes, proceeding from his 7 years of experience as the secretary of defense, that the United States should revise all of its doctrines and concepts based on plans for the use of nuclear weapons because all of these plans are simply impracticable under present conditions. McNamara points to the colossal danger that a nuclear war could be started as a result of a miscalculation or error made by a person or a machine. In his opinion, the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries should pledge not to use nuclear weapons first (as we know, the USSR has already made this pledge and the fraternal countries have supported it), and work should begin on a strategy envisaging the careful verification of any incident that might be interpreted as the use of nuclear weapons.

Washington's policy of escalating the nuclear arms race was pointedly criticized by Senator A. Cranston when he announced his intention to make a bid for the Democratic presidential nomination in the 1984 election.

Appearing on a program on NBC television, the senator underscored the direct connection between the arms race and the economic problems facing the United States, which, as he commented, cannot escape the economic crisis as long as it invests an increasingly high percentage of national resources in the arms race. In Cranston's opinion, curbing the arms race and rejecting all programs for the development of new weapon systems, such as the MX missile, will be an important step toward a healthier American economy.

These statements reflect the feelings of the particular segments of U.S. ruling circles that are striving to put an end to the dominion of the right-wing conservatives in Washington who do not want to accept the realities of today's world. To a certain degree, these statements are also evidence of the fact that political realism is once again making its way into the thoughts and feelings of influential circles in the United States.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1983

8588

CSO: 1803/10

GROMYKO BOOK ON EXPORT OF CAPITAL REVIEWED

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 5, May 83 (signed to press 15 Apr 83) pp 99-106

[Review by V. M. Kudrov and G. A. Trofimenko of book "Vneshnyaya ekspansiya kapitala. Istoriya i sovremennost'" [Foreign Expansion of Capital. Past and Present] by A. A. Gromyko, Moscow, Mysl', 1982, 494 pages: "The Economic Aggression of American Imperialism"]

[Text] Another scientific monograph by Doctor of History A. A. Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR minister of foreign affairs, has been published. It is devoted to questions of the export of capital as an instrument of capitalist expansion.

The author has worked long and fruitfully at the study of the policy and economy of U.S. imperialism. Scientists, specialists and wide circles of readers are well acquainted with two previously published works on this subject by the same author, namely "Eksport amerikanskogo kapitala" [Export of American Capital] and "Ekspansiya dollara" [Dollar Expansion]. The new book by A. A. Gromyko is a fundamental analysis of practically all aspects of the expansionist activity of U.S. imperialism. This critical analysis is aimed at uncovering dialectically the main contradictions of contemporary imperialism and unmasking the anti-people nature of the methods by which the U.S. monopolies have guaranteed and continue to guarantee their gigantic profits. The author convincingly demonstrates that foremost among these methods are economic expansion, political pressure and military adventures.

In his classic work "Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism," V. I. Lenin revealed the role played by the export of capital as one of the main features of imperialism. Based on this and other fundamental works by the founder of the Soviet State, A. A. Gromyko develops the Leninist analysis of the evolution of imperialism, covering the period up to the early 1980's. Citing the example of the most powerful imperialism--U.S. imperialism--he demonstrates how the international activity of monopoly capital is sharply directed against those progressive transformations which have taken place in the world since the Great October Socialist Revolution and under its influence.

The monograph by A. A. Gromyko is written in a way which sets the problems in their historical perspective. In eight long chapters the author lays out the results of his long historicoeconomic investigation of the export of capital, which is the most important feature of imperialism and the material foundation of its international expansionism and its foreign policy. He primarily analyzes the export of capital from the United States and traces its changing forms and methods. The vast analytical and documentary material assembled in the monograph also throws light on questions of the export of capital from the other imperialist countries, both partners and competitors of the United States.

Proceeding from the Leninist definitions of the export of capital, the author sees the initial cause of this process in the growing dimensions of the "excess" or "overaccumulated" capital which cannot be used profitably within its own country at a time when profits are decreasing. As a result, imperialism strives to solve its internal contradictions at the expense of other countries and foreign markets, by way of foreign expansion and by constantly expanding the export of capital.

The author analyzes the specific features of the export of U.S. capital during different historical periods, starting with the time before World War I when the U.S. corporations made their way into the wide international arena and ending with the export of capital from the United States under contemporary conditions. He profoundly examines the positions and activity of the U.S. monopolies in different parts of the world and in different markets (oil, rubber, agricultural products and other goods) and analyzes the levers it uses to establish and consolidate its influence abroad.

Revealing both the general features characterizing the foreign economic expansion of the U.S. monopolies and the specific peculiarities of their expansion in various particular stages, the author also presents a broad picture of the deepening general crisis of imperialism and the weakening of American-owned companies in the world market.

The author emphasizes: "The specific features of capitalism's present-day positions, pointed out at the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses, logically follow from the Marxist-Leninist analysis of imperialism, but also reflect the characteristic features of the struggle between the two systems at the present stage and the unprecedented growth of anti-imperialist forces throughout the world. In the late 20th century capital can only play its role in politics and international relations in the world capitalist system on a reduced basis, taking into account those basic changes which the Great October Socialist Revolution has brought the world. As time goes by, the influence of these changes becomes more and more pronounced" (p 14). The author demonstrates that it is particularly dangerous for mankind that capital, while striving to prolong its development and viability or, in other words, to continue growing and making profits, resorts to such means as the militarization of the economy, the arms race and threats to use military force to defend its purely class interests. The arms race unleashed by monopoly capital has already cost mankind, including capitalism as a socioeconomic system, a great deal.

A. A. Gromyko's investigation of the United States' economic expansion abroad during World War I and between the two world wars is quite interested and well-founded.

The author emphasizes: "Declaring on paper its adherence to high ideals and, in particular, insisting that the United States entered the war (World War I--ed.) with the aim of 'making the world safe for democracy,' U.S. monopoly capital pursued quite concrete selfish goals" (p 83). These goals consisted of the U.S. monopolies' striving to increase their profits and expand their positions in the world. World War I led to a situation in which the majority of European states, particularly England and France, found themselves deeply in debt as a result of loans which they had received from the United States. According to the official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce, during World War I the volume of U.S. foreign capital investments almost doubled and reached 9.7 billion dollars in 1919, as compared to 5 billion in 1914 (p 89).

The U.S. monopolies used the military debts of no fewer than 20 states to penetrate even further into the economies of the European states and expand enormously the export of American goods.

The aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism, which enriched itself during the war, was revealed particularly clearly when U.S. credits were granted to finance the Russian counterrevolution after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia.

A. A. Gromyko writes: "Ruling circles in the United States demonstrated their extreme hostility to the Soviet state not only as organizers of and participants in the intervention against our country, but also as creditors of the White Guards. They spent freely in financing the Russian counterrevolution" (pp 99-100). Of the total sum of credits granted by the United States in 1917-1918, which amounted to 10 billion dollars, 450 million was intended for the provisional government in Russia. Later the U.S. Government, representing financiers and industrialists, made unfounded demands on the Soviet state, demanding that it repay the debts left by the czarist and provisional governments, which amounted to 18 billion rubles. As is known, Soviet Russia refused to repay these debts to the United States, thus freeing the workers and peasants of our country from a heavy financial burden (the author calculates that the repayment of the debts would have meant the payment of around 480 prewar rubles by each Soviet family to the U.S. imperialists).

Emphasizing the historic significance of freeing the Soviet people from repaying old debts to the imperialists, on 8 November 1918 V. I. Lenin said at the Sixth All-Russian Extraordinary Congress of Soviets: "The Soviet republic has openly declared war against the imperialists of all countries by taking away their capital in the form of foreign credits, by hitting them in the face and openly reaching into their highwayman's pockets."*

* V. I. Lenin, "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, p 157.

Examining in detail the intensifying expansionism of the United States and its growing foreign capital investments after World War I, the author analyzes the role of U.S. monopoly capital in the preparations for World War II and in the revival of German militarism. A. A. Gromyko writes: "The United States was counting above all on utilizing the military-economic potential, which it had helped to reconstruct, and the reactionary political regime in Germany as an outpost in the fight against the USSR and against all progressive and democratic forces" (p 138). The "Dawes Plan" of reparations played a significant role in implementing these intentions. The author notes that this plan counted on selling German industrial products on the Soviet market, which would have nullified the industrialization of the USSR and transformed it into an agrarian and raw material appendage of capitalist Germany" (pp 155-156).

The "Young Plan" (31 August 1929-30 June 1931), which followed the "Dawes Plan" and pursued the same goal of reconstructing the German military and industrial potential, opened even wider the gates through which U.S. capital could penetrate Germany. The author arrives at the thoroughly substantiated conclusion that U.S. monopoly capital ruthlessly ignored all of its previous promises to oppose the ambitious and aggressive plans of German imperialism and began placing weapons in the hands of this imperialism even after Hitler had taken power. The direct and ample support given by U.S. ruling circles to German Fascism played a truly sinister role in world history.

After World War II the U.S. monopolies, which had profited enormously from the war, waged a further offensive against foreign countries (in the war years of 1940-1945 the profits earned by U.S. monopolies from foreign investments amounted to 3,257,000,000 dollars).

The victory of the freedom-loving peoples over fascist Germany and militarist Japan brought about basic changes in the world and led to a new correlation of forces in international relations. The formation of the socialist community of peoples and states was a decisive turning-point in international relations. The historic victory of the Soviet people in the war confirmed once again that there are no forces capable of stopping the triumphant march of socialism and communism.

Under these conditions--with the despair of those who are doomed and refuse to take into account the objective course of social progress--the imperialists began to undertake efforts to crush the new tendencies and to "win back" from history the positions they had lost. U.S. imperialism displayed particular aggressiveness in declaring its broad global claims and a redivision of the world while utilizing political, military and economic means to achieve its goals.

In chapter six of his monograph, the author examines in great detail the means employed by the United States in its postwar economic expansion--that is, the so-called "aid" to foreign states, including the notorious "Marshall Plan," as well as the enslavement of other countries through the export of surplus agricultural products and the use of international monetary and credit organizations. He arrives at the very important conclusion that "under contemporary

conditions the buildup of the expansionist activity of U.S. capital is an important indication of the desire of American big business to maintain its dominant position in the world capitalist economy" (p 345).

The author notes that the export of capital from the United States in the form of loans, credits and in other forms is a means of enslaving many countries of the world economically and politically. Specifically, the U.S. administration is presently demanding that foreign countries adopt U.S. concepts and, above all, that they pursue a policy of anticommunism and anti-Sovietism as a condition for obtaining U.S. capital and technology.

At present about half of all the direct private investments of the capitalist world are U.S. investments. As regards the total sum of foreign investments, the United States surpasses all West European countries combined. This is why it is not surprising that the U.S. industrial enclave abroad is sometimes referred to as "the second-ranking industrial power in the capitalist world," because in terms of the volume of goods and services it produces, it surpasses all capitalist countries, with the exception of the United States. In this connection the author cogently demonstrates that, on the one hand, the growing export of U.S. capital takes place against the background of the deepening crisis of capitalism--in particular, in addition to exporting capital, the United States is trying to export its difficulties, thus facilitating their resolution inside the country--while, on the other hand, this export meets not only with resistance from recipient countries but also with growing competition from other imperialist states. As a result, following a certain consolidation of U.S. positions in the capitalist economy after World War II, a lengthy period of the relative weakening of these positions began in the late 1960's and is still going on today.

The dimensions of direct U.S. investments abroad increased from 56.6 billion dollars in 1967 to 168.1 billion in 1978. However, their share in the grand total of direct foreign investments by developed capitalist countries decreased from 50.4 percent to 45.2 percent (p 356). The U.S. share of world capitalist exports and of gold and monetary reserves in the capitalist world decreased even faster. According to the figures quoted in the monograph, it decreased from 14.6 percent in 1965 to 11 percent in 1980 in the case of exports, and from 27.4 percent in 1962 to 5.9 percent in 1980 in the case of gold and monetary reserves (pp 348, 351).

The United States is no longer the undisputed leader of the capitalist world, as it was in the 1950's and 1960's. For example, Japan has surpassed the United States in the production of steel, automobiles, ships and a number of important types of electronics and other technology, and it is assisting the United States in the development of several types of production, research and development. Recently the U.S. Government even tried to involve Japanese monopolies in arms production in the United States by demanding that Japanese concerns supply various components for weapon systems. Japan and Western Europe (the Common Market) have become major economic, scientific and technical centers of the capitalist world and are now much less dependent on the United States than they were in the past. The international expansion of these capitalist "power centers" in the sphere of capital exports has also increased

and is hurting U.S. monopolies. For example, whereas the share of the United States has decreased, the share of Japan in the total volume of foreign investments of developed capitalist countries in 1967-1968 has grown almost sixfold and that of the FRG has more than tripled.

The world of capitalism has changed greatly during the last decade and not to the United States' advantage. The United States is being forced to adapt to the changing requirements and to the new correlation of forces in the world. The technological revolution exerts substantial influence on the correlation of forces in the capitalist world. The West European countries and, in particular, Japan, which once made use of new U.S. technical equipment and technology but did their own research and development, managed to quickly renew their production apparatus and start producing new science-intensive goods, to reduce the cost of production and to enhance the competitive potential of their goods on the world market. As a result, they possess more highly perfected machine tools than the United States and are beginning to push U.S. capital out of several regions of the world.

Many developing countries (for example, Brazil, Mexico, Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia) have recently been actively bringing their products onto the foreign market and have also become notable competitors of the United States, and not only in traditional products, such as textiles, but also in modern electronics.

As a result, approximately one-quarter of the domestic U.S. market goes to goods imported from other countries. American industry cannot compete in a number of important branches, particularly the automobile industry, ferrous metallurgy and the production of consumer electronic items. Public opinion in the United States is voicing serious concern in this regard, appealing not only to scientists and engineers, who have failed to secure the necessary rate of scientific and technical progress and the corresponding technological break-away from competitors, but also to corporations which, instead of consolidating the industrial, scientific and technical power of their own country, building enterprises in the United States and thereby solving the unemployment problem, are exporting capital in search of easy gains. Much has been said about the "unpatriotic behavior" of American business, which leads to "de-industrialization," in the course of numerous hearings in the Congress and at meeting of American labor unions. What is the result?

It is precisely in our time that the U.S. monopolies are striving to relieve the situation in their own country, whose economy is being shaken by ever more frequent cyclical crises, by expanding the export of capital, primarily through the channels of multinational corporations, which have proved to be extremely well suited for the purpose. The refusal of the leading U.S. monopolies to invest on a large scale in the U.S. economy obviously cannot help in overcoming crises. To the contrary, this behavior guarantees that the level of unemployment will remain high and it undermines the prospect of stable economic revival. At the same time, the dwindling profits caused by reduced domestic production are compensated for, at least in part, by the higher gains from U.S. capital exported to other countries. According to the data in A. A. Gromyko's book, the profit from exported capital is generally 1.5 to 2 times higher than

inside the country. Thus, when U.S. capital is exported to other capitalist countries, the profit amounts to 15 or 16 percent and when it is exported to developing countries the profit is 22-25 percent (pp 383, 422).

At present, however, the United States does not merely have a more outdated production apparatus than Japan and the countries of Western Europe. It is also experiencing a very acute structural crisis of reproduction, the inertia of a huge, historically formed production apparatus, reflecting the level of technology existing at the time when it was formed as well as the structure and organization of production at that time. The inertial economic process, which obstructs the reconstruction, modernization and even the simple scrapping of accumulated technology, is much more noticeable in the United States than in the economies of Japan, the FRG and several developing countries. Overcoming this process requires very sizeable resources which must be diverted both from new branches and from the export of capital. At the same time, the very inertia of the existing economic process with its periodic highs and lows and the sluggishness of the U.S. economic mechanism--to mention factors of great dimensions--sharply complicate the search for realistic concepts of effective structural transformation, let alone the possibility of implementing these concepts. The conclusion is obvious: It is highly unlikely that the difficulties experienced by the United States in its relations with competitors will abate. Realizing this, the captains of U.S. big business are striving to utilize not only the possibilities of capital exports but also the U.S. scientific-technical potential--its so-called technological superiority.

The strength of the United States now lies first and foremost in its scientific-technical potential, in its powerful research base and infrastructure and in the wealth it has accumulated in the sphere of scientific research and experimental design. The United States possesses approximately the same scientific-technical potential as all the other developed capitalist countries combined. The system of U.S. universities conducting scientific research in virtually every sphere of contemporary knowledge provides a developed infrastructure for fundamental research. Equally strong potential for applied research is concentrated in so-called non-profit (reinvesting the entire profit) private research corporations and the laboratories of companies and government institutions, which, through a system of contractual relations, are closely connected with the universities. However, the main strength of the United States over its competitors lies not so much in research carried out on a broad scale, as in industrial research and development, in experimental work and in the know-how to quickly introduce a new technical item into production and market it at equal speed after expanding the market and thereby recovering all the costs of introducing innovations.

The scientific-technical potential which the United States has built up is a factor which determines the permanent technological dependence of other countries, which have not yet built up this kind of potential. This is precisely why the United States can actively sell licenses and the latest science-intensive products and maintain a very impressive positive balance in this sphere while its total trade balance remains unfavorable. This is precisely why other countries send their youth to study in the United States and send older scientists and engineers to improve their qualifications. Meanwhile,

the United States is not reluctant to have talented specialists from other countries on its side. Transnational monopolies actively utilize their channels to secure the flow of this type of manpower to the United States. In recent years an increasing number of research laboratories have been set up abroad with the participation of local personnel. However, all of the inventions and projects of these laboratories become U.S. property.

Thus, under the conditions of the technological revolution, the export of capital is closely connected with scientific and technical progress. As a scientific-technical leader of the capitalist world which is losing a number of important economic positions, the United States wants to supplement the economic dependence of other countries with a new form of dependence--technical. Under capitalist conditions, this dependence is naturally exploitive. The technological superiority of the United States was built up not only through the work of American scientists, engineers and workers, but also through the work of foreigners and the working people of the countries from which the U.S. monopolies have been pumping profits for such a long time. These profits are utilized in the United States not only to develop the economy but also to develop its scientific-technical potential. At present U.S. imperialism is trying to combine new forms of exploitation with old ones.

Life has demonstrated that technological--including scientific--backwardness must be paid for today, in the same way as economic backwardness. Whereas traditional economic backwardness was, and still is, paid for by the difference in price (or production costs) of what is produced for international trade, technological backwardness is paid for by the high price demanded for unique products, licenses and the transmission of know-how.

Advanced science-intensive companies working in the fields of electronics, automation, space technology and airplane and jet-engine production, producing the equipment for mining the seabed and operating in other state-of-the-art industries seriously expect not only to maintain but also to broaden the technological gap separating them from other countries, including Japan. In a number of industries the rate of scientific-technical progress is so high that U.S. business is planning to quickly replace not only individual items but also entire generations of products, while other countries are just beginning to master their production. When U.S. business sells these products to other countries, it expects them to pay a constant tribute for lagging behind in the scientific and technical sphere.

Indeed, the scientific and technical revolution has sharply intensified the role played by the obsolescence of technical equipment and has generated new forms of competition in which questions of the qualitative perfection of equipment, the rapid exchange of generations of individual types of equipment and the display of marketing ability as well as the provision of consumer service have become questions of paramount importance. In this respect, big American corporations generally have an advantage over the corporations of other countries and will strive to utilize this advantage. Even now the United States is exporting capital to certain science-intensive industries and intends utilize it to consolidate its technological superiority. While other countries are just getting used to a "new product" from the United States, American

business moves on to the next generation of this product, thereby devaluing the expenditures made by its competitors, involving them in a ruinous technological race and pushing them into the accumulation of capital which is doomed to rapid obsolescence. It is natural that the monopoly price of new U.S. products allows U.S. corporations to realize an additional surplus value and recover the cost of scientific-technical progress. Competitors usually lack this ability because the price of their product drops as it becomes obsolete.

There is no doubt that these forms of inter-imperialist rivalry will expand and develop in the future.

At the same time, it would be wrong to overestimate the possibilities of the United States in this respect. Today no country in the world can seriously hope to maintain a long-term monopoly in the sphere of scientific and technical development and the incorporation of its results in production. The countries of Western Europe, Japan and even some developing countries have firmly embarked on the path of building and developing their own scientific-technical potential. They are actively striving not only to acquire and adopt all that is advanced and new and can be bought from others, but also to open their own front of scientific research. In many cases the successes of these countries have been amazing. They testify that, just as the economic superiority of the United States has been called into question, its scientific-technical superiority may be called into question in the future, which would also affect its position in the capital export sphere.

Therefore, imperialism utilizes scientific-technical progress to consolidate its position in business competition and as an instrument for the exploitation of other countries. However, the other--weaker--countries are finding all possible ways of resisting this pressure.

Socialism counterposes the system of constant struggle for superiority and survival with an open and clear-cut policy of mutually advantageous international cooperation, the exchange of scientific ideas and the development of scientific-technical ties between all countries, regardless of their social system and in the interest of all mankind. Socialism supports the ideas of a new international economic order and the limitation of transnational corporate activity, which is aimed at securing unilateral advantages, and it supports the struggle against the monopolization of information that is also partially based on the dominant position held by the United States in the non-socialist world in the sphere of the latest means of mass communications. In particular, Soviet representatives at international gatherings have repeatedly put forth proposals for restructuring the existing system of international economic, scientific and technical relations and creating an entirely new and just system of international scientific-technical exchange.

However, the United States and its partners among the other capitalist countries constantly block these successes. A. A. Gromyko writes: "Most negotiations on questions of the reorganization of international economic relations are in fact blocked because of the hard line, based on inequality, taken by the West, and especially by the United States, which is aimed at securing the immutability of the existing system of capitalist division of labor...."

Washington does not want to accept the fact that the unequal nature of current international economic relations--whose mechanism took shape when the correlation of forces in the world was absolutely different, at a time when most of the new sovereign UN members were colonies or dependent territories--has now become anachronistic and flagrantly contradicts the interests of the liberated states and the contemporary system of international economic cooperation on an equal basis" (pp 449-450).

In spite of the worsening international situation, the socialist countries have continuously supported detente. As far as the economic aspect is concerned, this attitude is a result of the clear understanding that the easy and "fat" years of world economic progress are probably over. During these years, speedy industrialization depleted natural resources, polluted the environment and generated acute social problems. At present we are living through difficult, "lean" years, when the price of natural resources will go up and the conditions of reproduction will grow more complex. Only science and technological progress can help overcome these difficulties to the maximum with the aid of new technical equipment, more highly qualified specialists and better organization. However, none of this will produce the desired effect if countries are hostile to one another, if they do not trust each other and if they make secret preparations for war, thereby destroying the hope of solving the most urgent global problems through combined effort. This is the only possible outcome of behavior which undermines the principles of peaceful coexistence and mutual cooperation by all states, large and small, which have been agreed upon and accepted by the international community.

Considering the growing significance of many global problems, it is becoming an impermissible luxury to divert enormous resources for the arms race and apply all kinds of "sanctions" with the aim of deliberately harming entire nations and artificially impeding their development. The historic and human significance of detente is now so great that no hostile acts by imperialist states can abolish it. This is attested to by the mass movements in the West against the nuclear arms race and the deployment of new nuclear missiles in Europe. It is also attested to by the fact that hundreds of millions of people in the developing countries are advocating a new economic order which will recognize the sovereignty of states over their own natural resources and their equality, guarantee the developing countries a fair role in the international decisionmaking process, stabilize their profits from raw material exports, regulate monetary and financial problems, normalize trade in finished manufactured goods and scientific-technical exchange and regulate the activity of transnational corporations. It is also attested to by the numerous appeals made by scientists and representatives of the intelligentsia in many countries who demand that comprehensive international cooperation be established and that wars, the arms race and all outdated forms of economic, scientific and technical ties be renounced. This is also the subject of the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact States, recently adopted in Prague. The declaration states that these countries are ready for dialogue and cooperation with all those who strive to consolidate peace and maintain and extend the relaxation of international tension. This growing public awareness of the importance of detente in the face of global problems concerning all mankind is an important factor in curbing the forces of hostility and aggression.

In conclusion, A. A. Gromyko emphasizes: "Socialism is the most humane and progressive system in the history of mankind. Peace and creativeness have always been its motto. The countries of the socialist community are linking their present and their future with peaceful development. In their capacity as a leading factor in the struggle to maintain peace, these countries are contributing to the resolution of a problem of truly worldwide historic significance and are striving to secure the necessary external conditions for the successful construction of a new society" (p 452).

The publication of A. A. Gromyko's new book is an important event in the development of economic and political science in our country.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1983

CSO: 1803/10a-F

BOOK ON U.S. DEBATE ON MILITARY VS. SOCIAL SPENDING REVIEWED

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 5, May 83 (signed to press 15 Apr 83) pp 118-119

[Review by Yu. V. Katasonov of book "'Natsional'nyye priority' SShA. Debaty i politika" [U.S. "National Priorities." Debates and Policy] by N. A. Dolgopolova, Moscow, Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya, 1982, 144 pages]

[Text] In American political terminology, the term "national priorities" refers to the most important objectives set by the government within the country and in the international arena. The problem of setting "national priorities" and of distributing resources (specifically, federal budget funds) accordingly has long been the subject of a political battle in the United States. In the late 1960's and early 1970's this battle, as N. A. Dolgopolova illustrates in her book, acquired a qualitatively new nature and unprecedented significance for two reasons: Firstly, the ratio of military to non-military objectives, particularly the relative scales of government military and socioeconomic programs and expenditures, became the focal point of the battle over "national priorities"; secondly, this was probably the first time the battle transcended the bounds of the ruling class and was joined by numerous groups of Americans from different social strata. The main aspect of the battle was the widespread demand for a change in "national priorities"--lower military spending and higher expenditures on socioeconomic needs. In other words, the movement for a change in "national priorities" became the most important form of struggle against militarism and the arms race.

The author presents a detailed discussion of the problem of "national priorities" in postwar U.S. history from two vantage points: the way in which it has been reflected in federal budget figures and the way in which the political struggle has revolved around this problem. The composition of the struggle's participants, their position and their role in setting "national priorities" are thoroughly analyzed. During the first postwar decades the system of "national priorities" and the corresponding distribution of budget funds were affected by cold war policy and Washington's unconcealed aim of greater military strength and higher military expenditures. The aggression in Vietnam and the mounting domestic socioeconomic problems were catalysts of the movement to curb militarism and revise "national priorities." These internal processes were one of the main reasons why Washington had to slow down the growth of military spending in the first half of the 1970's, stop the intervention in Southeast Asia and work toward better relations with the Soviet Union.

In the mid-1970's, however, there was a definite reduction in domestic political activity and an increase in the pressure exerted by rightwing and openly militaristic forces, striving to change "national priorities" in the opposite direction--in the direction of a U.S. foreign policy resting on military strength, the escalation of military spending and the disruption of SALT. This tendency, which was already evident during the Ford Administration and had grown much stronger by the end of the Carter Administration, reached its peak when Ronald Reagan entered the White House. The present administration is not only carrying out an arms program of unprecedented scales, but has also made unprecedented cuts in civilian programs, particularly social ones. This revision of "national priorities" has given the antiwar movement new momentum and has increased social protest in the nation. This is why we must agree with the author's conclusion that the 1980's could become, just as the late 1960's and early 1970's did, a period of struggle by the broad laboring masses in the United States for changes in government domestic policy, the limitation of the arms race and the revision of "national priorities." This idea makes N. A. Dolgoplova's book particularly pertinent.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1983

8588

CSO: 1803/10

U.S. INFORMATION, TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY CRITICIZED

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 5, May 83 (signed to press 15 Apr 83) pp 120-127

[Article by M. V. Ven'yaminova: "U.S. Information Expansion"]

[Text] The Western powers, with the United States in the lead, are striving to undermine the political independence of the liberated states, which has been attained by more than 90 countries since World War II, by various means. The export of information, accompanied and facilitated by the export of a philosophy and way of life, became one of the spheres of acute battles, particularly between the developed capitalist states and the developing countries. Big corporations in the sphere of information control the training of specialists, impose the advertising system of media financing on developing countries and sell them informational materials at low prices in an attempt to mold the lifestyle of the consumers of these products. Furthermore, the fact that information activity is conducted primarily by private enterprises is being used to maximum advantage by the governments of imperialist countries. This allows them, on the one hand, to transmit information aimed at specific political goals through private channels and, on the other, to escape international accountability for the activity of these enterprises by pleading their "independence."

Political, economic and social problems connected with the development of the mass media are being hotly debated in the United Nations and its specialized agencies, particularly UNESCO. The developing states are taking an increasingly perceptible part in these debates now that they have coordinated their efforts in the movement for nonalignment and can rely on the support of the socialist countries. At the same time, the position taken in these debates by the Western states, headed by the United States, is becoming increasingly rigid. The American administration's increasing "intransigence" in matters connected with information is due to the sharply augmented influence of the mass media on the economic, political and social aspects of life in each country and on international relations in general.

According to UNESCO data, more than half of the employed population in the most highly developed capitalist countries is already involved directly or indirectly in the production and distribution of information.¹

In the United States more than 50 percent of the labor force is employed in one way or another in the sphere of information, and experts predict that the figure could reach 85 percent before the end of the 1980's.

The growth rates of "information potential" can be illustrated by the example of North America: Whereas expenditures on telephone and telex systems in this part of the world totaled 14.2 billion dollars in 1977, preliminary estimates put the figure at 19.2 billion in 1982, and the projected figure for 1987 is 25.9 billion.² The number of radios per 1,000 inhabitants rose here from 688 in 1960 to 1,372 in 1979; 4.5 million American families watched television in 1950, 45 million watched in 1965 and the figure in 1980 was over 80 million.³

The information industry, including equipment, spare parts, special paper and so forth, now ranks second among U.S. industries in terms of export volume.⁴ The value of this industry's exports in 1980 was 30 billion dollars. Fabulous profits are being earned by American corporations manufacturing the latest technical information media (IBM alone produced 70 percent of all the computers in the capitalist world in 1980) and by advertising agencies.⁵ The owners of the American mass media attach great significance to advertising: For example, advertising costs in the United States in 1979 fell just short of 50 million dollars (this is almost double the combined advertising expenditures of the five other major Western countries).⁶

An important feature of the American mass media is the participation of the military-industrial complex in the production and distribution of news. The convergence of military-industrial concerns with newspaper, magazine and publishers' associations (or "chains") began in the late 1960's and early 1970's. Furthermore, U.S. ruling circles have actively promoted the military-industrial complex' participation in informational propaganda activity. In particular, a special group was set up in 1974 with F. Stanton as its head. He is known for his connections with military-industrial circles (he has been chairman of the board of the RAND Corporation, founded with American Air Force funds, the president of the executive committee of Radio Free Europe, the president of the CBS Corporation and the chairman of the Advisory Committee on Information). The Stanton Group was one of the initiators of the idea of reorganizing the information-propaganda network, which was implemented in 1978 when the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) and State Department Office of Educational and Cultural Affairs were united in a new agency--the American Agency for Information and Cultural Exchange, which was later renamed the International Communication Agency (ICA) and then regained its earlier name, the USIA, in the second half of 1982. The main purpose of this reorganization was the consolidation of the bonds connecting government agencies with private channels of information.

The main components of the U.S. system of foreign policy propaganda are now the USIA, with its mouthpiece, the Voice of America, and the Board for International Broadcasting, which oversees the CIA's Radio Liberty--Radio Free Europe (RL-RFE) center in Munich. The plan to establish a subversive radio station for broadcasts to Cuba is in its final stages.

The Reagan Administration regards the supervision of all information production and distribution as one of the main functions of its policy. It made major

personnel changes in the USIA and the Voice of America (the USIA director is now W. Wick from the "Reagan team" and the director of Voice of America is C. Tomlinson, one of the people who were christened with the short word "ultra" in the United States; the recently appointed director of RL-RFE, J. Buckley, and Chairman F. Shakespeare of the Board for International Broadcasting belong to the group of ultra-rightwing ideologists of the "caveman" brand of anticommunism"); allocations for the mass media were increased. The USIA (at that time known as the International Communication Agency) received 500 million dollars in fiscal year 1981 (an increase of 87 million).⁷ This year USIA expenditures will total 644 million dollars, and the draft 1984 budget for the foreign policy propaganda network envisages USIA allocations of 711.4 million dollars. The Voice of America will receive 250 million dollars in fiscal 1983, and in the next 5 years an entire billion dollars will be allocated for the "technical modernization" of this U.S. radio center, according to its director.

Three State Department offices, overseen by an assistant secretary of state, are in charge of mass information affairs. Some congressional committees are engaged expressly in the elaboration of the American position in the sphere of information.

Therefore, three basic components of power over American mass information media--the government, the military-industrial complex and the private sector--have displayed increasingly close interaction, as a result of which the concentration of power in this area has totally refuted the thesis of the so-called "independent" mass media.

The American Policy of Hegemonism in the Sphere of Information

The activities of American private information corporations and official or semiofficial mass media are virtually unbound by any kind of international legal standards, despite the demands of an increasing number of states, including demands voiced within specialized UN organizations, that such standards be drafted and made compulsory for the entire international community. These demands have grown louder as the U.S. monopolies and mass media have expanded further into the international information market. Their activity has clearly displayed a tendency to transmit more misinformation than information and to use the sphere of information for "psychological warfare" against the developing and socialist countries. This aim of the operations of the American mass media was frankly admitted just last May by F. Nicolaides, then the deputy director of Voice of America: "We must destabilize the Soviet Union and its allies by driving a wedge between these people and their governments."

This function of the activities of the American mass media is quite clearly apparent in the intensive broadcasts to Poland, the length of which has recently tripled.

Allocations for foreign policy propaganda were already raised by the previous administration (by 100 million dollars), and 28 new powerful radio stations were founded during that time, most of them for broadcasts to the socialist states. The Reagan Administration has displayed even greater interest in the

mass media transmitting foreign policy propaganda to the socialist countries. Through its efforts, the RL-RFE radio station received 44 million dollars for modernization between 1976 and 1981 and obtained 23 new 100- and 250-kilowatt transmitters, which have doubled its broadcasting power (to 7,500 kilowatts).⁸

Washington's efforts to impose its own political, economic and ideological dominion on people at any cost have been evident in U.S. relations with developing states. American news agencies account for two-thirds of the news transmitted in the non-socialist world. In Latin America UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL (UPI) and ASSOCIATED PRESS (AP) supply the region with more than 70 percent of all the international news published in newspapers.⁹ According to A. Smith, the director of the London Institute of Cinematography and the author of several books and publications on the mass media, more than half of the television programs in Chile, 34 percent in Colombia, 62 percent in Uruguay and 84 percent in Guatemala are American in origin. According to UNESCO data, at least half of the programs in the developing states with television are imported, and around 70 percent of the imported programs are produced in North America.¹⁰

The United States is the leading exporter of films. Movies made in the United States account for up to 50 percent of the movies shown, measured in screening time, in some countries. On the whole, according to some statistics, American movies absorb 80 percent of all world screening time, and even 90 percent in Thailand.

The structure of the mass media in Latin America and their role in the life of this region are colored primarily by the factor of U.S. domination of the sphere of information and communications in South America for decades. The situation is the same in other parts of the Third World (with the sole difference that the United States is competing here with other developed Western states). Washington plans, for example, to augment the capacity of American radio transmitters in the Philippines, Liberia and Egypt. The further expansion of the Voice of America's broadcasting range with the aid of a communication satellite is also planned. Plans for the improvement of the technical base of Voice of America envisage the erection of a huge (2,500 kilowatts) transmitter on the West Coast of the United States to send programs to Asia. Broadcasts to Iran, Afghanistan, India, the Middle East and Africa are being intensified.

Plans are being made for direct television broadcasting through satellites from the United States to TV sets in any part of the world. The aim is the more extensive and intensive advertising of the American way of life through the incorporation of technical innovations.

The activities of Western private information corporations in the international arena are regulated primarily by the law of commercial advantage. But the imperialist mass media are hoping for more than profits when they seek access to the information markets of other countries. According to University of California Professor H. Schiller, "although economic considerations lie at the basis of cultural penetration, the influence of this phenomenon extends far beyond the profit hunger of a handful of huge and influential press and

television monopolies and cultural conglomerates.... Activity leading to cultural domination begins with economic actions, but this does not diminish the influence on the cultural climate of the penetrated country."¹¹

American information corporations are striving to control virtually the entire process of information and cultural exchange with their partners, including the large Western powers. Washington is now taking steps to integrate the information services of the NATO countries, which will effectively turn them into branches of USIA.¹²

The cultural-informational products made in the United States have penetrated deeply into Western Europe and other developed capitalist countries (Canada, Japan, etc.). This is a direct result of the application of the principle of "free enterprise" in this field.

American film distribution firms are particularly powerful. The American movie industry makes appearances in Europe in various forms and under various names. In the FRG, for example, American firms operate as independent branches but in Italy and France they are more likely to operate as partners in local production.

The development of television in Western Europe has made it the focus of considerable attention from the United States. As a result, in France, for example, the proportion accounted for by national TV programs decreased from 70 percent to 23 percent between 1967 and 1979, and 80 percent of the foreign programs were made in the United States.¹³ In Western Europe as a whole, almost one-third of the TV programs are produced in America.

The West European market has been inundated with American comics, books, records and cassettes.

A dependent relationship can also be seen in the activities of the major news agencies. For example, the process has gone so far in the FRG that the UPI and DPA have agreed that UPI will supply international news and DPA will be the supplier of news from the FRG. Whatever one agency reports is picked up by the other; whatever one agency chooses to ignore is of no consequence to the other.¹⁴

Canada is also dependent on the United States in the sphere of culture and information. Interrelations with the Canadian market have recently been the object of particularly close attention by American culture and information merchants. This market, as the most profitable and convenient one, has been completely taken over by the American mass media: The English-language press and radio depend largely on the United States for international news; TIME and READER'S DIGEST (New York) have put down such deep roots in the Canadian mass media that they enjoyed the status of Canadian news organs for a long time and, on the strength of their circulation figures (500,000 and 1.5 million respectively), pocketed more than 50 percent of the funds spent in Canada on magazine advertising; 60 percent of the Canadian population receives American television programs. And this is all occurring in spite of the fact that the Canadian mass media are protected by legislation against foreign competition. The

majority of the population has had a negative reaction to U.S. expansion in Canadian spiritual life. Canada's dependence on U.S. information monopolies motivated the Canadian minister of communications to create a select committee (the Klein Committee) in 1978 to study the effect of telecommunications on national sovereignty. The committee concluded that protective measures had to be taken against the saturation of the information market with American products.¹⁵

French author J. Thibau states that the American mass media were able during years of expansion in many parts of the world to mold "some kind of average individual needing American cultural products (regardless of whether they are produced directly in the United States or in another country, as long as they correspond to the American model)."¹⁶

The Struggle Over the New International Information Order

In addition to the direct penetration of foreign markets by the American mass media, U.S. information expansion is also accomplished through international organizations. This has been particularly evident in recent years in the struggle that broke out in UNESCO and other specialized UN agencies over the establishment of a new international information order (NIIO).

The idea of the NIIO was set forth in 1976 in Colombo (Sri Lanka) at a conference of the heads of state and government of nonaligned countries. Along with the new international economic order, the NIIO is regarded by its supporters as an important and integral part of the total reorganization of contemporary international relations. The focus of this idea is the struggle for national sovereignty and democratization in the sphere of information, and against colonialism and its relics. In their demands for a new information order, the developing countries have been actively supported by the socialist countries, which are prepared to give the liberated states concrete assistance in the creation of their own systems of mass news and communications media.

The Western countries, especially the United States, had an extremely negative reaction to the demands of the developing countries for the NIIO. This negative stance became stronger after the 20th Session of the UNESCO General Conference in Paris in 1978 adopted a declaration on the basic principles of the contribution of mass news media to the consolidation of peace and international understanding, the development of human rights and the struggle against racism, apartheid and the instigation of war. The declaration is significant because it was essentially the first document of a major UN organization devoted expressly to mass information problems. In this document, which was adopted on the initiative of the socialist countries, moral obligations are assigned to the mass media of all states for the first time in international practice and their responsibility to establish mutual understanding between peoples is discussed. The declaration applauds "the free, broader and more balanced transmission of information" but states that the activities of the mass media should be regulated by definite legal standards. The regulation of information flows, according to representatives of the developing countries, should promote the more effective selection of information received from the United States and other imperialist states.

Representatives of the United States, as J. Conkling told a House committee in 1981 when he was the director of Voice of America, discerned a "fundamental contradiction between the proposal regarding the international regulation of information" and the American "concept of freedom of the press." It was precisely on the pretext of defending "freedom of the press" that the United States waged a struggle against the declaration's demands for the democratization of the mass media and the limitation of the expansionist activity of multinational information corporations at the 21st Session of the UNESCO General Conference in Belgrade in 1980. The American delegation vehemently opposed all measures connected with changes in existing procedures in the information sphere, particularly during the drafting of resolutions aimed at implementing the principles of the 1978 declaration. The discussion of the final report of a UNESCO international commission of communication problems, headed by S. MacBride, the Irishman who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize and the International Lenin Prize "For the Consolidation of Peace Among Peoples," occupied an important place on the agenda of the forum. The report contained recommendations on the establishment of the NIIO, which evoked loud objections in the headquarters of "information imperialism" because it wants the unimpeded implementation of the concept of the "free flow of information."

The essence of this concept was probably set forth most clearly during a colloquium in May 1981 in the French village of Talloires, convened by the so-called International Committee for Freedom of the Press, headquartered in Washington, and the Edward R. Murrow Center of Taft University. It was a gathering of representatives of many Western information organizations upset by the turn of events at the 20th and 21st Sessions of the UNESCO General Conference. The United States was represented by the organizers of the conference and by the Inter-American Press Institute, American Association of Newspaper Publishers, North American Federation of Radio Broadcasting Companies and the AP and UPI agencies.

In the "Talloires Declaration" adopted at the conference, participants subjected UNESCO efforts to establish the NIIO to harsh criticism, declared their disagreement with the basic premises of the 1978 UNESCO declaration on the mass media and made their own views on the international exchange of information public.¹⁷ The basic features of these relations, according to this document, should be the following: total freedom for the West in the interpretation of world events and media-aided influence on the internal affairs of other countries; the non-acceptance of any kind of international legal standards in the sphere of information.

The editor of the WASHINGTON STAR proposed that "free news organs" order their governments to withdraw from UNESCO if it does not accept the West's terms. But this proposal was not supported by representatives of other countries.

American bourgeois press organs, which did not conceal the fact that the Talloires conference was conceived as a means of counteracting UNESCO plans to create the NIIO and was the first step toward the "coordination of Western strategy and tactics in UNESCO," gave the results of the conference extensive coverage. The U.S. mass media advised American diplomacy to seize the initiative in the discussion of the NIIO and continue the offensive from the stand agreed upon in Talloires.

Certain steps in this direction were taken by the U.S. Senate. It approved the draft resolutions of Senators J. Quayle and D. Moynihan which declared that the United States resolutely rejects the UNESCO attempts to regulate the content of news; they propose a "penalty" in the form of the confiscation of 25 percent of the U.S. contribution to the UNESCO budget if these funds are used for measures which "restrict freedom of information." After lengthy debates, the House of Representatives approved R. Byrd's amendment on the total curtailment of these contributions "if this organization takes any steps against freedom of the press."¹⁸

It must be said that the struggle against the NIIO is only part of the broad campaign against UNESCO¹⁹ that has been going on in the United States for several years. The extent to which the possibility of the NIIO disturbs the American mass media is evident in a report published by the National News Council, which is supposed to oversee the observance of professional ethics by newspapers.

The council researchers examined 448 signed articles and 206 editorials from newspapers in all American states (around 80 percent were articles by AP and UPI reporters) and concluded that not one of the articles on the 21st Session of the UNESCO General Conference, which lasted 6 weeks, mentioned a single report, speech or resolution on such basic areas of UNESCO activity as its struggle against illiteracy, preservation of historical monuments, training of scientists and engineers and financing of fundamental research in food production, oceanography, power engineering and many other fields. Information and communications policy, on the other hand, was discussed in detail in 173 articles and 181 editorials; 158 items were written in an extremely hostile tone, and 27 newspaper expressly advised the United States to withdraw from UNESCO if this organization continues to take actions regarded in the United States as infringements of freedom of the press.²⁰

In recent years, the AP and UPI agencies alone have distributed more than 400 items through their channels in which an attempt is made to prove that the NIIO demands to make the mass media accountable to the public to some degree and to eradicate existing inequalities in the sphere of information and communications "are not in the interest of the developing countries." The advocates of "freedom of the press" suggested that repressive actions be taken against UNESCO and that its instructions be ignored. The demand for the withdrawal of the United States from UNESCO has become almost the dominant theme of the struggle against positive changes in this organization.

More sophisticated and subtle tactics are being worked out in the United States to compel the international community, especially the developing countries, to accept the terms dictated by Americans without running the risk of direct conflicts. In particular, in addition to elaborating harsher criticism of the idea of the NIIO, U.S. information monopolies are working out a so-called "technological approach" to this idea, which consists essentially in attempts to attach the developing countries to Western information systems for rewards in the form of financial and technological assistance. For example, L. Sussman, the director of the so-called "Freedom House," headquartered in New York, has advised the West to pressure the developing countries into accepting the concept of "free flow of information." According to his article in the WALL STREET

JOURNAL, an unofficial group of representatives of 20-30 countries in North America, Western Europe, Asia and the Pacific is working within UNESCO to preserve the status quo in the sphere of information. Sussman suggests that this group publicly announce that technical assistance will be given to developing countries only if they accept the terms dictated by their Western partners in information exchange. He insists that the 20 million dollars previously allocated to UNESCO by the United States and several other developed countries for assistance in the development of communications media in the Third World be confiscated. He proposes the use of the confiscated sum for the selective (without UNESCO participation) assistance of countries agreeing to Western terms.²¹

In this way, technical aid to the developing countries in the area of news and communication media is to be used as payment for political and ideological concessions.

During the fourth special session of the UNESCO General Conference, held in Paris from 29 November through 3 December 1982 in connection with the adoption of the organization's latest medium-range plan for 1984-1989, the expansionist aims of U.S. representatives became even more apparent. Even during the preparations for the session, American representatives were already trying to influence the position of Western states and the line of UNESCO Director General A. M. M'Bow (Senegal) in matters pertaining to information. During the working meetings preceding the session, the United States suggested, both behind the scenes and during open debates of the draft plan, that the world community grant total freedom to the information corporations which are striving to absorb young news agencies in the developing countries and saturate the markets of developing and developed capitalist states with their products. Past U.S. participation in UNESCO activity indicates that the Americans will even resort to political and financial blackmail in order to attain this goal.

The United States is also trying to secure the "free flow of information" with the aid of the International Program for the Development of Communications, drawn up within the UNESCO framework to strengthen the independence of the developing states in the sphere of communications and information. Violating the charter of UNESCO as an intergovernmental organization acting through government channels, the United States is trying to concentrate aid to developing countries in the private sector and to thereby divest UNESCO of control over its own program.²²

Washington apparently cannot accept the fact that UNESCO activity as a whole has been based on anti-imperialist principles for several years due to the efforts of the socialist countries and the active struggle of the developing states for their independence. American representatives tried to include the maximum number of phrases like "free flow of information" in the final document of the special session, and exclude all references to the NIIO and to the role of the mass news media in the struggle for peace and the frustration of attempts to incite war. They insisted that news media should not be subject to control and objected to governmental regulation in this area.

The socialist countries and the overwhelming majority of developing states resolutely opposed the basic theses put forth by the West, with the United States in the lead.

The recent failures of American diplomacy in UNESCO have forced several U.S. politicians to conclude that the domination of this organization by the United States, which was characteristic of the initial stage of UNESCO activity, is now impossible and can never be restored.

FOOTNOTES

1. "UNESCO. Draft Medium-Range Plan (1984-1989). 4XC/4. General Conference. Fourth Special Session," Paris, 1982, pt 3015.
2. UNESCO Document CC-80/Conf.212/4, p 11.
3. "UNESCO. Cultural Statistics and Cultural Development. A World Statistical Survey of Some Media as Cultural Development Support, Prepared on the Occasion of MONDIACULT," Paris, 1982, p 16; T. White, "America in Search of Itself," N.Y., 1982, p 165.
4. "Communications in the Twenty-First Century," edited by R. Haigh, G. Gerbner and R. Byrne, N.Y., 1981, pp 37, 39.
5. A. Smith, "The Geopolitics of Information. How Western Culture Dominates the World," N.Y., 1980.
6. JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (Columbia University), Fall 1981--Winter 1982, p 183.
7. A. Vlasov, "Politicheskiye manipulyatsii (istoriya i praktika sredstv massovoy informatsii SShA)" [Political Manipulation (The History and Practices of the U.S. Mass Media)], Moscow, 1982, p 278.
8. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 12 December 1982.
9. TIME, 6 October 1980, p 24.
10. "UNESCO. Ends and Means of Establishing a New International Order in the Sphere of Communications," International Commission on Communication Affairs, Paris, 1980, p 5.
11. H. Schiller, The Mind Managers," Moscow, 1980, pp 211-212.
12. L. Zamyatin, "Detente and Anti-Detente," LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 29 September 1982.
13. J. Thibau, "La France colonisee," Paris, 1980, p 91.
14. E. Carlebach and F. Noll, "Die Meldung als Waffe," Frankfurt am Main, 1982.
15. "Communications in the Twenty-First Century," p 185.

16. J. Thibau, Op. cit., p 112.
17. "Voices of Freedom. A World Conference of Independent News Media. Working Papers," Talloires, 15-17 May 1981.
18. DIPLOMATIC WORLD BULLETIN, 16 November 1981.
19. For more detail, see V. L. Roshchin, "American Diplomacy in UNESCO," SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA, 1981, No 10.
20. LE MONDE, 18 March 1981.
21. THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, 16 June 1981.
22. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 20 January 1982.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA--ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1983

8588

CSO: 1803/10

- END -