

144087

JPRS 83119

23 March 1983

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1388

SELECTIONS FROM SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY JOURNALS

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

19990813 097

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

5
44
Aφ3

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 83119

23 March 1983

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1388

SELECTIONS FROM SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY JOURNALS



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

23 March 1983

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1388

SELECTIONS FROM SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY JOURNALS

CONTENTS

Contents, Articles From Soviet Journal (RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, Sep-Oct 82).....	1
Information on Authors (RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, Sep-Oct 82).....	3
Forces Opposing U.S., Dictatorships in Latin America Surveyed (Ye. D. Stroganova; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, Sep-Oct 82).....	5
Book on Ideology of National Liberation Movements Reviewed (S. N. Alitovskiy; RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, Sep-Oct 82).....	20
Weinberger Influence on U.S. Defense Policy Examined (Melor Sturua; ZNAMYA, Dec 82).....	28

CONTENTS, ARTICLES FROM SOVIET JOURNAL

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 5, Sep-Oct 82 pp 107-114, 176-180

[Table of Contents, Information on Authors, and Articles From Journal RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR, No 5, 1982]

[Text] Table of Contents

M. P. Trenov. The Food Program--An Overall Approach	3
TOWARD THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FORMATION OF THE USSR	
J. Jackson. The Light of Lenin's Ideas	12
P. I. Batov. Under the Banner of Internationalism	20
K. Yu. Matskyavichyus. The Problems of International Socialist Competition	29
THE SITUATION AND STRUGGLE OF THE WORKING CLASS IN THE DEVELOPED CAPITALIST COUNTRIES	
N. I. Latitskiy. Contemporary Unemployment: The Social and Psychological Aspects	36
E. S. Kul'pin and V. A. Sycheva. Problems of Foreign Labor Power in Western Europe	46
A. F. Khramtsov. The FRG: The Working Class in the Present-Day Anti-War Movement	54
B. M. Maklyarskiy. The Environmental Protection Movement: New Frontiers	66
M. M. Panteleyev. Workers in France's Political Parties System .	77
The Strike Movement in the Developed Capitalist Countries: 1981-The First Half of 1982 (Analytic Review)	88
THE WORKING CLASS OF THE ASIAN, AFRICAN, AND LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES	
Yu. I. Gvozdev. Latin America: Offensive Against Workers' Rights	102
Ye. D. Stroganova. The Role of Solidarity in the Struggle of the Revolutionary Forces of Latin America	107
V. M. Tzhela. The Struggle of the Communist Party of Colombia for the Unity of the Working Class	115
S. S. Novikov. The Working Class and the Workers' Movement in Zambia in the 1970s	120

TRADE UNIONS IN THE MODERN WORLD

- V. V. Natalukha. The Struggle of Trade Unions for the Establishment of Democratic Control Over the TNK [Transnational Corporation] . 125

COMMUNICATIONS

- O. G. Nagornyak. From the Practice of the Introduction of an Advanced Form of Labor Organization Stimulation 137

* * *

- B. P. Tichkov. Contradictions in the Training of Highly Qualified Cadres in the United States 143
A. M. Kukharchuk. France: New Workers' Rights in Production . . . 148
G. I. Luk'yanova. Strike at the "Citroen" Company 152
A. V. Kuz'mishchev. Honduras: The Domestic Political Situation and Progressive Changes in the Structure of the Trade Unions . . 156

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

- V. V. Prozorovskiy. At a Conference in the Institute of Marxism-Leninism at the CPSU Central Committee 160
V. S. Pisklov. Trade Unions for Trade and Economic Cooperation and Social Progress in Peacetime 165
T. Ye. Yarkho. Garibaldi's Revolutionary Legacy 174

CRITICISM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- S. A. Alitovskiy. Class and the National in the Ideology of the National Liberation Movement (Joint Work of the Orientologists of the USSR and GDR) 176
A. S. Akhiyezer. Problems of Ecology--From the Point of View of the Working Class 180
L. S. Yershova. A Monograph About Pakistan's Proletariat 183
A. Ye. Yefremov. Political Extremism--A Tool of Reaction 185

- BOOKS IN BRIEF 188

- Information About Authors 190
Contents in English 191

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1982

2959

CSO: 1807/106

INFORMATION ON AUTHORS

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNIY MIR in Russian No 5, Sep-Oct 82 p 190

[Information on authors of articles]

[Text]

Trunov, Mikhail Petrovich	-- First Secretary of the CPSU Belgorod Obkom, Member of the CPSU Central Committee, Deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet
Jackson, James	-- Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States
Batov, Pavel Ivanovich	-- General of the Army, Twice Hero of the Soviet Union
Matskyavichyus, Kazimeras Yuozovich	-- Secretary of the AUCCTU
Lapitskiy, Mark Isaakovich	-- Candidate in Historical Sciences, Senior Scientific Associate at the Institute of the International Workers' Movement of the USSR Academy of Sciences
Kul'tin, Eduard Salmanovich	-- Candidate in Historical Sciences, Senior Scientific Associate at the Institute of the International Workers' Movement of the USSR Academy of Sciences
Sycheva, Viktoriya Alekseyevna	-- Scientific Associate at the Institute of the International Workers' Movement (IMRD) of the USSR Academy of Sciences
Khramtsov, Aleksandr Fedorovich	-- Candidate in Historical Sciences, Senior Scientific Associate at the IMRD of the USSR Academy of Sciences
Maklyarskiy, Boris Mikhaylovich	-- Candidate in Economic Sciences, Senior Scientific Associate at the IMRD of the USSR Academy of Sciences

Panteleyev, Mikhail Mikhaylovich	-- Aspirant at the Institute of the World Economy and of International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences
Gvozdev, Yuriy Ivanovich	-- International Affairs Journalist
Stroganova, Yelena Dmitriyevna	-- Candidate in Historical Sciences, Scientific Associate of the IMRD of the USSR Academy of Sciences
Pchela, Vasiliy Mikhaylovich	-- International Affairs Journalist
Novikov, Sergey Savel'yevich	-- Aspirant at the Institute of Africa of the USSR Academy of Sciences
Natalukha, Valentin Vasil'yevich	-- Candidate in Economic Sciences, Studio Chief at the Diplomatic Academy of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1982

2959

CSO: 1807/106

FORCES OPPOSING U.S., DICTATORSHIPS IN LATIN AMERICA SURVEYED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MİR in Russian No 5, Sep-Oct 82 pp 107-114

[Article by Ye. D. Stroganova: "The Role of Unified Actions in the Struggle of Latin America's Revolutionary Forces"]

[Text] The conflict between the forces of reaction and the forces of progress is acquiring in the contemporary epoch an increasingly global character, especially in recent years when American imperialism has become much more aggressive. It was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress: "Adventurism, and the readiness to gamble with the vital interests of mankind in the name of one's own narrow selfish purposes--this is what lays itself especially bare in the politics of imperialism's most aggressive circles."¹

The politics of the United States government during the last years of the Carter Presidency, and especially after the accession to power of the Reagan Administration whose tone is being supplied by the most militaristic and belligerent circles of America's ruling classes has been a graphic example of the increased expansion of American imperialism. Calling attention to the serious consequences of this for the peoples of the world, L. I. Brezhnev noted that it "has already led to a considerable increase in international tensions with all of the dangerous consequences which follow from this."² During the time which has passed since the congress this danger has become even greater. Under these circumstances, only the joint and active united actions of the broad progressive forces are capable of defeating the intrigues of reaction and imperialism. The international responsibility of every participant in the anti-imperialist struggle for the fate of the revolutionary process on a world-wide scale is increasing correspondingly. In this connection, R. Arismendi has stated: "The fiercer and the more brazen the policies of the imperialists become, the more resolutely and actively must we seek the unity of all of the opponents of imperialism."³ The international solidarity of the proletariat and the unity of action of its various detachments plays a leading role in this struggle.

International solidarity is exercising a substantial influence on the development of the liberation movement in Latin America. The strongest positions here are held by American imperialism which holds sway over the economies of these countries and which is attempting to keep the Latin American republics under its political influence, to crush the liberation movement on the continent, and to put the countries of the region in the service of its aggressive global

aspirations. American imperialism finds its support in Latin America in the local bourgeois and landowner oligarchy which is closely connected with foreign capital.

A grave situation in the region has been created by the general offensive of the forces of imperialism, reaction, and fascism which began in the first half and in the middle of the 1970s and has led to serious defeats of the liberation movement in a number of Latin American countries. The counter-revolutionary military-fascist coup of 11 September 1973 in Chile was the culmination of this offensive. Toward the second half of the 1970s more than one-half of the territory of Latin America was under the control of fascist and terrorist pro-imperialist regimes (Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, Bolivia, Paraguay, Nicaragua, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Haiti). Reaction has become more active in other countries also. The process of progressive anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchy transformations in Peru was halted and replaced in 1976 by an attack upon the living conditions and rights of the workers and by appeasement of American imperialism and the oligarchy. In the countries in which reaction has been victorious the working class and the democratic forces have incurred heavy losses and have found themselves in a difficult position. By helping to strengthen the positions of international reaction the offensive by the imperialist, reactionary, and fascist forces in Latin America also contained a threat for the peoples of other areas of the world.

Under these conditions, the question of the necessity of organizing active joint unified actions by the working class and the popular masses and by all of the progressive and democratic forces of various countries arose with especial sharpness, determining the scope of the solidarity movement with the struggle of the peoples of Chile and of other countries against reaction and imperialism and for democracy.

On the eve of the 1980s American imperialism's reactionary policy in Latin America, and, above all, in Central America and the Caribbean where a powerful new upsurge of the liberation struggle had taken place began to acquire the features of an increasingly open crude armed intervention with the purpose of drowning the peoples' movements in El Salvador and Guatemala in blood, overthrowing the progressive governments in Nicaragua and Granada, and creating an atmosphere of tension and threats around socialist Cuba. The interventionist policy of the United States government and, especially, of the Reagan Administration which has resurrected at the end of the 20th century the policy of the "big stick" is fraught with the danger of direct United States military intervention and the inflaming of a hot-bed of war in this region and bears a threat to the entire liberation movement of the peoples of Latin America and to peace as a whole. For this reason, the organization of a resolute rebuff to the actions of the United States and the providing of the broadest and most effective solidarity aid to the peoples of El Salvador, Nicaragua, Granada, Guatemala, and other Latin American countries has recently acquired paramount importance for the fate of the liberation struggle of the Latin American peoples.

The existence of a common enemy in the person of American imperialism and the tasks of the anti-imperialist struggle and of the struggle for social progress are bringing together the liberation movement of the Latin American peoples and the struggle of the peoples of the developing countries of Asia and Africa, and are serving as a solid foundation for their mutual solidarity and for the unification of their efforts.

At the same time, the working class and the progressive forces of Latin America also have much in common with the struggle of the workers of the developed capitalist countries of Western Europe and North America against the dictates of American imperialism, against the multinational corporations, against capitalist oppression, and for peace, democracy, and socialism. All of this is creating the basis for wide mass solidarity actions with the peoples of Latin America by the peoples of other continents.

The movement for solidarity with the Chilean people and against the evil deeds of the military fascist junta took on a broad and truly world character in the 1970s. The USSR and the other socialist countries and the communist parties, trade unions, and other public organizations of these countries were the leading force of this movement. They broke all relations with the Chilean junta and made persistent efforts on the international arena to condemn and isolate the junta and to organize aid for the Chilean patriots. Mass demonstrations and meetings, solidarity strikes, and "protest weeks" took place in many countries of the western and eastern hemispheres. Everywhere committees for solidarity with the people of Chile began to be created and these committees organized help for the victims of terror and collected money for an aid fund for the Chilean democrats.

Latin American communists issued appeals condemning the Chilean junta and summoned the workers to struggle. All of the continent's basic trade union centers actively participated in the organization of solidarity manifestations by the workers. The movement was supported not only by regional trade union associations--the Permanent Congress for the Trade Union Unity of the Workers of Latin America (PCTUWLA) and the Latin American Workers' Trade Union Center (LAWTUC),--but also by the WFTU, the International Conference of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), the World Confederation of Labor (WCL), and the national trade union centers of many countries.

Along with the working class, the solidarity movement was joined by employees, students, representatives of the Church, all of the left and democratic parties, and also by a number of influential bourgeois parties, with the result that an extraordinarily wide spectrum of social and political forces was brought into union. As a result of pressure from within, the governments of many countries interrupted or halted diplomatic, economic, and other relations with the Chilean junta. In keeping with a proposal by international trade union associations, every year since 1974 a "Solidarity Week" with the people of Chile is held from 4 through 11 September. The Chilean junta was subjected to severe censure in the UN Commission on Human Rights, in the UN Economic and Social Council, in UNESCO, in the World Labor Organization, and in other

international organizations. An International Commission to Investigate the Crimes of the Military Junta in Chile was created and it presented abundant accusatory material against the junta and United States imperialism and called for increased support for the struggle of the Chilean people. Even Pinochet was compelled to admit that the campaign against his government had gripped "the entire world."

Thanks to the solidarity movement in October 1973 L. Corvalan was saved from physical reprisal, and in 1973-1975 thousands of Chilean democrats were saved. In early 1975 a large group of Popular Unity leaders were released from incarceration. "Their liberation," HUMANITE wrote, "is the result of the international solidarity campaign."⁴ The liberation in December 1976 of L. Corvalan, the leader of the Chilean communists, from the junta's torture chambers was a great victory for the progressive forces. In a statement by the Communist Party of Chile in December 1976 it was said in this regard: "The liberation of Comrade Corvalan and of hundreds of political prisoners and dozens of political leaders proves the enormous power of the solidarity movement and bears witness to its broad possibilities for achieving new successes."⁵

However, the attempts by the Chilean junta and its protectors to create by means of maneuvers and partial concessions the appearance of a "normalization" of the situation in Chile and emerge from international isolation did not succeed. Since the fascist character of the regime did not change and the repressions did not stop, the movement for solidarity with the Chilean people received a further development at the end of the 1970s. In February 1978 in many countries there were workers' meetings of solidarity with the working class and people of Chile on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the creation of the UTUCWC--the United Trade Union Center of the Workers of Chile. From that year on it became a tradition to regularly hold analogous measures on a world scale on the occasion of each anniversary of the UTUCWC.

At the end of 1978 the largest international trade union associations--the WFTU, ICFTU, and WCL--jointly called for a boycott of foreign trade with the Chilean junta and a refusal to give it economic, financial, and military aid. The Latin American TCTUWLA, LAWTUC, and ORIT (Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers) supported this appeal. Similar demands were made in March 1979 by the International Federation of Transportation Workers, and then by the Latin American Confederation of Seamen and Port Workers. The port workers of Mexico, Venezuela, and Italy actively carried out this boycott. The support of the workers and peoples of Latin America and of the entire world stimulated the development of a struggle by the Chilean workers themselves against fascism.

Although in 1981 Pinochet clothed his regime in the uniform of state institutions, its essence did not change. Reagan's open support for the Chilean regime made it possible for Pinochet to begin a new wave of repressions against the country's democratic forces. A new solidarity campaign in their defense and against terror began within the country and outside of it.

The Communist Party of Chile came out with a manifesto in which it unmasked the policies of the Pinochet regime and called upon the people to struggle

against it: "We call for the broadest unity of the democratic forces and for all kinds of militant actions in defense of every gain and in support of every demand. We call for the organization of a mighty mass movement based on the use of various forms of struggle, and for the realization by the people of its right to answer reactionary violence with violence."⁶

A "Solidarity Week" with Chile was held under the slogan of condemning the new repressions and the imprisonment of the Chairman of the NK SP [expansion unknown] M. Bustos and the General Secretary A. Guzman solely because they had presented a list of workers' demands. Protests were made by the World Peace Council, the WFTU, and many other international and public organizations from various countries. Representatives of a number of public organizations in Canada, England, and other countries declared their solidarity with Chile's political prisoners. In February 1982 the UN Commission on Human Rights again discussed the matter of repressions and arbitrary rule in Chile.

The broad movement of solidarity with the people of Chile is of enormous importance not only in helping the Chilean people, but also in the struggle against attempts by the forces of reaction to impose a "Chilean" and other "models" like it upon other countries in Latin America.

Evaluating the importance and results of the solidarity movement with the Chilean people, L. Corvalan has written: "Had it not been for the resistance within the country and the condemnation of progressive mankind, the dictatorship's evil deeds would have been measured in an even larger number of victims. Thanks to international solidarity, thousands of human lives were saved, and thousands of prisoners were pulled out of their torture chambers; this solidarity has become an important stimulus in the struggle which the forces of Chilean democracy are waging in the very lair of the fascist beast. The new stage of our peoples' struggle requires, as never before, the unity of all democratic forces and the broadest international solidarity."⁷

The solidarity movement with other peoples of Latin America which have found themselves under the power of reactionary terrorist regimes has also reached substantial proportions. This applies, in particular, to the people of Uruguay where the ruling classes, with the support of American imperialism, brought about a military coup on 27 June 1973 which established a military-civilian dictatorship in the country that gradually took on a fascist character.

The working class and the progressive forces of Latin America and of other countries of the world have shown their solidarity with the struggle of the Uruguayan people against its reactionary dictatorship. The solidarity movement became intensified in May 1974 in connection with the growing cruelty of the repressions in Uruguay and the arrest of the leader of the Uruguayan communists R. Arismendi, the leader of the Broad Front L. Sener'i, and other patriots. Their liberation and an end to the arbitrary rule in Uruguay was demanded by the communists of the region's countries, by trade union centers, representatives of the progressive public, and the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Central America and Mexico (May 1974). In early January 1975 R. Arismendi was set free.

In June 1975 the Havana Conference of Latin American and Caribbean Communist Parties expressed its solidarity with the victims of repression in Uruguay. On the initiative of the WFTU, a Solidarity Day with the people of Uruguay was held on the second anniversary of the coup, 27 June 1975. The World Peace Council, International Labor Organization, trade union and other international organizations, members of Parliament, government officials and politicians, clergymen, prominent members of the intelligentsia led by G. Garcia Marquez, and women and youth organizations came out against the repressions in Uruguay, in support of the Uruguayan Democrats, and for the freeing of L. Sener'i, L. Masser, V. Turyansky, and many other political prisoners.

In December 1978 a "Solidarity Week" with the Uruguayan people took place in Panama. Its participants included the trade unions of Panama, Costa Rica, and Mexico, and also representatives of the WFTU and WCL. The joint declaration which was adopted expressed "full support for the Uruguayan workers, peasants, and popular masses in their stubborn struggle for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship." The declaration demanded "in the name of tens of millions of workers of Latin America" that the Uruguayan government observe human rights, halt its persecutions, and restore the rights of workers and employees. The declaration proposed that the "different continental and national trade union organizations begin a broad campaign in defense of imprisoned Uruguayan trade union officials and hold a day of solidarity on 27 June 1979 with the National Congress of Uruguayan Workers and with the popular masses of this country."⁸

Since that time every year the entire progressive public of the world celebrates 27 June as International Solidarity Day with the people of Uruguay. By the beginning of 1980 the solidarity movement and the struggle of the working masses in Uruguay itself had appreciably weakened the dictatorship. On 30 November 1980 the government, wishing to give its actions a "legal" character, held a "referendum" on the question of adopting a new constitution which had been worked out by it. The majority of the Uruguayan people voted against this constitution and against the dictatorship and its plans, compelling it to make concessions. The country was promised a "political settlement" and "institutionalization," and a new president, General Alvarez, was appointed who promised a gradual return to a constitutional regime and the opening of a "political dialogue." Bourgeois political parties were granted the possibility of limited activity. There was a widely advertised 10 percent wage increase (with the result that it came to 65 percent of the 1971 wage level), some of the most reactionary regulations in the trade union law were removed, and, with great reservations, the right of workers to organize in unions was now recognized. At the same time, feeling the support of the United States, the regime did not give up its repressions against activists of the trade union and democratic movement.

The situation of the people of Paraguay is extremely difficult. Since 1954 it has been under the rule of the odious Stroessner dictatorship which has doomed the country's popular masses to extreme poverty and a complete lack of rights. For a long time thousands of democrats in this country have been behind prison walls and subjected to torture, and many of those who have been

tortured have "disappeared." The leaders of the Paraguayan communists A. Maidan, J. Rojas and A. Alcott were kept in prison for 19 years.

The solidarity movement with Paraguayan patriots became especially strong in the 1970s. Solidarity committees with the Paraguayan people were created in Peru, Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, Argentina, France, Great Britain, Belgium, the United States, and other countries. The struggle for the liberation of Paraguayan prisoners took on a large scope in neighboring Argentina. A "Movement For the Liberation of the Political Prisoners of Paraguay" was created here with the participation of representatives of various parties, trade unions, public organizations, congress deputies, and scientific and cultural figures. On the initiative of the "Movement" and other organizations a mass campaign for the liberation of Paraguayan prisoners was held in Argentina from 10 April through 10 July 1974. The Havana Conference of Communist Parties of the Latin American and Caribbean Countries in June 1975 expressed its solidarity with the "persecuted and arrested patriots of Paraguay."

The WFTU, the World Peace Council, World Festival of Youth and Students, International Association of Jurist-Democrats, the UN Commission for Human Rights, and other international organizations came out in defense of the Paraguayan prisoners. The socialist countries have been taking an active part in this movement for many years. Mass campaigns and meetings expressing solidarity with the Paraguayan patriots were constantly held in the Soviet Union. The socialist countries have persistently struggled and continue to struggle on the international arena for greater international solidarity with the Paraguayan prisoners and for their freedom. As a result of the solidarity movement, in January 1977 A. Maidan, J. Rojas, and A. Alcott were set free. However, in late August 1980 A. Maidan and one of the leaders of the Paraguayan Workers' Movement E. Roja, were tracked down by the dictator Stroessner's personal guard, seized in Argentina, and taken back to Paraguay. Many political and public organizations from various countries have been demanding of the Paraguayan authorities that they observe elementary human rights and free the patriots. It is not accidental that the participants of the 10th World Congress of Trade Unions sent a special protest telegram to Stroessner demanding that A. Maidan whose life and health were being put in great danger be given his freedom.⁹

Support for the struggle of the people and government of Panama against American imperialism and for the return of the Panama Canal Zone which had been seized by the United States in the early 20th century was an important direction of the solidarity movement in Latin America in the 1970s. The communist parties, trade unions, and other workers' organizations of the Latin American countries repeatedly expressed their solidarity with the Panamanian people, demanding that the United States government return the Canal Zone to its genuine owner--Panama. The 1975 Havana Conference gave high praise to the struggle by the Panamanian people against American imperialism. Panama was supported not only by the workers, but also by the governments of a number of Latin American countries: Argentina, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia, Costa Rica--and many countries of the world.

After much procrastination the United States made concessions to Panama and in June 1978 signed a new treaty in accordance with which the Canal Zone was

to be transferred to the jurisdiction of Panama, and after a period of time the canal itself was to become the property of the Panamanian people. This was a great success for the Panamanian people and for all of the anti-imperialist forces of Latin America.

At the present time the fate of the canal is again being put in danger. As is proposed by the document by which Reagan is guiding himself ("A New Inter-American Policy for the 1980s"), the agreements on the canal which were signed by Carter should be discarded, the canal should be put under the control of an Inter-American Council, and Latin American armies should be compelled to participate in a demonstration of force in the Caribbean. The Panamanian government and workers have been compelled to appeal for support to world public opinion as a result of constant violations of the terms of the treaty by the United States.

At the end of the 1970s the heroic struggle of the people of Nicaragua against the region's longest dictatorship--the dictatorship of the Somoza family--became the epicenter of a powerful and broad solidarity movement of the workers and peoples of Latin America. During its 40-year dominion the Somoza regime based itself on the active support of American imperialism, performing true and faithful service for it. The government of Nicaragua had become the bulwark for the most reactionary and retrograde forces in Central America. It actively participated in anti-Cuban campaigns, and threatened Costa Rica in which there was a constitutional regime. For this reason the elimination of the Somoza regime became an important task for the progressive forces not only of Nicaragua, but of the entire region in their struggle against reaction and imperialism.

The solidarity movement with the Nicaraguan people, with the patriots of Nicaragua--the victims of Somoza's repressions--took place until the beginning of the people's revolution in that country. Thus, in June 1975 the Havana Conference of Communists declared its solidarity with the revolutionaries and democrats of Nicaragua. But it reached an especially large scope in 1978-1979, during the decisive period of the struggle of the Nicaraguan patriots, when the danger of direct military intervention by the United States was great. Mass actions by workers in support of the struggling people of Nicaragua took place throughout all of Latin America. In Honduras, in June 1979, thousands of its inhabitants filled the streets of the capitol demanding from their government that it stop giving military aid to Somoza. In Peru demonstrations by many thousands of people blockaded Nicaragua's diplomatic mission, demanding Somoza's resignation. Venezuela's petroleum workers boycotted the Somoza regime. The people of Cuba, Costa Rica, Panama, and other countries collected money for an aid fund for the battling fighters of Nicaragua. Mexico's trade unions sent the Nicaraguan patriots food and medicines.

In a number of countries there was a registration of volunteers who wanted to fight on the side of the Nicaraguan revolutionaries. In Mexico the left parties organized a registration for international detachments in order to help the Sandinista National Liberation Front in the event of foreign intervention. The workers of El Salvador collected and gave the Nicaraguan revolu-

tionaries 10 million dollars to purchase arms and ammunition. Venezuelan workers collected 2 million dollars. The "Victorio Lorenzo" International Brigade from Panama led by Panama's Deputy Minister of Health W. Spafudor who on account of this gave up his government post took active part in the battles in Nicaragua on the side of the Sandinistas. The 16-year-old son of the military and political leader of Panama O. Torrijos fought in the ranks of the brigade. A column of Costa Ricans, "Carlo Luis Fal'yas," led by the communist M. Mora Salas saw action on the southern front in Nicaragua. Mexicans, Salvadorians, men from Honduras, and Colombians fought in the ranks of the Sandanistas.

The broad popular solidarity movement with the Nicaraguan patriots was supported by the governments of many countries. In a special resolution the Chamber of Deputies of the Venezuelan Congress called upon the democratic governments of the continent to support the struggle against Somoza tyranny. The governments of Ecuador and Venezuela announced an end to their aid to the Somoza regime. On 28 May 1979 the presidents of the countries of the Andean Pact--Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia--expressed themselves at a joint meeting in favor of the adoption of the collective measures to halt the bloody terror and protect human rights in Nicaragua. In addition, they offered military assistance to Costa Rica in the event that its borders should be violated by Somoza's National Guard.

When it became clear that the Somoza regime was on the edge of complete collapse the United States government attempted at an extraordinary meeting of the OAS Ministers of Foreign Affairs on 21 June 1979, under the pretext that the events in Nicaragua were taking on an "international character," to obtain a resolution on the introduction into Nicaragua of "collective Inter-American armed forces." In fact, it was a matter of sanctioning armed intervention in Nicaragua under the OAS flag (actually, headed by the United States) in order to prevent a victory by the Nicaraguan revolutionaries. However, this attempt encountered a resolute rebuff by the vast majority of the OAS member countries. The draft resolution was rejected. The OAS expressed itself in favor of "an immediate and absolute replacement of the Somoza regime and the creation of a democratic government." After this Panama, Costa Rica, Peru, Mexico, Brazil, and other Latin American countries recognized the Council for National Regeneration which had been created by the patriots of Nicaragua as the legitimate government of the Nicaraguan people.

The proportions which had been taken on by the movement for international aid to the Nicaraguan people (along with its own revolutionary struggle), and the failure of the United States' plans in the OAS clearly showed that in this area a situation had arisen which had made difficult direct armed intervention by the United States in Nicaragua of the kind which had occurred in the Dominican Republic in 1965. This was a great victory for the Latin American peoples in their anti-imperialist struggle. As F. Castro said, "Around the struggle of the Sandinistas there secretly developed what we might call a broad, democratic, anti-imperialist, liberation front in Latin America."¹⁰ This is the fundamental importance of the solidarity movement with the patriots of Nicaragua.

The movement against the rotten Somoza regime encountered wide support beyond the confines of Latin America from the socialist countries, the world proletariat, democratic forces, and international organizations.

The solidarity movement with the people of Nicaragua provided great help to the Nicaraguan revolutionaries at a decisive moment by ensuring them favorable conditions for their victory, isolating the Somoza regime, and preventing attempts at intervention by the United States and the pro-imperialist forces in Central America. The latter circumstance is especially important: for the second time after Cuba it was possible to have a victory by a popular anti-imperialist revolution in a small country in the immediate vicinity of the citadel of world imperialism.

With the victory of the revolution the solidarity movement with the struggle against Somoza turned into an aid movement for the Nicaraguan people in the restoration of the country and the building of a new society, and in preventing any danger for the revolution from without. As early as four days after the victory of the revolution, on 23 July 1979, the Communist Party of Mexico stated: "As in the past, during the time of the struggle against Somoza, today we Mexican communists state our determination to provide every possible assistance to the Nicaraguan people. We are already taking measures to send material aid and technical personnel specifically to participate in the rebuilding of Nicaragua."¹¹ The government of Mexico extended credit to Nicaragua, increased its sale of food to it, provided assistance in the construction of a number of industrial enterprises, and sent it drilling equipment and personnel free of charge. Cuba, Panama, Costa Rica, Venezuela, and other countries gave Nicaragua similar assistance.

Immediately after the victory of the Nicaraguan revolution on 6 August 1979 a Soviet airplane left Prague for Nicaragua with a load of medicines, food, and clothing for the children of Nicaraguan workers as a gift from the WFTU trade union centers of the socialist and capitalist countries of Europe. Later the socialist countries concluded a number of agreements with the revolutionary government of Nicaragua on the development of diplomatic, economic, and cultural relations and on aid to Nicaragua in the restoration and development of its economy.

As a result of the recent increased intrigues by international reaction, right up to the threat of military aggression by American imperialism and neighboring reactionary regimes and of an economic blockade, Nicaragua is in acute need of international support and solidarity. The leaders of the Nicaraguan revolution have repeatedly appealed to international public opinion for support. Under these conditions, the solidarity movement with Nicaragua has not ended. In January 1981 the First International Solidarity Meeting with the Nicaraguan Revolution took place in Managua. It was participated in by around 40 countries in which there are solidarity committees with the Nicaraguan people. The participants in the meeting discussed a further strengthening of international solidarity relations with Nicaragua and increased help for the Sandinista revolution. When the United States placed an embargo on grain and food deliveries

to Nicaragua, various countries made the demand: "Bread For Nicaragua." Nicaragua received gifts of substantial quantities of wheat from the GDR, Bulgaria, Canada, Sweden, and other countries. The WFTU called upon the workers of the world to resolutely condemn the aggressive intrigues of imperialism against Nicaragua and called upon all trade union centers and progressive and peace-loving forces to express solidarity with the Nicaraguan people, and not to permit imperialist aggression. The World Assembly of Journalists which was held in Managua in April 1981 unanimously came out in support of the revolutionary process in Nicaragua, in its defense against the intrigues of imperialism, and against the campaign of lies and slander about Nicaragua by the transnational mass information media. In replying to the Reagan Administration's refusal to grant credit to Nicaragua, many countries of the socialist commonwealth and of Western Europe granted it a total of more than one billion dollars in the form of loans and non-repayable grants.

All of these and other solidarity actions are creating difficulties for the fulfillment of the imperialist plans to strangle the revolutionary process in Nicaragua and are helping the Sandinista revolution to withstand the attacks of reaction.

The victory of the revolution in Nicaragua stimulated a growth of the revolutionary movement in the other countries of Central America where pro-American reactionary regimes are in control, especially in El Salvador. In 1980 El Salvador was in a state of civil war between the military-civilian junta supported by the United States and the patriotic revolutionary forces united around the Revolutionary Democratic Front and the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front. The junta and the reactionary Salvadoran military replied to the powerful upsurge in the struggle of the popular masses with bloody repressions in which many thousands of people perished. Trying to save the junta from the fate of the Somoza regime, in 1980 the United States increased its military and material aid to the Salvadoran government, allocating more than 100 million dollars for this end.¹² American military advisors who led punitive operations by the Salvadoran army were sent to El Salvador. United States naval forces were concentrated on the coast of El Salvador. The neighboring pro-imperialist regimes of Guatemala and Honduras were enlisted to provide military aid for the Salvadoran junta. The war in El Salvador threatened to develop into a serious international conflict. With the danger of the interference by American imperialism and the forces of Central American reaction in the war in El Salvador threatening to develop into direct military intervention, solidarity with the Salvadoran patriots by all progressive and anti-imperialist forces became a necessity.

By 1980 the solidarity movement with the people of El Salvador had rapidly taken on broad dimensions, and was an important factor in uniting the anti-imperialist forces. On 10 March 1980, on the initiative of a number of public organizations, a large demonstration of solidarity with the Salvadoran patriots took place in Mexico. It ended with a meeting in front of the building of the Salvadoran Embassy. The participants in the demonstration were protesting against the repressions by the Salvadoran junta and against the threat of military intervention by the United States. A solidarity campaign was developed

by the Peruvian Committee for Solidarity with the Peoples of Latin America. In May 1980 the communist parties of the countries of Central America and Mexico called in a joint statement for complete support for the struggle of the people of El Salvador for its freedom. In August mass demonstrations of solidarity with the Salvadoran people took place in Panama, as did a protest against United States military aid to the junta. Forty-eight parties and other political organizations of Latin America which signed a joint document condemned the interventionist actions of the United States and called for concrete help for the Salvadoran's struggle against the forces of reaction and imperialism.¹³ The WFTU, the UN General Secretary K. Waldheim, and the leaders of a number of Latin American states condemned the punitive actions of the Salvadoran junta and the policies of the United States. Voices condemning American imperialism and the Salvadoran junta were heard at a general session of the World Labor Organization in 1980. In December 1980 the World Peace Council helped to hold a "Solidarity Week" with the people of El Salvador.

A further exacerbation of the situation in El Salvador and a sharp increase in United States military interference called forth in January 1981 an even more active solidarity and protest movement in the European countries also. On 17 January 1981 there was a demonstration in Brussels demanding a break in diplomatic relations with the Salvadoran Junta and the organization of political and material support for the Revolutionary Democratic Front and the F. Marti National Liberation Front. In January 20,000 demonstrators passed through the streets of Frankfurt-am-Main shouting: "Americans--Out of El Salvador!" and "No Second Vietnam in Central America!" The Barcelona port workers' union, supported by other unions from Spain's ports, came out for a boycott of a Peruvian ship which was transporting 20 tanks for the Salvadoran Junta. In February 1981 the Permanent Peoples' Tribunal (the former Russell Tribunal) accused the Salvadoran Junta of genocide, of systematic violations of human rights, and it accused the United States government of involvement in this.¹⁴ In February-March a meeting of the UN Commission on Human Rights emphasized the right of the Salvadoran people to an independent resolution of the issues of the political and social organization of Salvadoran society without interference from without. Solidarity manifestations continued in Latin America also. On 5 March 1981 solidarity demonstrations took place in Mexico City and in other cities of Mexico. The trade union of the workers of the capitol's autonomous university allocated 33,000 dollars for the Marti National Liberation Front.¹⁵

A protest movement against American interference in El Salvador took on an active scope in Canada. Demonstrations took place in Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal, and other cities. E. Broadbent, the leader of Canada's New Democratic Party, criticized the government's vacillation with regard to United States intervention in El Salvador. "If the United States undertakes direct military intervention," he stated, "we shall unite Canada's religious, workers', and democratic forces in order to openly protest against involving us in a second Vietnam. We demand that the United States get out of El Salvador."¹⁶ In April 1981 a conference of progressive Canadian politicians was held in Ottawa in support of the struggle of the Salvadoran people. This movement influenced the position

of the Canadian government which came out against outside interference in Salvadoran affairs.

Active participation by broad circles in the United States itself, since the involvement of the country in the war in El Salvador had become a real danger and reminded many people of the war in Vietnam, became a distinguishing feature of the solidarity movement with the people of El Salvador. When in the beginning of 1981 it became known that there were plans to call men into the army in order to send them to El Salvador protest meetings and demonstrations began in the United States, and there were mass petitions signed by political and trade union activists, representatives of the clergy and the intelligentsia, and by university teachers and students. They opposed military aid to the Junta. Mass demonstrations against peacetime conscription took place in Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and many other cities. In a number of places committees for solidarity with the people of El Salvador became active. Religious leaders also called for opposition to military aid to the Salvadoran Junta. A group of Negro Congressmen and the Machinist and Woodworkers' Unions came out against United States policy in El Salvador. In Oregon 30 local public organizations formed a coalition which had the task of seeking to stop United States interference in Salvadoran affairs, of seeking to achieve self-determination for the Salvadoran people, and of curtailing military expenditures. The same slogans could be heard at a protest demonstration in New York on 2 May 1981 which ended with a meeting at which progressive politicians and trade union and public leaders spoke.

The most impressive active protest was a demonstration in Washington on 3 May by 100,000 people at the Pentagon buildings--the largest mass anti-war action in the United States since the Vietnam War. The speakers at the meeting protested against the arms race and the cutback in appropriations for social needs, against aid to the Salvadoran Junta, and against United States intervention in Salvadoran affairs.

The dissatisfaction which had begun to take on a mass character was reflected in the decision by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives not to provide the Salvadoran Junta with military aid until it halted its terror and its violations of civil rights. True, this decision did not in fact stop an expansion of military aid to the junta; however, it revealed vacillations within a section of the ruling classes regarding interference in Salvadoran affairs which had become intensified under the influence of the mass demonstrations.

The joint declaration of the Presidents of France and Mexico in August 1981 which recognized the Revolutionary Democratic Front and the Marti National Liberation Front as "a representative political force" provided substantial political support to the Salvadoran fighters. The presidents came out against foreign interference and for self-determination by the Salvadoran people and a political settlement of the situation in El Salvador. This declaration was approved of by the broad international public. The Salvadoran fighters were supported by the International Conference of Solidarity with the People of El Salvador which was especially

convoked in November 1981 in Montreal. The 36th Session of the UN General Assembly (December 1981) condemned the terror and the repression of the junta. In February 1982 the 10th World Congress of Trade Unions passed a resolution of solidarity with the people of El Salvador, condemned imperialist intervention, and emphasized its danger not only for El Salvador but for the entire region.

The scope which has been taken on by the solidarity movement with the Salvadoran people and the protest against the interventionist policy of the United States is undoubtedly unifying broad progressive and democratic forces on an anti-imperialist basis and is a serious obstacle to the realization of the plans by imperialism and reaction to isolate and suppress the struggle by the Salvadoran patriots. It is restraining open armed intervention by the United States and compelling maneuverability by the Salvadoran Junta which in March 1982 made an attempt by holding "free" elections under martial law and terror "to legitimize" its rule in the country. The solidarity movement is a mighty support for the Salvadoran patriots in their heroic struggle which the forces of imperialism and local reaction are powerless to crush.

Here only the basic directions of the solidarity movement with the struggle of the peoples of the Latin American countries against the forces of reaction and imperialism have been cited, but an examination of them makes it possible to draw the conclusion that this movement has during the last decade taken on a systematic character and has become an important component part of the liberation movement on the continent and in the world.

As in other regions, the chief force of the solidarity movement in Latin America is comprised of workers and of mass proletarian and people's organizations whose vanguard is made up of communist parties. At the same time, the solidarity movement frequently takes on the character of a broad association of the most diverse political and social forces on a national, regional, and international scale and on a general democratic and anti-imperialist basis. This helps to strengthen the positions of the democratic and anti-imperialist forces both in the countries with whose people the solidarity movement is developing and in the countries where this movement is having its direct development.

The international character which is frequently taken on by the solidarity movement is a lawful confirmation of the fact that the struggle which has developed in the Latin American countries is a component part of the world struggle of the forces of reaction and progress. The development of this struggle in Latin America cannot but be influenced by the changed correlation of forces in the world, and the increased role of the Soviet Union, the socialist countries, and of all of the progressive and democratic forces which with their participation in the solidarity movement with the Latin American peoples are making an important contribution to the success of this movement.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Materials of the 26th CPSU Congress," Moscow, 1981, p 20.
2. Ibid., p 26.
3. "Twenty-Sixth CPSU Congress." Stenographic Report, Vol 2, Moscow, 1981, p 121.
4. L'HUMANITE, 14 February 1975.
5. PRAVDA, 1 January 1977.
6. "Manifiesto del Partido Comunista de Chile," Santiago, Setiembre de 1981.
7. L. Corvalan, "Forward Along the Path of Unity and Struggle," LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, 1981, No 11, p 73.
8. VSEMIRNOYE PROFSOYUZNOYE DVIZHENIYE, Praga, No 2, 1979, p 16.
9. Llamamiento y resoluciones. X. Congreso sindical mundial (La Habana 10-15 de febrero de 1982). SSM, Praga, 1982, p 35.
10. GRANMA, 28 July 1979.
11. OPOSICION, 26 July-1 August 1979.
12. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 10 September 1980.
13. F. Athos, "Concretar la unidad para lograr una apertura democratica," Buenos Aires, 1981, p 21.
14. DAILY WORLD, 3 February 1981.
15. GRANMA, 6 March 1981.
16. CANADIAN TRIBUNE (Ottawa), 9 March 1981.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1982

2959

CSO: 1807/106

BOOK ON IDEOLOGY OF NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS REVIEWED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNIY MIR in Russian No 5, Sep-Oct 82 pp 176-180

[Review by S. N. Alitovskiy of book "Aktual'nyye problemy ideologii natsional'no-osvoboditel'nogo dvizheniya v stranakh Azii i Afrika" [Important Problems of the Ideology of the National Liberation Movement in the Countries of Asia and Africa] by editorial board: G. F. Kim, A. S. Kaufman, L. R. Polonskaya, M. Gzheshkovyakh, M. Robbe, and G. Khepp, Moscow, "Nauka," 1982, 446 pages]

[Text] The collection of articles under review is the result of successful collaboration by Soviet orientologists, chiefly scholars from the Institute of Orientalism of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and their colleagues from the Central Institute of History of the GDR Academy of Sciences. The joint editorial board which directed the preparation of the manuscript for the press was made up of prominent specialists: the collection provides a quite full reflection of the level of research on the important ideological problems of the national liberation movement and of social and political thought in the Asian and African countries which has been attained by scholars in both the USSR and the GDR.

In the USSR this research began to be conducted especially intensively in the second half of the 1960s and since then has risen from a primarily country-by-country study to a problem level, including an overall analysis of basic ideational currents and their influence on the formation of mass consciousness and the political struggle in the developing countries of Asia and Africa. The German scholars, for their part, have made a valuable contribution to the development of this highly important branch of orientology primarily with concrete studies, especially for the countries of the Arab East and Tropical Africa.

The materials in the book are subdivided basically into two chief groups. The first consists of articles (by G. F. Kim, L. R. Polonskaya, and A. D. Litman) which pose the theoretical and methodological problems of studying the ideology of the national liberation movement, present a typology of the ideational currents in the social and political thought of the East, and provide a study of the problems of the evolution of nationalism as an anti-imperialist ideology. The second group of articles contains an examination of the various aspects of general ideological problems and of their concrete manifestations in the most important spheres of social and political life, frequently through the example of individual countries or regions.

A profound historical approach in their analysis by all of the authors is a common virtue of the collection which ensures the effectiveness of its scientific analysis and a quite deep penetration into the essence of the ideological problems it treats. Although each of the articles is interesting in its own way, we shall single out above all some of the most important and general issues which are touched upon to one or another degree or in one or another connection by almost all of the writers.

The article by G. F. Kim, "Proletarian Internationalism and the National Liberation Movement," takes us into the circle of the basic ideological problems of our day. The problem of the relationships between two ideologies--proletarian and internationalist--which is placed by it in the forefront is posed as one of the most important problems, especially in our day when the role of the unity and alliance of the international workers' and communist movement and national liberation movements is becoming even more important in the face of imperialist adventures against peace, democracy, and socialism. The author examines the ideological problems of the national liberation movement in the light of increasingly exacerbated class contradictions both within national societies and on the international arena, emphasizes the leading role of socialism and proletarian internationalism in the anti-imperialist struggle, including in the ideological sphere, and takes note of a tendency toward the coming together of the ideologies of proletarian internationalism and anti-imperialist nationalism in a number of issues.

The very concept of nationalism as an historical and social category and as the chief ideological expression of the national liberation movement and of its interests and goals is subjected to a detailed and profound study. The ideational currents and their genesis, correlations, and interactions which comprise it are brought to light and systematized, and this has made it possible to demonstrate historically that anti-colonial nationalism and bourgeois nationalism are far from identical phenomena.

An essential characteristic of the nationalism of enslaved peoples which is convincingly and fully revealed by A. D. Litman and L. R. Polonskaya is the heterogeneity and diversity of types of its component elements. It would scarcely be possible to find an ideology in the history of the development of social thought and political movements which would be characterized by such a diversity of ideational currents, doctrines, and conceptions borrowed from other, sometimes mutually contradictory ideas and ideologies (beginning with medieval heresies and ending with scientific communism) as is the case in the ideology of the nationalism of the colonial peoples throughout its entire formation and development. Nevertheless, a study of the historical roots of this phenomenon provides grounds for regarding this nationalism as a relatively integral ideology which unites its component elements into a single whole and is directed toward the achievement of a single goal--the liberation of the oppressed peoples from a foreign colonial yoke. A. D. Litman emphasizes that, despite all of the differences between the types of ideational currents which have arisen within anti-colonial nationalistic ideology, "in all cases the degree of the differences is restricted by limits within which the varieties of nationalism do not acquire

the character of opposites of an antagonistic order, no matter how acute the contradictions between them may be." (p. 56)

Extensive treatment is also given in the collection to another important historically conditioned feature of the nationalism of oppressed nations, namely, the traditional forms of their worldview and consciousness which are exceptionally powerful in the influence they exercise on the social thought and political behavior of enormous masses of people. A number of the writers take note of a frequent appeal to the pre-colonial past, to "national character" and "national traditions" and so forth as a typical and mass phenomenon of the entire period of struggle for independence. Gandhism which brought many millions of people into the movement against colonialism under the utopian slogans of social equality, the rebirth of domestic weaving, and the protection of small-scale production may serve as a graphic illustration. In contrast to this, the proponents of bourgeois conceptions, and, in particular, enlighteners of a bourgeois persuasion "actually remained as the founders of new schools and trends, but not as leaders of the masses." (p. 34)

And nowadays, as the events of the 1960s and 1970s have shown, "mass support is enjoyed in the countries of the East above all by those social and political doctrines which show concern for traditional (including religious) institutions and norms," G. F. Kim writes. "In those cases in which adherence to traditions (so characteristic of the psychology of the peasantry and of other non-proletarian laboring strata) and specific national features are ignored political doctrines and programs, even those which include definite progressive demands, may either not win the support of the masses, or be deprived of it." (p. 18)

It is all of this which determines the necessity for a deep study of traditions and of their influence on the ideational formation of the various currents of nationalism. German scholars have been making a serious contribution to the study of this question, particularly of the influence of Islam. Their articles are supported by a rich source basis. A study of the ideational formation of revolutionary democracy and of the possibilities and prospects for its further evolution is connected with an analysis of the influence of Islam. "The progressive forces in the Arab countries," M. Gzheshkovyak (GDR) writes, "set forth their views in Moslem categories, and the measures which they carry out in those places where they are in power are given an Islamic interpretation by them." (p. 224) The articles by R. M. Shapirova on the contemporary interpretation of "Moslem socialism" in Egypt and of A. I. Ionova on the problem of the typology of "Moslem socialism" (based on the examples of Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines) are also of considerable interest with regard to explaining the ideological role of Islam.

The common methodological position of the authors of the collection promotes a deep understanding of the essence of contemporary ideological problems in the developing countries, and particularly of the evolution of nationalism and of its complexities and contradictions. The relationship between the class and the national elements in its theory and practice is a very important criterion for evaluating the character and direction of its contemporary evolution. At

the present stage this relationship is gradually but steadily changing in favor of the class element. The articles in the collection demonstrate with sufficient fullness the qualitative aspect of this change, its forms and the degree of its depth, and also the equivocal and frequently contradictory character of its results which is determined by the transformation of nationalism in the field of the ideological struggle of heterogeneous class and political forces--both progressive and reactionary.

The collection cites and substantiates the important idea of the ideational polarization--within nationalistic ideology--of social forces which act from opposite positions regarding the paths of the development of the liberated countries: capitalist or socialist.

With L. R. Polonskaya this idea is expressed in posing the question of the two tendencies in the development of nationalism, one of which is "a unification of socialism and the workers' movement and the formation of the revolutionary democratic ideology of the laboring strata, and the other is a gradual loss by individual bourgeois ideological currents of the specific features of the nationalism of the oppressed nations, their general turn toward the right, and the increasing correspondence between their forms and their class content." (p. 45) In the opinion of L. R. Polonskaya, the process of the interaction of the two aspects--the national and the class--develops in accordance with the laws of social development under capitalism: "The relationships between the classes are basic, and the national connections between the people of different classes are secondary." (Ibid.)

While expressing the same idea, G. F. Kim places a greater accent on deepening the social aspects of the national liberation movement and on expanding the sphere of the influence of proletarian internationalism. (p. 22) Characterizing the revolutionary theories of social development which have been developing within the revolutionary democratic ideology, he emphasizes that, although they "to one degree or another preserve a nationalistic coloring, on the whole they can no longer be numbered among the ideologies of a genuinely nationalistic type." (Ibid.) At the other pole of nationalistic ideology the role of the reactionary elements of bourgeois ideational currents becomes more important, while the role of progressive elements is circumscribed. (p. 15) This process of ideological polarization which is accelerated by the influence of the ideas of socialism itself serves, in its turn, as a factor in expanding the sphere of influence of these ideas. There arises a "new relationship between the action of internal and external factors and national and social elements" which "inevitably leads to the formation of fundamentally new features in the national liberation revolutions" and in their ideological expression. (p. 14)

In this connection, the article by A. S. Kaufman which is devoted to a theoretical and political analysis of the characteristics and prospects of revolutionary democratic ideology in socialist orientation countries is of unquestionable interest. It examines the fundamental factors which objectively stimulate the process of a deepening of national democratic revolutions and of the coming together of revolutionary democracy and scientific socialism. This process which has at its basis the logic of the class struggle and the influence of

revolutionary practice is steadily developing, despite individual failures. The author correctly sees in the cooperation of communists and revolutionary democrats, particularly on an international scale, a very important fundamental precondition for overcoming the weaknesses and vacillations of revolutionary democracy, including its ideological ones.

The enormous international resonance which has resulted from the solid ideological and political positions that have been gained by revolutionary democracy in the developing countries is successfully portrayed by an analysis of the contemporary forms of the ideology of neo-colonialism. They are looked upon (in the article by B. A. Shabad) as a reaction to this historic event, and as an attempt by imperialist ideologists who are wagering on reactionary nationalism and "who are very actively glorifying bourgeois nationalism" (p. 20) to prevent the coming together of national liberation ideology and its revolutionary currents and scientific socialism.

Their theoretical analysis provides the authors with grounds for believing that anti-imperialist nationalism has entered a period of crisis phenomena in its evolution which are the result of its growing inability, while remaining within the framework of nationalistic and, especially, bourgeois and petty bourgeois conceptions, to meet the urgent tasks of the social stage of the national liberation revolutions. A concretization of this idea is contained in the articles (especially by the German authors) devoted to a study of the social conditions of the evolution of nationalism and, chiefly, of the influence of the traditional factor, including Islam. These articles demonstrate that the class contradictions in traditional society are becoming stronger, although as a result of their lack of development they continue to be compelled to clothe themselves in traditional, including religious, clothing, which results in the ideological priority of the national aspect over the class one; but the process of the displacement of the former by the latter is steadily developing.

It is precisely this process which is traced by Yu. Gertzog (GDR) in the example of the evolution of the views of Dzh. N'yerere, and his gradual approach under the influence of revolutionary practice to a recognition of the importance of the class struggle in the development of society. Yu. Gertzog comes to the conclusion that as the "traditional" content decreases "national socialism" develops into a revolutionary theory. (p. 304) This idea is developed in a detailed article by G. Khepp (GDR) who uses the example of the Arab countries to show the difficult and complicated process of revolutionary democracy's approach to a scientific understanding of what class is. "And this," he emphasizes, "also engenders the interpretation 'by the leading forces' of the character of social division and confrontation in society which differs from the conception of the national reformist leaders." (p. 406)

As the Iranian revolution has shown, Islam is undoubtedly obliged for the "take-off" of its ideological and political influence at the end of the 1970s to the inclusion of millions of believers in the struggle for the accomplishment of the urgent and closely interconnected anti-imperialist and social tasks of the revolution. However, after having played the role of the uniter of

the masses against imperialism, is Islam capable, and if yes, to what degree, of serving the class interests of the workers? This question is sharply posed in the article by N. Hasan and S. Mamedogly (GDR). The authors point out the great danger for the revolution which is contained in the endeavour by the top Shiite clergy to monopolize power, removing left-wing and democratic forces from participation in it, to strengthen the absolute priority of Islamic dogmas in the ideological and political life of the country, and to create a situation of political instability.

Islam's limited nature as a social ideology is increased by the fact that it is actively utilized as an ideological weapon not only by progressive but also by reactionary forces. A. I. Ionova observes that in Indonesia, under the cover of a declaration of fidelity to the principles of "Moslem socialism," the supporters of capitalist development consolidated their forces. In Egypt in the 1970s, as R. M. Sharipova writes, increased attempts were made to use the conception of "Moslem socialism" for reactionary purposes, a fact which was connected with the strengthening of the divisions of the big and middle bourgeoisie. Thus, the polarization of ideational currents in the ideology of the national liberation movement is a relatively drawn-out process which is slowed down by the fact that its development often has to be achieved by no means through the development of certain traditional forms of the expression of this ideology, but, on the contrary, through overcoming them, and this means slowness and difficulty in the maturing of its class aspect and its transformation into the ideology of the laboring classes.

This idea is also confirmed by such a negative phenomenon as the extraordinary vitality and adaptability of extremist currents in the nationalism of the oppressed nations--currents behind which stand the pauperized, demi- and de-classed, and also the lumpen strata of the population. Such currents are frequently colored in "communist" tones, or, on the contrary, currents are reembodyed in them which have as their source degenerated groupings in the communist movement. An eloquent example of this is Maoist ideology whose unmasking is the subject of the article by M. S. Kapitsa in which the author reveals with great erudition and knowledge of his subject the reactionary essence of Maoist foreign policy doctrines, and the hostility of the foreign policy of the Maoist leadership of the CPC to proletarian internationalism.

The problem of the political mobilization of the masses which is closely connected with the collection's topic is also examined in it. It is the subject of an article by A. G. Bel'skiy. Although the subject of the article is a critical analysis of bourgeois conceptions, it also contains elements of a constructive analysis which are valuable for understanding the importance and difficulty of the solution of the problem in the interest of the progressive forces. The article is also valuable in that this problem is posed in this form for the first time in Soviet orientology.

This problem is contiguous to the problems treated in the article by A. Hafner (GDR) on the formation of the political consciousness of India's proletariat. It provides a detailed and fruitful investigation of the great difficulties

and complexities in solving it under Indian conditions and expresses, in our view, correct ideas on the ways and means of raising the trade union consciousness of the basic mass of workers to the level of class consciousness.

The problem of cooperation between communists and social democracy in the developing countries in the interest of creating a broad anti-imperialist front which also has an ideological essence is also an important one. The analysis of this problem in the article by I. Icherenska (GDR) on the ideology of the Socialist International (1970s) is a very convincing and well-argued one. The author isolates the general democratic content of the theory and practice of the Socialist International which can and should serve as the basis for this cooperation.

The very rich analytic historiographical reviews by A. Kh. Vafa (USSR) and K. Shyunke (GDR) which are included in the collection provide a capacious characterization of the level of research in the two countries and help the reader to better orient himself in the complexities of ideological problems and arrive at his own opinion regarding debatable or insufficiently studied questions.

Such questions can be encountered in the collection. Let us note the divergences in the evaluation by different authors of the progressive possibilities of bourgeois nationalism which, apparently, flow from differences in their evaluation of the role and influence of traditional factors, and also of the degree of maturity of the economic and class conditions of the contemporary evolution of nationalism. A number of authors are inclined to regard the ability of the bourgeoisie to serve as an expressor of general national interests under independence as basically exhausted, since these interests come into contradiction with its class interests. (p. 48) Others are inclined toward more cautious opinions, obviously having in view the power of traditions and the still insufficient development both of the economic and of the other bases of the societies of the developing nations. This point of view is held, for example, by M. Robbe (GDR). Let us refer to his substantive article on the international aspect of nationalism. This aspect which has manifested itself so vividly in the movements for nonalignment and for the democratization of international economic relations is interpreted by the author as being definitely progressive, since it is directed against imperialism, even though it does not go beyond the framework of capitalism. (p. 386) Similar views are expressed by A. D. Litman (p. 70) and I. Icherenska (p. 171). In other words, the anti-imperialist potential of the nationalism of the oppressed nations in which the bourgeois current may predominate, although it has in some respects exhausted itself, has, on the other hand, become enriched in other matters with a new content, particularly in connection with the increased internationalization of the struggle of the liberated countries for economic independence. "On the whole," as, in our view, I. Icherenska rightly believes, "imperialism has not succeeded in acquiring in the person of the national bourgeoisie a 'reliable' partner from its point of view. . . ." (p. 171)

Of course, the progressive nature of this aspect of nationalism has been most fully embodied in the politics of revolutionary democratic regimes, and in their relations with the socialist countries. On the other hand, as G. F. Kim correctly notes, the social aspect of the bourgeois ideational currents are increasingly taking on reactionary tones. Consequently, in determining the degree of the progressiveness of nationalism in general and of bourgeois nationalism in particular, it is necessary to have a differentiated and concrete approach on account of the contradictoriness which follows from the social and historical conditions of their existence.

Great praise should be given to the creative approach of the collection's authors to the problems of the methodological character which is aimed at a maximally deep study of the internal factors of the evolution of nationalism. A. S. Kaufman has expressed a very important idea: The replies to many of the questions of the evolution of nationalism should be sought not simply in the contradictions of the views of ideologists, but as a "direct or mediated reflection of complex processes and historical tendencies which are characteristic for social life itself, in the unique mirror of the conditions in which the social activities of classes take place. . . ." (pp. 91, 92)

Methodologically, attention is also merited by the ideas on the specific nature of economic conditions under colonialism and the character of their influence on the ideational formation of nationalism which are expressed in the articles by L. R. Polonskaya (p. 29), Yu. Gertsog (p. 284), and others. Also interesting is the idea of the lagging economic consolidation of the bourgeoisie in relation to the process of the establishment of national self-consciousness, and of the connection of this circumstance with the destruction of the productive forces of the colonies and the preservation of medieval socio-economic and social institutions, and, consequently, of medieval ideas and conceptions. (p. 29)

It is not without interest in this connection to note that an opinion regarding the non-bourgeois character of colonial production relations is very widespread in the Soviet economic literature. Without going into the essence of this special issue (on which there is no single opinion among specialists), let us only single out the essential fact that colonialism, not so much by preserving as by subordinating and actively utilizing and, consequently, transforming traditional economic structures and destroying productive forces, did not create alternative national forms of economic activity with an adequate class and ideological superstructure. Is this not where we will find the secret of the extraordinary staunchness of such phenomena as the hypertrophy of the role of traditional and, in particular, religious forms of social thought in the developing countries, and the striking ideational eclecticism of nationalist currents to which A. M. Kaufman correctly points?

On the whole, the collection merits high praise as a very profound study of the important ideological problems of the national liberation movement both in a theoretical and in a concrete cognitive sense. It would be appropriate to publish it in some variant in foreign languages so as to make it accessible also to foreign readers.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1982

WEINBERGER INFLUENCE ON U.S. DEFENSE POLICY EXAMINED

Moscow ZNAMYA in Russian No 12, Dec 82 pp 209-218

[Article by Melor Sturua: "Caspar Weinberger, the Pentagon Chief"]

[Text] Nightmares are a sort of occupational ailment among inhabitants of the Pentagon. Especially among the bosses. Caspar Willard Weinberger, 41st defense secretary of the United States, is no exception. "At any time of day or night they can wake me up and report that the Soviet Union has invaded a territory which we have to defend but where we have neither bases nor troops," he says.

Considering the fact that American bases and troops are scattered literally throughout the world, it is extremely difficult to imagine the territory appearing in Weinberger's dreams. But let us not carp. The Pentagon insomnia does not involve mirages alone. There is also some logic to it. And, as the sad fate of James Forrestal attests, it has its own logical end....

Weinberger's appointment as U.S. defense minister astonished Washington political circles. In the words of perpetually vicious and vitriolic commentators Evans and Novak, who write in duet and tell many tall tales, not one of Weinberger's predecessors can compare with him in ignorance of strategic military matters. (In this particular case, Evans and Novak are not far from the truth, which ordinarily they do not especially favor.) And it is not just the fact that by tradition the Pentagon chief must be a civilian. Frankly speaking, Weinberger does not have much military experience. He joined the infantry as a private in 1941 and ended the war as a captain in the intelligence service on the staff of General Douglas MacArthur. He could therefore not make judgments on strategic problems from any higher level than a captain's boot.

Vicious tongues assert that Weinberger owes his rise to two people, Winston Churchill and Ronald Reagan, to the former's ideological devotion to anticommunism and the latter's personal devotion to the former. One is in perfect harmony with the other, however. At meetings of the National Security Council in the White House and at numerous NATO meetings Weinberger quotes Churchill time and again, citing the example of his bulldog anticommunism for the present day Western "milksops and weaklings."

"Caspar considers himself to be more than just an admirer of Churchill. He sees himself as a sort of reincarnated Churchill with the mission of arming the West against the Soviets," they say at the Pentagon. And they say it with admiration and not derision.

Weinberger himself does not object to such a comparison.

"Yes, Churchill is one of my greatest heroes," his Pentagon admirer states. "He warned Europe of the need to arm itself in the face of the German threat. And he was right, although he was accused of poor manners and of making a nuisance of himself. Today, I am attempting to prove that there are mortally dangerous parallels: The threat now comes from the Soviets, and we must rearm."

The fact that it was the Soviets which saved world civilization from the Hitlerite plague is not a part of Weinberger's philosophy, which was adjusted once and for all to the tuning fork of Churchill's Fulton speech. And it is not simply a matter of poor memory on the part of the Pentagon chief. His anticommunism is not simply irksome, not simply annoying. It is an obsessive idea, a fixation, which, like the nightmares, is also a form of sickness, extremely dangerous, sometimes fatal ("letal'nyy"). (Unfortunately, not always from the Russian word to fly "letat'." To fly out the window, for example.) "Virulent anti-Sovietism is formed by everything Weinberger brings to the Reagan Administration and to the North Atlantic Alliance," writes the newspaper WASHINGTON POST. Yes, this virus has established itself firmly in Weinberger's blood. This accounts for his unquenchable thirst for blood.

Infinite veneration of Churchill. Absolute subordination to Reagan.... Weinberger was considered a Republican of the Rockefeller bent. He served in the cabinets of Presidents Nixon and Ford, but the boss to whom he vowed his loyalty was and remains Reagan, or rather his California "kitchen cabinet"--a group of ultra-conservative, self-made multimillionaires.

Weinberger was born in San Francisco. He graduated from the law school at Harvard University--Phi Beta Kappa, magna cum laude and other marks of academic excellence. He took an active part in California's political life. He engaged in journalism and conducted a television show. He was a member of state legislative bodies. He served as chairman of the Republican Committee. When Reagan became governor of California he made Weinberger his minister of finance. (His official title was finance director.) They rapidly found a common language in the "puritanical approach" to state expenditures on social needs for the sake of balancing the budget, which they considered the highest form of financial virtue. (Balanced, of course, at the expense of the simple Californians and not the "kitchen cabinet" of multimillionaires.)

Weinberger's performance in Sacramento (the capital of California) gained him the reputation of Caspar-the-knife, a man able to skillfully cut away the fat from the healthy budget tissue. (And I repeat, at the expense of those people about whom they say: They don't ask for fat, they just want to live. And Caspar-the-knife was essentially not just removing the fat but cutting on the vitals.) The

skill of the California butcher was noted and approved in Washington, and in 1970 Weinberger moved from Sacramento to the banks of the Potomac--first as chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, then deputy director and somewhat later, director of the Office of Management and Budget.

From 1973 to 1975 Weinberger held the post of secretary of health, education and welfare. Here Caspar-the-knife's talents manifested themselves on an all-American scale. He advocated the amputation of almost all social programs--from school breakfasts to medical research. He demanded that President Nixon veto even a bill on federal aid to the blind and disabled! (What one will not do in the blind pursuit of a balanced budget! Weinberger did not touch the enormous expenditures for the Vietnam adventure, however. He preferred to look the other way.) There was talk to the effect that Weinberger was the most conservative of all the secretaries in the Republican administration. Even Nixon and Ford looked at him with apprehension, especially since they did not believe in his personal loyalty. He was Reagan's man, after all, and Reagan was their main rival for the right to live at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. (The postal address of the White House.) To Weinberger's credit it should be mentioned that he did not conceal this fact. During that period when Nixon and Reagan were engaged in fierce preelection battles--"the primaries"--Weinberger insolently and defiantly hung on the wall of his room in the budget office a photograph of a broadly smiling Reagan, embellished with the latter's handwritten inscription: "Thanks to you this smile is real. With a feeling of friendship and best wishes. Ron."

In 1976, after the Democrats came to power, Weinberger left Washington, returned his knife, with which so many social bloodlettings had been performed, to its holster and returned to San Francisco, where the good samaritans from the "kitchen cabinet" prepared for him a soft position as a vice president of the multinational construction and engineering firm Bechtel Corporation.

The 1980 presidential campaign once again drew Weinberger to the Reagan banner. Following his patron's victory he moved to Los Angeles, where with the members of the "kitchen cabinet" he set about forming Reagan's administrative team. He did not forget about himself, naturally, and looked longingly at the portfolios of secretary of state and secretary of finance. The first portfolio went to General Alexander Haig, however, who was "known" in Western Europe, the second to businessman Donald Regan, who "knew" Wall Street. Weinberger did not lose out, however. The Pentagon was assigned to him, although Weinberger "did not know" the military-industrial complex prior to this. "Don't worry, my Disraeli will handle the position. The Pentagon is the same as the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, after all, only military," Reagan said in answer to those who had their doubts. And so, "my Disraeli" became the master of the lives of 1 million citizens in civilian attire and around 3 million citizens in military uniform.

Weinberger's accession to the Pentagon--circle "E" on the third floor of the famous pentagonal building on the banks of the Potomac--alarmed both the liberals and the conservatives, both the "doves" and the "hawks." The cause for alarm in the different political camps was one and the same--the California Disraeli's

incompetence. The reasons were as different as day and night, however. The former were afraid that Weinberger, who was not an atomic scientist like his predecessor Brown and did not have the computer brain of super technocrat McNamara, would prove to be easy prey, a toy in the hands of the Pentagon professionals. "Those generals and admirals will chew him up and spit him out within 15 minutes," the liberal "doves" said, shuddering but certainly not rejoicing.

The new defense secretary's past was what troubled the conservative "hawks." A corporate lawyer, he was known as a close-fisted man, guided by the motto "Money loves to be counted," for whom there was no such thing as "sacred cows." He was called the "butcher" with good reason, after all! Even before assuming the position of Pentagon chief Weinberger threateningly stated: "There is thievery, waste and negligence everywhere, including the national defense. Nothing is inviolable, nothing is sacred." Talk of Weinberger not as Caspar-the-knife but Caspar-the-scalpel, that is not a butcher but a surgeon, did little to ease minds in the Pentagon, which cannot tolerate even therapists where its budget is concerned.

Weinberger's very first statement to the Pentagon demonstrated that both the liberal "doves" and the conservative "hawks" had been wrong. The error of the former was bitter, to be sure, while that of the latter was pleasant. Weinberger immediately demonstrated that he was a hard nut, impossible to crack, and especially to chew up either in 15 minutes or in 15 months. No one at the Pentagon would have considered this, however. Why chew up and spit out a man who understands very well that the Pentagon loves money more than money loves to be counted? Weinberger inherited from his predecessor a budget of 196 billion dollars. The chiefs of staff demanded 206 billions from him. He sliced off or hacked off 222 billion dollars for them. (This was 11 percent more than the previous draft budget figures for fiscal year 1982.)

Since then, although Weinberger has "hacked off" billions of dollars, he is no longer referred to as Caspar-the-knife but as Caspar-the-shovel. "He shovels money into the Pentagon furnace!" the liberal "doves" complained and the conservative "hawks" said with delight.

The following small detail might be humorous if it did not pertain to a megadeath conveyor. Entering as the rightful victor over American Democrats his office on the third floor of circle "E" in the Pentagon, Weinberger immediately made arrangements to have the "bureaucratic daubings" removed from his walls and replaced by the Italian masterpiece "Titian and Student" dating from the year 1590. The liberals rejoiced: Caspar is one of us, flesh of our flesh, blood of our blood, white blood, blue blood, an intellectual, Harvard graduate, Phi Beta Kappa, magna cum laude and so forth. Ha ha!--this liberal cooing resounded as a derisive echo in the conservative chambers. Your Caspar is not a fool. He won't go for scraps. He does not like cheap things. Give him nothing but the expensive! And they gave it to him. The decision to build the new B-1 and Stealth Strategic Bombers, to create a naval fleet with from 400 to 600 units and to create 2 additional nuclear aircraft carriers-dinosaurs was made by Weinberger during his very first weeks as defense secretary. I do not know about Titian's student, but the Pentagon's

student proved to be extremely bright and capable. He promised to go far. (Incidentally, Weinberger passed the confirmation hearings in the Senate fairly well. He was thoroughly coached for this by Pentagon experts, who prepared substantial crib sheets for the new chief.)

"It was nothing special," Weinberger said modestly. "The Pentagon is the same sort of corporation as Bechtel."

And in fact, why not compare a construction company with a machine of destruction? After all, the President compared the Pentagon with the department of health, education and welfare!

The Pentagon invariably comes out ahead from such a comparison. All the others lose. The American economy is in a deep slump. There is a terrible budget deficit. Health, education and welfare have been crudely dumped onto a Procrustean bed, over which current budget director David Stockman is performing his magic with axe in hand. And only the Pentagon has what they call there a "free ticket." (The taxpayer coughs up the money.)

When it became clear that no sort of budget "squeezing" could dry up or drain the huge deficit even a little bit, Stockman decided to "snip" 30 billion dollars from the Pentagon. The duel between the former and the present budget directors took place in the Budget Committee of the House of Representatives and ended in a devastating victory for the former. Stockman's elaborate econometric models were ruthlessly smashed by the Pentagon steamroller, which demonstrated, as the newspapers maliciously wrote, "the institutional impotence of the budget office." In vain Stockman attempted to take his rival back to the past, in vain cited the latter's own words to the effect that he "would not be a tool in the hands of the military-industrial complex." "Having changed hats," Weinberger naturally did not go for this naively sentimental bait. He gave Stockman to understand that the latter was forgetting the first commandment of the bureaucratic catechism: "What I stand for is determined by the chair in which I sit." And Weinberger now sits in the chair of the Pentagon chief.

The "change in hats" was not without its savory side. Several years before, in that same committee, Weinberger had protested against plans of current Defense Secretary Laird to begin developing the B-1 bomber. "He demanded a hundred times. I refused a hundred times. He wanted to grab everything in the first 5 minutes," Weinberger recalls. And he did. Together with his deputy David Packard--extremely important military magnate and Californian--Laird applied pressure to Nixon. The latter took his secretary to task for his passion for "low figures" and ordered him to bow the budgetary head in front of the impatient and intractable Pentagon. The lesson from this 5-minute confrontation did not escape Caspar-the-knife but contributed to his subsequent retraining as Caspar-the-shovel....

This time Weinberger pounded on the table more than once in the committee and demanded that he be given billions "during the very first 5 minutes." It was a matter not of haste but of survival. He frightened the legislators, showering them

with "appropriate" documents with the intensity of snow-making machines on the ski slopes of sunny resorts on the Atlantic. He berated "human rights" and "unilateral disarmament," referred to the OSV-2 [SALT II] as a "sad chapter in recent history" and asserted that the defense policy of the United States was being discredited by people who "wring their hands instead of flexing their muscles." The chiefs of staff were delighted. First Deputy Secretary Frank Carlucci was beside himself. (Former Deputy Director of the CIA Carlucci was in perfect agreement with Weinberger. He is known as the "man who leaves no trace," although traces of the CIA are spattered literally over the entire planet.)

It was a "mean" battle in the Congress. (I took this epithet from the bulletin DEFENSE MONITOR.) Another former budget director, Cotter, who attended the hearings, subsequently recalled: "It was an unprecedented situation. I kept saying to myself: 'Either I am dreaming or they have all lost their minds. No administration could afford to do something like this unless the President has lost his senses.'" That day in the Capitol heads rolled on the other side of the budget barricades, where the moderate legislators were dug in. Committee Chairman Jim Jones, recalling Voltaire's "the large battalions are always right," sneeringly congratulated Weinberger on his "brilliant victory."

Having suffered defeat in the Congress, Stockman tried to take his revenge in the White House. Reagan was at the time vacationing on his California ranch. And that is where the main characters in the budget melodrama headed. Stockman was the first to have his say. He eloquently demonstrated that without a strong economy there can be no strong defense and that the Pentagon's insatiable appetite threatened to undermine the nation's economic foundations. Weinberger, surrounded by a constellation of generals and admirals who had still gone no further than to spread out their diagrams and charts, frowned in silence, eyes tightly squinted, and pinched the bridge of his nose. (His subordinates knew this meant that their chief was irritated and was attempting to concentrate.)

Taking the floor, Caspar snapped:

"Without a strong defense a strong economy has no meaning. Fighting is done with weapons and not with social services...."

And once again, as could have been expected, Weinberger's "devastating" logic triumphed. "The Pentagon is not afraid of the budget office and does not need it. Any budget director caught between the President and the defense secretary will be the loser," Donald Hessman, who headed the military department of the budget office, sadly stated.

Washington observers say that the secret of Weinberger's victories in the diplomatic arena is extremely simple: President Reagan is on his side. Reagan, after all, came to the White House with the intention of rearming the United States, in order to close the notorious "vulnerability gap," and Weinberger came to the Pentagon in order to bring the plans of his boss to life (oh, how inappropriate, inappropriate to the point of blasphemy is the use of the word "life" here!).

Remember the inscription on the photograph given to Cap by Ron. The latter thanks the former for the "real smile." Cap is prepared to do anything necessary at the Pentagon to keep Ron's real smile on his face in the White House. This is precisely why Reagan protects Weinberger from the close-fisted Stockman.

There is unquestionably some truth to this reasoning. And not just "some" but a considerable amount of truth. It is undoubtedly significant that Reagan and Weinberger share the same faith. It is also significant that they are bound by close personal relations. The military-political history of the corridors of power in Washington has shown that no Pentagon chief can hold his post long if he does not have the President's "ear," that is, if the President does not listen to his advice. The military establishment considers such a chief to be a "weakling," the generals have contempt for him, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff disregard him and go over his head to deal with the Congress and the White House directly. He finally announces his retirement, which is invariably accepted with the hypocritical "sincere regrets" and the no less hypocritical "recognition of service." (Remember the all-powerful McNamara, as an example. It was enough for him to have doubts about President Johnson's Vietnam policy, and he was "retired.")

The president's power and influence are nonetheless not absolute. To consider them the determining factor would be to exaggerate the role of the White House in the overall structure of leading circles in the United States. Listen to what Steven Hirsh of Washington's Defense Information Center had to say on the subject: "The president must prove to the Joint Chiefs of Staff that he takes seriously his constitutional duties as commander in chief, that his program enjoys Pentagon support. He cannot give the impression that he delegates the authority of the commander in chief to any other individual, to the director of the budget office, for example, without weakening his own position in the process. Military leaders keep a close eye on the president's tone and style. If he opposes their desires too frequently, if he does not trust them, they rapidly begin maneuvering outside the system through their allies in the Congress and industry, with the help of such quasi-lobbyist organizations as the Navy League or the Air Force Association...."

Recent memoirs discussing President Nixon's Watergate agony tell how the President, who already had a tendency to abuse alcohol, attempted to drown his fear of the impending impeachment in alcohol. While under the influence, he talked profusely about using the elite 82d Airborne Division "to guard the White House." As a result, then Defense Secretary Schlesinger and the Joint Chiefs of Staff issued secret instructions ordering the armed forces not to act on orders from the President/commander in chief unless they had been approved by the Pentagon.

Or take another example less dramatic, perhaps, on the surface, but essentially even more indicative. We know that "for the public" the Joint Chiefs of Staff supported President Carter's decision to sign the SALT II Treaty. General Jones, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was even a member of the official American delegation to Geneva. The Pentagon's position with respect to the SALT II Treaty, however, was an open secret. Immediately after the treaty was signed the military-industrial complex began to take action "outside the system" and managed to halt

ratification of the documents signed in Geneva. "These are tough nuts. They can outlast any civilian," former Director of the Budget Office Cotter said about the military establishment.

The real source of strength of Weinberger, of this Pentagon "immortal," lies not in the "magic chest" called the White House but in the very power structure of imperialist circles in the United States. And Reagan-the-boss and Weinberger-the-vassal are the henchmen, even the darlings, of these circles, because they pursue a policy of unrestrained arms race, opening the door for suicidal military adventures, while pretending to be closing the "vulnerability gap."

...And so, Caspar-the-knife became Caspar-the-shovel. A very short time later, however, he acquired a third name--Caspar-the-saber. It would have been far more accurate to call him Caspar-the-bomb, of course. For one thing, however, this nickname had already been attached to one of his predecessors in the Pentagon--Laird (Melvin-the-bombino). In the second place, the need for stylistic unity (knife-shovel-saber) had to be observed. In the third place, also having to do with stylistics, sabers and not bombs are rattled. (Bombs are brandished.) And for Weinberger saber-rattling, like dollar-jingling, became the essence of his work as Pentagon chief. "If the move from 'cold war' to detente is progress, we cannot afford such progress," he proclaims. Progress, according to Weinberger, is progressive war paranoia. (Here we have one more cause-and-effect link between the "vulnerability gap" and the gap through which Forrestal leapt into oblivion!)

They say that traveling expands a person's horizons, enriches his mind. Weinberger is perhaps the most "traveled" U.S. defense minister ever. During his first 14 months in the Pentagon he managed to visit 26 countries. (Compare this with his predecessor Harold Brown, who visited 11 countries in the same length of time.) It would be difficult to say whether this intensive roaming over the planet has broadened Weinberger's mental horizons, but they have immensely broadened and simultaneously moved toward us the horizons of the danger of war. Wherever Caspar-the-saber has appeared, he has invariably been trailed, like a train, by the arms race and the Pentagon's Greek gifts--the neutron bomb for Western Europe, AWACS for Saudi Arabia and so forth.

Weinberger travels the world not simply as the Pentagon chief. It turns out that he is also conducting his very own foreign policy. But let us not exaggerate: It is "his own" only to the extent that Weinberger himself is his own man on the Potomac. When the observers state the Weinberger is his own secretary of state, even this refers primarily to the increased influence exerted by the U.S. military establishment on Washington diplomacy. The confrontation between Weinberger and Haig, overly dramatized by the American press, unquestionably did involve a personal element--dislikes, ambitions and a power struggle--and was in the final analysis a reflection of this dangerous phenomenon. What an evil and at the same time, instructive irony of fate that in comparison with civilian Weinberger even General Haig appeared "moderate," if not reasonable. This is how far Washington's political spectrum has moved to the right!

Let me cite two examples by way of illustration. In February of 1981 Weinberger announced at a press conference that he was for deploying the neutron bomb in Western Europe. In the NATO capitals this announcement upset government circles and created a tempest in public circles. The State Department hastened to "explain" that Washington's policy with respect to deployment of the neutron bomb in Western Europe remains unchanged, that it would continue to be kept on American territory. Speaking over Voice of America in September of 1981, Weinberger accused the Soviet Union without proof of using chemical and biological weapons and "hinted" that the United States might "reconsider" agreements outlawing these barbarous weapons and develop "possibilities for an appropriate response." Again there was an uproar and again the State Department hastened to disavow the defense secretary's statement, announcing, also over Voice of America, that the United States would observe the international agreements which it had signed.

The naive "fans" totaling the points in the confrontation between Weinberger and Haig put on the scoreboard 2:0 in favor of the secretary of state, while attributing the Pentagon chief's verbal attack to his lack of experience and quick temper. (At that point Weinberger acquired yet another nickname. "Ready! Fire! Aim!") Weinberger himself supported this version with suspicious willingness: "Frankly, I did not think that so much importance would be given to my every statement. The fact is that when I served as director of the budget office and secretary of health, education and welfare, very few people paid any attention to what I said."

It would be at the very least naive to say, however, that the U.S. defense secretary actually does shoot first and then aim. The new draft budget for the Pentagon shows that menacingly large allocations are being made for the development and deployment of neutron, chemical and biological weapons, which demonstrate that these weapons are beginning to play an ever increasing role in Washington's strategic doctrines. And so, the score which is called Hamburg score, was not 2:0 in favor of Haig, but 2:0 in favor of the arms race. As far as the negative public reaction is concerned, it was as usual attributed to the machinations of "Soviet propaganda" and discounted.

The rivalry between Weinberger and Haig began even before Reagan's inauguration. Upon receiving the post of secretary of state Haig sent the President a memorandum in which he demanded for himself the crown of "foreign policy czar" with the right to oversee the Pentagon. Weinberger immediately compiled a memorandum in response, in which he accused Haig of attempts "to rape" his department. A turbulent telephone discussion took place between the two. Weinberger sat in his office beneath the painting by Titian, while Haig was in his limousine speeding along the streets of Washington. Once again the Hamburg score ended in Weinberger's favor. Haig was refused his "coronation" not so much because the President and the defense secretary were fellow Californians and good friends, while Haig was an outsider, a "piece" of the Nixon-Kissinger empire, but because the new Republican administration had placed the arms race, dictation and the policy of operating "from a position of strength" ("Fire!") ahead of diplomacy ("Aim!"). According to

well-informed Washington commentator Joseph Kraft, when problems pertaining to renewal of the SALT II talks were discussed in the U.S. National Security Council "the Pentagon's proposals ordinarily won out," while Haig's role was limited to "reminding them of the need for continued discussions." The new head of the council, William Clark, is a Californian and an old friend of Weinberger. "In all the years we have known each other we have never had conflicts," says Weinberger. The role of Richard Allen, former head of the council, in the Weinberger-Haig confrontation was compared with that of a monkey jumping about the branches of a tree beneath which elephants are fighting.

The deliberately parallel journeys of Weinberger and Haig confirmed with adequate eloquence the apportionment of Reaganite Washington's foreign policy goals. Once again, however, the brilliant web of court intrigues should not obscure the real essence of the matter. (The inner workings are more important than the external web.) Weinberger and Haig were not like the swan and the crab pulling the administrative cart in opposite directions. They were in the same harness and doing the same job. This is why their parallel journeys, unlike the parallel lines of Euclid's classical geometry, finally crossed each other. And not in infinity at all. Weinberger, for example, preferred to arm Saudi Arabia and Egypt (he had ties with the first from his years as vice president of the Bechtel Corporation), while Haig wanted to arm Israel. As a result, streams of the latest American military equipment are flowing in all directions, and it is not the Pentagon and not the State Department, but peace and security in the Near East, which have been "raped."

Outwardly, Haig's dramatic retirement resolved once and for all his quarrel with Weinberger. Caspar's former colleague in the Bechtel Corporation, George Schultz, joined the U.S. State Department. For the first time in the history of the United States the portfolios of the two leading departments--the diplomatic and the military--were in the hands of agents of the same monopoly. "What is good for Bechtel is good for America," the new residents in Washington say in a take-off on an old Wall Street formula.

They say that the style is not the man. It is the general opinion of both friends and ill-wishers that the main feature of both Weinberger's character and his style--of the man and the politician--is inflexibility. "Caspar is possibly the least flexible member of our team," says one of the senior White House advisers. "After choosing a direction to take, he never deviates from it." Unfortunately, the direction chosen by Weinberger leads down the blind alley of dangerous opposition. Caspar-the-saber's inflexibility is akin to the stubbornness of his spiritual mentor Churchill-the-bulldog. The newspaper WASHINGTON POST quotes a statement by a high-ranking individual in the Pentagon about his chief: "That is just like our Caspar: When he gets something in his head, he grabs onto it with a death grip. He will argue with you until you drop, repeating the same thing over and over, over and over, over and over, until he finally wears you down: 'Don't provide Western technology to the Soviets!' 'Don't let the Soviets build the gas pipeline in Europe!,' 'Try to bankrupt Poland financially!' And so on, all in the same vein. For Caspar this is like all-out war."

Yes, in the area of anticommunism Weinberger's inflexibility becomes an obsession, a "Fire!" before "Aim!" He travels around the world like a roving preacher of anticommunism, hypnotizing his flock with the bugbear of "the Soviet military threat." These sermons sometimes turn into circus shows. This occurred at one of the NATO council sessions in Brussels, for example, when Weinberger, instead of delivering a speech, passed around to his West European colleagues a copper switch ostensibly taken from a "Soviet submarine." While the surprised NATO ministers twiddled with the copper gadget, Weinberger expounded about how "Soviet spies" are stealing military secrets from the West in order to destroy Western civilization. Weinberger ended that trick, which was extremely reminiscent of an act by a magician manipulating objects and the auditorium--"someone from the audience, come up and see for yourself!"--with a phrase which has become something of a refrain in his speech: "Right now is the very time when we should not be making it easier, but harder for the Soviets." (The Pentagon version of Cato's "Carthage must be destroyed.")

To tell the truth, since the very birth of the Soviet Nation there has hardly been a single day when imperialism has made our life easier and not more difficult. It is another question as to whether the gentlemen with the heads made of the same metal as the switch from the "Soviet submarine," which was displayed for the NATO public by Caspar-the-saber, have succeeded in their attempts to strangle the first socialist nation. We are also "inflexible" people, and no one can force us to turn aside from the path chosen once and for all in October of 1917, Mr. Weinberger!

One other Pentagon official, who knows his chief very well, has the following to say: "Caspar is a militant anticommunist. Since he is a man without proper training and the necessary refinement, his foreign policy views are distinguished by cruelty and over-simplification: 'They (the Soviets, that is--M.S.) are our enemies, they are against us.' The same idea is invariably presented at each morning conference in his office: 'They are the bad guys.'" The idea is indeed not very refined and furthermore it is taken from the cowboy and gangster movies in which, even after color cinematography came into being, only two colors--black and white--dominated, and there are correspondingly only "the good guys" and "the bad guys." This reminds one of how the crowd ordinarily began singing "For he's a jolly good fellow" when Churchill addressed the people. Going back to the morning conferences in the office of the Pentagon chief, the possibility is not ruled out that he will make yet another change inside the office--remove Titian's painting and order it replaced with a new "Churchill and Student" by amateurish Washington battle-painters....

About Weinberger they say that he is made of nothing but contradictions: He tries to be soft, but his words and thoughts are hard; he is considered an anglophile, but he does not understand Europeans; he has diplomatic ambitions, but he conducts himself in the international arena like a bull in a china shop; a Jew by birth, but member of the Episcopal church; shy by nature, but he refers to himself only with the plural "we"; a close-fisted man, but he does not touch even a half-trillion-dollar budget; totally civilian, but he heads the most gigantic militaristic machine; he preaches isolationism, but he is prepared to send American youth, the "good ones," of course, to any spot on the planet.

We need to take a somewhat detailed look at the latter "contradiction." (We place the word "contradiction" in quotation marks for a reason. It is actually illusory.) Weinberger's isolationism is a special kind. It is not the "this does not pertain to me" or even the well-known principle "America is a fortress." The logic behind his reasoning is approximately the following: Since our allies are an unreliable lot, who don't want to open up their pursestrings for the arms race, made soft by recent detente and ancient civilization, who prefer in the depths of their hearts a Russian gas pipeline to the American neutron bomb and traitorous pacifism to dependable aggressiveness, there is nothing left for us to do but to take the care of the world exclusively into our own hands. (This automatically reminds one of the slogan of the U.S. Strategic Air Force: "The world is our occupation.")

If you want peace, prepare for war. And "peace-maker" Weinberger is preparing. To his utmost. He is no longer satisfied with the doctrines of "half a war," "two and a half wars" or the other "half-and-half" rubbish. Nor is he satisfied with the other doctrines: blitzkrieg and drawn-out war, nuclear war or "conventional" war, local, limited or all-out. More precisely, he is not satisfied with them separately. In this hellish combination, however, they suit him completely, are completely to his liking. "We must prepare to conduct several wars simultaneously. Not on fronts chosen by the enemy, but on fronts which we will force upon him. These will be lengthy wars to break up the Soviet empire," Caspar-the-saber expounds. This verbiage not only emits moldy anti-Sovietism, it also smells of radioactive devastation. "Weinberger is too gloomy, too egocentric, too focused on one thing, too brawny, too cocky, too belligerent, too undisciplined, too simplistic. In his mind, the world is one solid and all-permeating threat," writes well-known Washington commentator Stephen Rosenfeld. Yes, Weinberger is "too," and this is why precisely he and those like him are the real threat to peace.

All the talk about an imaginary military "lag" by the United States behind the Soviet Union is also in the category of "too." The objective is to justify the unrestrained arms race and use it to achieve military superiority over us. In a 9 August press interview Weinberger openly stated that all the Pentagon's efforts are aimed at achieving superiority over the USSR in a nuclear war and termination of the war to the advantage of the United States. In his words, the nuclear capabilities of the United States "must surpass those of the Soviet Union at all stages in the conduct of a war." And here's your "vulnerability gap"! Why try to break down an open door, though?! The Washington gentlemen have never given up their dreams of achieving military superiority, because these dreams are steps toward their ultimate dream, one which has become an obsession, the dream of world domination. And "world domination," V.I. Lenin warned us, is, to put it briefly, "the substance of imperialist policy, the extension of which is imperialist war."

With respect to Weinberger's "isolationism," Caspar-the-saber himself defines it in the following manner: "It is far simpler and more effective to protect California in New Guinea than in Oregon." Of course, it is, Mr. Weinberger, of

course it is! And would it not be simpler and more effective to defend Oklahoma in Belgium, Mississippi in Holland, Iowa in Italy, Alaska in Denmark, Massachusetts in England, Louisiana in France, Alabama in Luxembourg, Ohio in Japan, the Far West in the Near East and Florida in El Salvador? Since in this case we are talking exclusively about defending American states, there is no need to ask the opinion of the people of those countries. And their permission--certainly not.... Incidentally, Weinberger himself does not consider himself an isolationist at all. "For God's sake, what kind of isolationist am I? I am a real internationalist," he says and to confirm this he keeps bringing out the same formula about protecting California in New Guinea. Apparently, Mr. Weinberger does not know that in normal human language this is called interventionism.

...Recently Weinberger has been appearing more and more frequently on the television screens, on the pages of newspapers and magazines, surrounded by gun kings and cannon fodder, accompanied by 6-foot generals and admirals. ("Like Bonaparte among his marshals," the wits say with a snicker.) In strange attire--half-civilian, half-military. He climbs the ladders onto aircraft carriers and descends through the hatches of tanks. He flies into the skies on an F-16 and descends into the ocean depths on Poseidon submarines. He receives military parades, his right hand on his heart, and launches military maneuvers "with a slight wave of the hand." He peers through binoculars and periscopes. In short, he is entering into the role.

I do not know what sort of pictures he sees through the military eyepieces, but one thing is clear: implementation of the delirious ideas of Weinberger and his bosses would turn our planet into a radioactive wasteland.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Znamya", 1982

11499

CSO: 1807/107

END