

212282

JPRS-UWE-85-005

16 May 1985

USSR Report

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No. 12, December 1984

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

19991008 099

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE



2
125
A06

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.

16 May 1985

USSR REPORT

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No 12, December 1984

Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language monthly journal **MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA** published in Moscow by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

English Summary of Major Articles (pp 158-159).....	1
Review of Documents Collection Lauds Gromyko Introduction (pp 3-13) (N. Kapchenko).....	5
Standards to Observe in the Nuclear Age (pp 14-28) (V. Davydov).....	18
Singularities of the Transnational Corporations' Current Expansion (pp 29-40) (A. Astapovich) (not translated)	
Paths of the Formation of Japanese Transnational Corporations (pp 41-52) (A. Kolontay) (not translated)	
Current Problems Confronting Ecologists in FRG (pp 53-62) (V. Granov).....	35
The Food Problem in the Developing Countries (pp 63-77) (L. Bagramov) (not translated)	
GLORIOUS ANNIVERSARIES	
Mongolia's Socialist Path (pp 78-87) (A. Taksabayev) (not translated)	

IDEOLOGICAL CURRENTS IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD

Various Third World 'Socialist Concepts' Critiqued (pp 88-95) (A. Kaufman).....	47
--	----

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT VICTORY

French-USSR WWII Cooperation Against 'Anglo-Saxons' Recalled (pp 96-104) (K. Zuyeva).....	59
--	----

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

Conference on East-West Relations in Europe Held in Prague (pp 105-118) (A. Kokeyev).....	70
--	----

DISCUSSION

Classification of Economic Crises, Periodization of Postwar Cycles (pp 119-126) (V. Khablyuk) (not translated)	
--	--

SURVEYS, INFORMATION

State-Monopoly Regulation of Foreign Trade of Developed Capitalist Countries (pp 127-133) (S. Chebanov) (not translated)	
--	--

BOOK, AUTHORS

IMEMO Series on Capitalist States: Volume on Italy (pp 134-136) (I. Levin).....	87
--	----

Book on Latin American Ideologies Reviewed (pp 137-139) (I. Zorina).....	92
---	----

Two Books on CEMA-Western Trade Reviewed (pp 139-140) (Ye. Yakovleva).....	96
---	----

U.S. Book Hits 'Artificial Obstacles' to U.S.-Soviet Trade (pp 141-142) (Ye. Prokudin).....	99
--	----

Review of "Transnational Corporations in World Development. Third Survey," United Nations (pp 143-144) (I. Sysoyev) (not translated)	
--	--

Review of "From Dependency to Development: Strategies To Overcome Underdevelopment and Inequality," (pp 145-147) (I. Aleshina) (not translated)	
---	--

Review of "Interregional Intersectorial Models of the World Economy (pp 147-149) (A. Mileykovskiy, I. Filatochev) (not translated)	
--	--

Index to Articles for 1984 (pp 150-157).....	103
--	-----

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS, No 12, December 1984

Russian title : MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE
OTNOSHENIYA

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : Ya. S. Khavinson

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : December 1984

Signed to press : 15 November 1984

Copies : 28,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya
ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye
otnosheniya". 1984

ENGLISH SUMMARIES OF MAJOR ARTICLES

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 84 (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 158-159

[Text] N. Kapchenko in the article "High Mission of Soviet Foreign Policy" reviews the book "For Peace, Disarmament and Peoples' Security: Chronicle of USSR Foreign Policy". The second supplemented edition of the book covers the history of the country from the October Socialist Revolution up to April 1984 in chronological succession. The book focuses attention on the persistent daily struggle of the CPSU and Soviet state for disarmament and deliverance of humanity from the threat of a nuclear holocaust. Special mention should be made of the introductory article by A.A. Gromyko, Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR. The article entitled "V.I. Lenin and Foreign Policy of the Soviet State" gives a correct interpretation of the facts dealing with the foreign policy course of the USSR, its stability and conceptional importance of the Leninist theoretical and practical legacy in the given field. It is pointed out that the scientific nature of the Soviet foreign policy is predetermined by the very nature of the social order--socialism, which is based on fundamental law of social development discovered by Marxism-Leninism. The Leninist idea of an inalienable interconnection between the home and foreign policy of the Socialist state, of their organic unity runs all through the edition. Another extremely important theoretical and practical problem, that of the alignment of the class, national and state interests is also being solved on the basis of this Leninist concept. The chronicle of home and foreign policy of the USSR clearly shows the collision of the two diametrically opposed courses in the world arena: the peace-loving course of the Soviet Union and its allies and aggressive one of the imperialist states with the U.S.A. at the head. The book cites many examples which convincingly prove that the struggle for peaceful coexistence runs through the entire history of the Soviet foreign policy. This chronicle clearly reveals the profound continuity of its foreign-policy course and duly appreciates the Soviet Union's contribution to the maintenance of peace.

V. Davydov's article "On Norms of Behavior of Nuclear Powers" is dedicated to one of the present-day problems of international security, that of averting the danger of nuclear war, of stopping the building-up of nuclear arms. The Soviet Union has put forward and upheld a package of concrete measures. The article considers their most important points: prevention of war should become the principal aim and obligatory norm of behavior of all nuclear powers,

the renunciation of nuclear war propaganda, reliable security guarantees for non-nuclear countries which do not have nuclear weapons on their territory, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and setting up of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, the quantitative and qualitative freezing of all nuclear weapons which are at the disposal of the nuclear powers. It also proposes that weapons of any type should not be allowed to penetrate into outer space, that following the example of the Soviet Union other nuclear powers should assume an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It points out the existence of a real opportunity to finalize the agreement on complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. There are some other important questions which demand answers. The author shows that most countries of the world have expressed their agreement with the Soviet Union's initiatives seeing in them the key to a cardinal solution of the above mentioned question. The author comes to the conclusion that the elaboration of such a code of conduct has become an imperative of the epoch, badly needed to prevent a situation which could lead to a nuclear conflict as the U.S.A. still pivots its policy on confrontation, further aggravation of tension and heightening of war danger.

The transnational corporations occupy the key positions in the economy of modern capitalism, exert significant influence upon industrial development, scientific and technological progress and the reshaping of international trade flows. They also bring to the international level the monopolies' operations in banking and other services. A. Astapovich in the article "Particulars of Contemporary Expansion of Transnational Corporations" indicates that the TNC's activity nowadays is typified by the uneven character of development, especially under the conditions of unceasing shifts in the balance of forces and emergence of new forms of competition. Internationalization of production within the TNC's structure is focused predominantly in high-technology industries which are the main area of international rivalry. Here transnational giants compete for the timely innovation and commercialization of advanced technology, participating aggressively in technology transfer and international production cooperation, drastically reducing and even discarding low rentable capacities in traditional production fields. The other noteworthy trend is the growing diversification of TNC's activity, embracing international banking, insurance, advertizing business, tourist services, freight and so on. The international trade is the most monopolized by TNC's sphere. Though it is very difficult to quantify the role of TNC's in the world trade some prominent Soviet scholars think that the TNC's proportion in the capitalist trade was almost 60 percent at the beginning of the 1980's. The author comes to a conclusion on the contradictory character of internationalization within the narrow framework of TNC's.

Due to the high rates of foreign operations growth Japan has occupied the third place in the world capitalist economy relating to the overall volume of its external trade and export of capital. The largest trade and industrial monopolies are the main exporting and investing bodies. A. Kolontay in the article "Paths of Japanese Transnational Corporations' Formation" states that Japanese control over a considerable segment of the world capitalist market let him regard the leading Japanese companies as international monopolies, pursuing the global goals. On the basis of historic overview of Japanese

development the author outlines three trends in the transnationalization of national firms backing his conclusion by interesting data. Primarily it is the universalization of traditional trade companies which concentrate their foreign business in extractive industries in the field of commerce and in the service sector. These companies strengthen their control abroad through portfolio investments, managerial and commercial mechanism, participation in technological decisionmaking. Secondly, Japanese industrial corporations take the same path of internationalization as their American and West European counterparts. Thirdly, financial monopoly groups in Japan practice target corporate consolidation with the special purpose to intensify foreign expansion, involving in the transnationalization process large firms as well as small and medium enterprises. Japanese monopolies expansion beyond the national borders contributes to the instability of the world capitalist economy and becomes the source of serious concern for their main imperialist rivals.

The article "The Greens: Ideology and Reality" by V. Granov introduces the reader to a movement which come afore among other "alternative" movements at the beginning of the eighties. According to the "Greens" they are united by the threat to life and the need to defend it. But on the principal issue--what is to be done--their positions are far from being clear. There are different trends inside the movement and much is unclear and contradictory. The author believes that the movement of petty-bourgeois radicalism of the fifties-seventies may be regarded as the predecessor of the Greens with the youth as the principal participants. Certain social-democratic ideas predominantly the reformist idea of overcoming capitalism and advancing to the petty-bourgeois socialist ideas have found ground in the movement alongside with anarchism and neomarxism. The Greens join ever more actively in discussing and solving a wide spectre of political problems particularly that of peace. Their energetic deeds have contributed to the peace movement. The Greens are maturing in the acute political battles on the most important issue of the day. Though their views are obscure one can, in the opinion of the author, single out anti-monopolist and anti-imperialist trends. This is non-proletarian protest against the inefficiency and brutality of capitalism.

L. Bagramov in the article "Food Problem in the Developing Countries" focuses attention on certain sides of reconstruction of international economic relations directly connected with the food problem. The article exposes the scientific and political groundlessness of the thesis widely spread in the West to the effect that the existing trend of increased food exports to the developing countries is quite natural and reflects the "comparative advantages" of food production in Western exporting countries and the benefits of international division of labor which had taken shape. The author examines the practical measures being taken by the developing countries to control the agrobusiness of TNC to make them adhere to a certain "code of behavior". The author stresses that of paramount importance in solving the food problem is aid to foster the development of agriculture on conditions free from burdensome payments. Neither should it intensify the developing countries' dependence upon the industrial centres of capitalist world. It is pointed out that food aid should be used for political pressure and negatively effecting local agricultural production. The final part of the article deals with as yet fruitless discussions carried by international organizations on the issue of

building of national food reserves which must be coordinated on the international level.

"The publication "Against Militarism and Revanchism" rendered by the "Scientific life" section is devoted to an international symposium in Prague on the danger presented by militarist and revanchist tendencies in the political circles of a number of Western countries. The symposium was attended by prominent experts in international affairs, research institute directors, public figures, scientists and journalists from 12 European countries, including the Soviet Union. Various aspects of the problem involved in international security were examined. The topical problem was to find ways of neutralizing the danger of revanchism which has grown enormously over the past few years. Every report gives a scientific analysis of the problem which exposes the inalienable connection between revanchism and the aggressive foreign policy course of present-day imperialism. The symposium voiced deep anxiety over the revival of revanchist forces in West Germany over their revanchist and militarist actions creating a threat to peace.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

CSO: 1816/9

REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS COLLECTION LAUDS GROMYKO INTRODUCTION

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, December 1984 (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 3-13

[Article by N, Kapchenko: "Lofty Mission of Soviet Foreign Policy"--Names between slantlines published in wide-spaced print; words between double slantlines published in boldface]

[Text] Contemporary life cannot be imagined without the Soviet state's influence on the fate of mankind and the future of civilization. It can be claimed with confidence that the further we go the more the course of world development will be determined by the real socialism that was born in the Great October Socialist Revolution and which, from the very first day of its existence, had directed the entire force of its creative and constructive potential toward asserting the ideals of peace and social justice. It is in this way that scientific socialism has merged with the living practice of millions and millions of working people. An era of grandiose victories of the workers class and achievements of popular masses began.

Among these achievements, the foreign political activity of the Land of the Soviets has invariably caught the imagination of its contemporaries and, we are convinced, will astound our descendants and future historians with its newness, scope, and purposefulness.

The following qualities are characteristics of the international course of the CPSU and the Soviet state: an organic integral fusion of sober scientific foresight and of orientation to a future such as it had been dreamed of by many human generations; the nobleness of the ideals and goals of the policy and their realism; and a complete conformity of means with these lofty goals to the achievement of which the Leninist strategy of their diplomacy of socialism is oriented.

I

The book "For Peace, Disarmament, and the Security of Peoples," published by the Political Literature Publishing House, is the second expanded edition of the annals of the USSR foreign policy covering a very long chronological period from the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution to April 1984.¹ This very fact, that is, precisely the fact that this entire period from the

birth of the Soviet state to our time is condensed in the sum of concrete events and facts, predetermines also the style of rendition which is laconic and at times extraordinarily lapidary and which, at the same time, makes it possible to trace the tireless efforts and the main directions of the Soviet state's struggle to ensure peace and restrain the aggressive circles of imperialism. And all these efforts have been dictated by deep concern for strengthening mutual understanding and cooperation, building an atmosphere of trust and stability in relations between peoples and states, and solving the most urgent problems that such a dynamic and contradictory development of events in our century has placed before mankind on the basis of just and democratic principles. The apparently dry and seemingly impassive facts hide the full intense and, at the same time, profoundly realistically substantiated, daily and tireless struggle of the Communist Party and the Soviet State for practical realization of the ideals of peace and implementation of the decisions aimed at delivering mankind from the dangers of increasingly destructive wars.

Of course, the knowledge and understanding of historical events and facts also have their own independent value: it is an accepted belief that only history itself passes the final verdict on itself. It goes without saying that all this is so. However, not only does history teach all generations about the past but it also helps us to understand the future. Reviewing the history of foreign policy of the Soviet Union precisely in this perspective and from this viewpoint makes it possible to provide a correct appraisal of the most important past international events and perceive in a similarly true light the most important trends of future development.

This understanding of Soviet foreign policy, of its genesis, of its strategy and tactics, of the forms and methods of its implementation, and, naturally, of the sources of inception of its fundamental principles, as well as of its most important directions at the contemporary stage is furthered by the foreword article of the edition by A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR minister of foreign affairs, entitled: "V.I. Lenin and Foreign Policy of the Soviet State." The article elucidates the fundamental features of the USSR's international course, characterizes its principle distinction from the foreign policy of preceding socioeconomic formations, reveals the significance of the Leninist theoretical and practical legacy in this field, and emphasizes the stability of this course and our party's loyalty to V.I. Lenin's legacy.

The history of Soviet foreign policy cannot be correctly understood and evaluated without the closest coordination, or outside of the organic connection of Soviet foreign policy with theory and practice. This is a shining example of the fundamentally scientific and theoretical basis of practical action and, at the same time, of the profoundly and essentially dialectical verification of theory by practice.

A.A. Gromyko emphasizes in his article: "Lenin accomplished an enormous amount of work in determining and scientifically substantiating the main goals and the basic principles and directions of international activity of the

Communist Party and the Soviet state. Guiding this activity over a period of several years, he was the first to unite the theory of scientific communism with the foreign political practice of the socialist state. It was this fruitful fusion that engendered a hitherto unprecedented foreign policy which has become a reliable supporting factor for peoples in their further struggle for peace, freedom, independence, and socialism" (pp 8-9). V.I. Lenin provided a model of a true scientific analysis of the most important and complicated questions of world politics and worked out a methodologically unsurpassed and theoretically fruitful approach to solving international problems. He taught the communists to appraise from class positions all questions placed before them by the development of world events. His classic formula is well known: "Politics is a science and an art which does not fall from heaven and is not presented as a gift, and... the proletariat, if it wants to triumph over the bourgeoisie, must produce for itself //its own// proletarian, 'class politicians,' politicians who will not be worse than the bourgeois politicians."²

The history of the foreign policy of the Soviet state most convincingly proves that the communist party is invariably and consistently fulfilling the instructions of its founder and leader. It has exercised and continues to exercise leadership over the country's multifaceted foreign political activity on the basis of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, creatively analyzes new phenomena in international relations, and demonstrates in this connection real political skill. Another of Lenin's behests, that on the need for the proletariat to "produce" its own politicians, is being also fulfilled successfully. The Soviet school of diplomacy that has developed under the assiduous leadership of the party and its Central Committee worthily represents and defends our country's interests on the international scene and has accumulated a vast and multifaceted experience in the foreign political struggle for the interests of peace and socialism. This experience is being constantly enriched and perfected and reflects the growing scope and depth of Soviet diplomacy's impact on contemporary international relations.

The scientific character of Soviet foreign policy is predetermined by the very nature of the social system of socialism that is built on the basis of the fundamental laws of social development uncovered by Marxism-Leninism. The creative potential of the Marxist-Leninist theory also determines the creative principles of the scientific foundations of the Soviet state's foreign policy. The loyalty and with the ability to appraise the processes taking place in the world without blinkers and from realistic positions and, on the basis of this analysis, to make conclusions that reflect the reality.

A.A. Gromyko's article especially stresses the significance of the tenets of dialectical and philosophical materialism developed by V.I. Lenin as well as the significance of the Leninist philosophical ideas for the formation of the principled foundations of the foreign policy of socialism. Relying on these tenets and creatively developing and enriching the ideas of K. Marx and F. Engels, V.I. Lenin developed the scientific theory of imperialism in which he brilliantly and perspicaciously revealed the basic laws of economic and political development under the conditions of the highest and last stage of capitalism. It is impossible to overrate the importance and lasting value of the Leninist theory of imperialism both for the theoretical and practical

activity of the CPSU, the Soviet state, and the world communist and national liberation movement. "The Leninist theory of imperialism is a remarkable scientific discovery that makes it possible to understand the laws of the contemporary stage of world development and international relations. Both the Soviet foreign policy and the world communist movement are armed with it. Marked by depth and accuracy, the Leninist characteristics of the main detachments of imperialism, that is, the American, German, British, French and other detachments, also now help us work out a differentiated policy in relation to such capitalist countries as the United States, the FRG, Britain, France, Italy, Japan and others." (pp 5-6)

It cannot be considered accidental that the contemporary bourgeois political science and all kinds of critics of the Soviet foreign policy are especially bitterly attacking precisely the Leninist theory of imperialism. There is an explanation for the continuous assaults of the bourgeois ideologues on this theory. And the explanation is utterly simple: Precisely this theory uncovers with scientific convincingness and objectivity the main source of war danger in the contemporary world, that is, imperialism. The documents included in the book confirm the truth of this conclusion with many examples concerning either the period of organization of a direct military intervention of imperialist powers against the young Soviet republic or the period preceding the beginning of World War II when the rivalry between these powers as well as their aspiration to destroy the world's first socialist state played a considerable role in the failure to prevent that war.

The events of the postwar period also prove the correctness of this conclusion. The "cold war" unleashed by the forces of imperialism and primarily American imperialism can and must be considered with complete justification as one of the manifestations of the imperialism's immanently inherent aspiration to war, aggression and force. Of course, the correlation of forces existing in the world already at that time did not permit the aggressive circles to turn the "cold war" into a real war. The developing process of weakening of the general positions of capitalism as a system has not abolished and cannot abolish the basic features and specific characteristics of imperialism as revealed by V.I. Lenin, that is, in particular, the fact that precisely imperialism has been and continues to be the main source of wars and dangers of war. These positions and conclusions are convincingly presented and supported with sound arguments in the book and are graphically confirmed with a vast amount of factual documents.

The Leninist idea of indissoluble interdependence of domestic and foreign policies of the socialist state and of their organic unity determined by the fact that both of them are dialectically interrelated and share a common basis because their main contents are determined by the socioeconomic system, runs like a red line through the entire edition of this book. The book cites V.I. Lenin's statements resolutely rejecting the concepts the promoters of which not only separated the domestic from foreign policy but quite often also opposed them to each other by pursuing their own self-seeking class interests.

The Leninist directions have made it and continue to make it possible to consider from the only correct positions the actions of states on the international community. "Precisely the indissoluble interdependence of

domestic and foreign policy of the socialist state, emanating from its social system, explains the fact that only socialism can guarantee the true democratic principles of international communication, full respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries, and equal interstate cooperation, and offer selfless support to the peoples struggling for national liberation and social progress." (p 12)

Another extraordinarily important theoretical and practical problem, the problem of correlation of the class and national interests, is also solved on the basis of this Leninist idea. This problem has been placed on the current agenda by the very course of life itself, by the historical conditions of the struggle to build socialism and to protect its achievements on the international scene. Proceeding from the scientific theory of socialism, the CPSU and the Soviet state have provided clear answers to the questions concerning the problem of correlation of the class and national interests and have demonstrated with their practical activity that the socialist state's foreign policy skillfully practices the dialectical interdependence of these two phenomena. This was convincingly demonstrated by the program documents adopted by the Soviet power as far back as in November 1917, such as the "declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia," the address "To All Muslim Working People of Russia and the East," and the "Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People."

It must be noted that the correlation of the class and national interests, the two categories that are so important for a correct analysis of domestic and foreign policies, is by no means the same under the conditions of different socioeconomic formations. In the bourgeois state, the ruling class proclaims its own class interests, which are antagonistically contrary to the interests of all working classes and to the interests of the nation as a whole, as "all-national" and "general state" interests. This represents not only an attempt to suppress the fundamental interests of the forces opposing the bourgeoisie but also a striving to present capitalism as a society that is devoid of social antagonisms and a society that is capable of "harmonizing" the interests of different classes.

As the practice of the USSR foreign policy shows, the situation in this respect is totally different under socialism where a natural process of merging of the class and national interests into one whole takes place. The absence of antagonisms in society and a close interweaving of the interests of the broadest working masses is the basis of this unification.

Because the interests of the workers class are devoid of any self-seeking narrowmindedness, it is precisely these interests that, in the socialist state, represent the basis on which the general interests of the nation and the people as a whole are shaped and formed. As a result of this, in socialist society both domestic and the foreign policy express the common interests of the working classes. This is the origin of the policy's stability and consistency. "The socialist statehood also undergoes qualitative changes in this connection and the most important of these changes is the transformation of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into an all-people's state. This fact found its expression in the 1977 USSR Constitution, adopted by all people, which provides the legislative basis for a further deepening of socialist democracy." (p 7)

II

The most important task of the USSR foreign policy is to protect the fundamental interests of the Soviet people and, together with other fraternal countries, ensure favorable international conditions for socialist and communist construction. The practical fulfillment of difficult and responsible tasks requires enormous and constant efforts because the sphere of foreign policy is essentially the sphere of continuous struggle against the imperialist attempts to undermine the development and strengthening of socialism under peaceful conditions. A.A. Gromyko points out in his article: "Accordingly, our country faces newer and newer tasks in the sphere of international politics, just as newer and newer tasks arise also in the cause of communist construction as a whole. And today, too, in such a complex sphere as the relations between peoples and states where multifaceted economic, political, military, national, and even psychological factors are interacting, intertwining and conflicting and where the resultant of various forces certainly does not lend itself easily to an advance determination, the CPSU possesses a true and reliable guideline, the Leninist teaching on the foreign policy of socialist state and the Leninist practice of its implementation." (p 14)

The documents of the annals of the Soviet foreign policy give the reader a graphically clear picture of the fact that the appearance of the first socialist state on the world scene signified a radical turn not only in the general course of history but also specifically in the sphere of international relations. Peoples acquired in the body of the Soviet state a real material force that has made it possible to raise and solve, in principle, in a new way the fundamental problems of our era, the issues of war and peace and of restraining imperialist aggression and the issues connected with disarmament. Until the appearance of the Soviet Union, it had been possible only to dream about any practical solutions for these problems of vital importance for mankind. Following its entry on the world scene, they became questions of the practical activity of the broadest popular masses which appeared on the historical scene for the first time not as objects of politics but as its active participants and creators. Thanks primarily to socialism and the foreign policies of the Soviet Union and other fraternal states, the vitally important questions of the contemporary period are no longer solved--as in the past--in the quiet of ministerial offices of major imperialist powers and in the boardrooms and offices of leading corporations and banks but are instead moved to an arena where the masses of the working people have a real voice, which is growing stronger and more resolute from year to year. It is necessary at all to note in this connection that this testifies to radical changes in the entire system of international relations? The beginning of their radical restructuring was provided by the Great October Socialist Revolution and the emergence of the Soviet state, whose foreign policy became a most important and active factor in breaking down the old relations of subordination and dependency, of violence and wars, which were the legacy of exploitative systems.

The facts and documents included in the book convincingly attest to the fact that the peace-loving potential of all mankind grows immeasurably and steadfastly as the foundations of socialism in the USSR and in other countries

that embarked on the path of building a new society are consolidated. This makes it possible to thwart the aggressive plans and intrigues of militarist forces and consolidate peace wherever the imperialists have tried to unleash war. As a result of this, already for 4 decades now, mankind has lived in peace even though this may have been an anxious peace subject to constant and sudden attacks and threats, an unstable but nonetheless real peace. Enormous credit for this fact must be given to the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and all countries of the socialist community which, in cooperation with all peace-loving forces, erected a mighty and reliable barrier on the path of instigators of a new world war.

The increased threat of nuclear conflict had engendered an antiwar movement that is unprecedented in extent, scope, and depth and on the platform of which the circles and strata of population of all countries and continents, most diverse by their class positions, political views, and ideological convictions, are uniting. And regardless of their own subjective views, they see the Soviet Union's peace-loving policy as a force that actively and purposefully, consistently and uncompromisingly works for the defense of peace, for disarmament, and for building stable and reliable foundations of international security. The high moral authority enjoyed by Soviet foreign policy has been won through a long and hard struggle and it is not based on any particular "artificial propaganda actions," as the imperialist propaganda tries to claim, but on concrete and real deeds the purpose of which is to make the world safer and the life of the peoples free from the Damocles' sword of nuclear self-destruction.

The annals of the foreign policy of the Soviet state distinctly express in the language of concrete facts the antagonism between the two diametrically opposite courses in world politics, between the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries of socialism on the one hand, and the imperialist powers headed by the United States, on the other. What is essentially involved is a matter of choosing between peace and war, between a policy aimed at cooperation between peoples and states and a policy aimed at military antagonism, at undermining international stability, and sliding into a nuclear catastrophe. This is precisely the way the question has been raised by the reality of our period and precisely this represents a genuinely real and not artificial choice.

III

It goes without saying that the annals of the Soviet foreign policy cannot fully reflect the process of formation and consolidation, in the practice of worldwide relations, of the principles by which our country is guided in its international activity. Nevertheless, they do provide an opportunity to trace the real struggle for the implementation of the fundamental principles of socialist foreign policy, the principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism and of peaceful coexistence, over a period of nearly 7 decades.

As the fundamental principle of the policy and ideology of the workers class, the principle of proletarian internationalism has been built into the very foundation of the Soviet state's foreign policy. It has been developed and

enriched through the growth and strengthening of the positions of socialism in the world. This principle has acquired a new quality as a result of the formation of the world socialist system. "As applied to the relations between the socialist states, proletarian internationalism appears in its highest form as socialist internationalism that includes not only the action unity of national detachments of the victorious workers class and their Marxist-Leninist vanguards but also a comprehensive solidarity and cooperation of the fraternal countries.

Socialist internationalism is a natural stage in the development of international solidarity of the workers class under the historical conditions under which it has become the ruling class and under which its Marxist-Leninist parties have become the ruling parties and when the tasks of building socialism and communism, of developing and strengthening the interstate relations of socialist type, of consolidating the international positions of the world system of socialism, and of jointly defending the socialist achievements have become a matter of practical concern for them." (pp 16-17)

The book reflects the most important landmarks in the development of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries, the process of continuous widening and strengthening of their ties and interactions in all spheres, in the political, economic, military, scientific-technical, cultural, and other spheres. The most important characteristic of the foreign political activity of countries of the socialist community are the coordination and agreement of their joint actions on the firm basis provided by the Warsaw Pact and the bilateral treaties of friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance. The forms of cooperation and interaction of socialist countries in the sphere of foreign policy are multifaceted and they are constantly further developed, deepened, and perfected, reflecting thereby an increased level of unity and the need for opposing the aggressive policy of imperialism with cohesion and with coordinated actions aimed at thwarting the militarist plans of the advocates of the new world war. The reader can obtain a clear and convincing picture of the way the coordination of these actions is achieved and the coordinated positions on the most important international problems are worked out by turning the pages of the annals which provide information on the activity of the political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-countries. The economic aspects of cooperation between the countries of socialism are reflected in the activity of CEMA, which plays a primary role in perfecting and deepening the socialist economic integration.

The coordination of actions of the countries of the socialist community on the basis of socialist internationalism have made it possible to solve a number of major and difficult international tasks. They foiled the attempts at an imperialist blockade of Cuba and contributed to an international legal recognition of the GDR, to the conclusion of treaties between the USSR, the GDR, the Polish People's Republic, and the CSSR on the one hand and the FRG, on the other, and of the four-power agreement on West Berlin, to the successful, historic CSCE, to the victory of the Vietnamese people against the American aggressors, as well as to achieving a number of accords aimed at limiting the arms race. All these achievements are indisputably important results of coordinated actions of the fraternal socialist countries which would have been impossible without a unity of goals, will, and actions.

The further cohesion and coordination of foreign political efforts of the socialist states on the world scene have become especially important in the present very aggravated international conditions. For this reason the fraternal parties of the socialist countries are intensifying their activity to foil the aggressive intrigues of the imperialist circles and the plans of the NATO military that are dangerous for the cause of peace.

The documents characterizing the Soviet Union's consistent policy in relation to the peoples and states that have won their freedom and independence through a persistent struggle against imperialism and colonialism have an important place in the annals. Their victory in this struggle is indissolubly linked with the assistance which the Soviet country and other socialist states provided and continue to provide for the just cause of the national liberation of peoples from the fetters of oppression and exploitation. The facts cited in the book testify to the fact that in its foreign policy the Soviet Union has proceeded and continues to proceed from an objectively existing community of its own fundamental interests and the fundamental interests of the liberated countries and peoples. As a result of this fact, the widest possibilities exist for further developing cooperation and interaction in the struggle for the consolidation of peace, the total liquidation of all aspects and vestiges of colonialism, the elimination of the phenomena of neocolonialism, and real political independence and economic autonomy of the developing countries.

The effectiveness and fruitfulness of this course have been confirmed by life itself and tested in practice. They have found their direct expression in the relations between the USSR and many Asian, African, and Latin American countries the high level of which is reflected in the conclusion of the friendship and cooperation treaties between our country, on the one hand, and India, Syria, Iraq, Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Afghanistan, Democratic Yemen, and--in October 1984--the Yemen Arab Republic, on the other.

VI

The struggle to assert the principles of peaceful coexistence in the practice of international relations has been and continues to be the main direction of the foreign political activity of the Soviet state. This direction has never been of a tactical nature and it has nothing in common with the fable spread by the imperialist propaganda according to which the USSR's devotion to the policy of peaceful coexistence allegedly depends on temporary current demand and circumstances. "The Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, consistently defended by the foreign policy of socialism," A.A. Gromyko points out, "corresponds to the character, basic laws, and demands of the contemporary period and therefore has the great vital force." (p 29)

The process of introducing this principle in international life is directly linked with the growing power of socialism as a social system the ideal of which is firm and just peace among peoples. The goal of the Leninist concept of peaceful coexistence, which concept is of a class nature, is not to channel

the historically inevitable antagonism between the two social systems into a course of conflict and sharp confrontation but into a peaceful course. What is involved here is to ensure that this antagonism does not turn into a military conflict toward which imperialism is pushing mankind. It has already become an axiom of the contemporary international reality that, in the nuclear and missile era, peaceful coexistence is the only sensible alternative to a nuclear catastrophe. The Soviet Union considers peaceful coexistence as the most important factor for the solution of the most acute problem of the contemporary period, the problem of excluding wars from the life of human society and establishing stable peace, reliable security, and fruitful cooperation on earth. At the same time--and this should be especially emphasized--the concept of peaceful coexistence is a concept of resolute and uncompromising counteractions to the aggressive impulses of imperialism and a concept of active struggle to restrain militarism and build the relations between states on just and democratic foundations.

The facts cited in the book convincingly show that the struggle for asserting the principles of peaceful coexistence runs as a red line through the entire history of the Soviet foreign policy, beginning with the first days of the Great October Revolution. It is embodied in the constructive and realistic steps and proposals concerning both the global international problems and the bilateral relations with one or another capitalist country. It was primarily as a result of the socialist states' policy of peaceful coexistence that, in the seventies, essential progress was made in stabilizing the international relations on a sound basis. That process was called detente. The successful conclusion of the all-European conference in Helsinki provided grounds for considering it as a turning point on the road of the assertion of the principles of peaceful coexistence in world politics.

The remarkable landmarks in this process were such events as the 1972 signing of the document on the foundations of mutual relations between the USSR and the United States which clearly stated that both sides would proceed from the conviction that, in the nuclear era, there can be no other basis for maintaining the relations between them than peaceful coexistence. The agreement was signed by the then U.S. President R. Nixon. Afterwards when he was no longer in power, Nixon considered it possible to express his true attitude toward peaceful coexistence which is strikingly different from the attitude stated in the aforementioned document. "The third world war began on the day when World War II ended," he asserts. And further developing this idea, he cynically states: "We are in a state of war (he means: with the USSR--//N.K.//), we have been drawn into a gigantic struggle in which the fates of peoples are being decided."³

It is enough to compare the document on the foundations of relations with the USSR which R. Nixon signed on behalf of the United States, and the aforementioned statement to understand the entire discrepancy between the words and deeds of the American leaders. At the same time this attests to the fact that the reality of life is stronger than the designs and aspirations of American leaders. And whether they want it or not, they must take into account the reality. And in our period, the reality is this: Peaceful coexistence is the only sensible foundation on which mutual relations between the states with different social systems can be based.

Of course, the process of asserting the principles of peaceful coexistence in the practice of international relations is a long process that is characterized by a continuous antagonism between the forces of peace and social progress and the forces of aggression, militarism, and reaction. Here the successes do not come easily and they are achieved only through persistent and intensive struggle. And yet, in appraising the course of events from a broad historical perspective, it cannot but be concluded that in the final analysis the principle and policy of peaceful coexistence are blazing a trail for themselves.

The truly titanic struggle of the Soviet Union to solve the fundamental problem of the contemporary period, the problem of curbing the nuclear arms race and of disarmament, is strikingly reflected in the book. The policy of the Soviet country on this question is traced through several decades, beginning with the Genoa conference. Regardless of the serious obstacles erected by the Western militarist circles, the persistent efforts of the Soviet Union and other countries of socialism have produced certain results that represent a restraining factor in curbing the arms race in several directions. Among these results are: The Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water; The Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies; the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; The Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction; the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, and a number of other agreements. It is proper to include here also the fundamental bilateral Soviet-American agreements: the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Missile Defense (protivoraketnaya oborona) Systems and the SALT I Treaty. The SALT II Treaty signed in 1979 could also make an effective contribution to the cause of peace but it has not come into effect through the fault of the United States.

The USSR decision to assume the obligation of non-first-use of nuclear weapons has evoked the widest international response.

At the 39th session of the UN General Assembly in the fall of 1984, the Soviet Union took important new initiatives by submitting for consideration by the international forum the questions "On Using Outer Space Exclusively for Peaceful Purposes for the Benefit of Mankind" and "On the Impermissibility of the Policy of State Terrorism and Any Other Actions of States Aimed at Undermining the Sociopolitical Systems in Other Sovereign States." These proposals are yet another convincing testimony of the fact that the Soviet Union has always been and will continue to be a consistent fighter for curbing the arms race and for disarmament.

This line is opposed by the position of the United States and its NATO allies who have hoisted upon mankind the heaviest burden of the arms race. Washington aspires to establishing its world domination and its policy is permeated with the spirit of imperial ambitions. It is essentially blocking the solution of cardinal disarmament problems and erecting an insurmountable wall on the path to agreements. The process of deployment of the American first-strike nuclear missiles in West European countries provides a striking confirmation of this fact.

However, both the historical experience and the facts of present reality incontrovertibly show that the U.S. aspiration to achieve military supremacy over the USSR in order to dictate its own will is unsound and hopeless. No one will allow the United States to break the existing military-strategic parity and thereby bring mankind to the extremely dangerous brink of a nuclear-missiles catastrophe. It must be finally understood by Washington that what is needed in the nuclear era is the political thinking that would be in accord with the realities dictated by the period.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it consistently advocates serious and honest negotiations on the entire complex of problems of limitation of the arms race and of disarmament, primarily in the sphere of nuclear weapons. As A.A. Gromyko pointed out at the 39th session of the UN General Assembly, "it is our firm conviction that the present alarming tilt in the development of international relations can be straightened, and that it is possible to stop and direct the arms race to descending spirals, to reduce and, subsequently, to completely eliminate the threat of war."

The annals of the Soviet foreign policy reveal especially distinctly and graphically the continuity of the foreign political course of the Soviet states. In the 20th century, the world has experienced a considerable number of grandiose changes and witnessed the events that were of the greatest magnitude by their scope and consequences, the changes and events on the course and development of which the very fact of the existence of the world's first socialist state and the USSR foreign policy have had a growing impact. However, no matter what these changes may be, the foreign political course of the CPSU and the Soviet state is unchanged in its principled basis: It is determined by the ideals of peace and socialism and by the interests of safeguarding the inalienable rights of peoples to freedom, independence and social justice and aimed at developing and deepening an equal and mutually beneficial cooperation between the states with different social systems and at seeking constructive solutions for pressing international problems.

The consistency and continuity of the foreign political activity of the Soviet state are the result of a steadfast loyalty to the Leninist legacy, a steadfast implementation of those noble goals and tasks which the great Lenin placed before the party and country. These characteristics of the Soviet foreign policy logically emanate from the class nature of the socialist system, from the Marxist-Leninist principles built in its very foundations, and from the analysis and consideration of deep trends of the world development.

The continuity of the Soviet Union's domestic and foreign policy finds its expression also in the fact that it is worked out by the party congresses and concretely defined in the resolutions of plenums of party Central Committee. The consistent guidance of the CPSU is its main guarantee. The entire history of our country confirms that the continuity in the understanding of the Soviet communists has nothing in common with any mechanical repetition or simple copying of past experience or with considering current problems through the prism of what has already become the property of history. Past experience does not prevail over the genuinely scientific approach but, on the contrary, helps to find new ways and methods of solving pressing problems and serves the

interests of the future. It is precisely this special characteristic of Soviet policy that K.U. Chernenko pointed out in his speech at the CPSU Central Committee extraordinary plenum in February (1984); "Continuity is not an abstract concept but a living and real task. And its essence is primarily in the need for a continuing movement forward without stopping. That is, moving forward by relying on everything that has been achieved earlier, by enriching it, and by concentrating the collective mind and energy of the communists, the workers class, and the whole people on the unresolved tasks and on the key present and future problems."

The history of Soviet foreign policy, which is reflected in the short annals reviewed here, confirms the conclusion that the foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet state fully reflects that lofty historical responsibility which the Soviet Union, as a great socialist power, has before peoples for preserving and strengthening peace, curbing the arms race, and delivering mankind from the danger of a world thermonuclear war, and for the future of human civilization. And the land of sovietys is sparing no efforts to deliver not only the present but also the future generations from the horrors of war and violence and is fulfilling with honor the noble mission that history has placed on it.

FOOTNOTES

1. "For Peace , Disarmament, and the Security of Peoples: Annal of the USSR Foreign Policy." Second Expanded Edition. Moscow, Politizdat, 1984.
2. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," Vol 41, p 65.
3. R. Nixon, "The Real War", New York, 1980, p 17.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

CSO: 1816/9a-F

STANDARDS TO OBSERVE IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 14-28

[Article by V. Davydov: "Rules of Behavior of the Nuclear Powers"]

[Text] Will mankind enter the 21st century, will the living conditions for the human race on our planet be preserved? These are far from hypothetical and abstract questions. Lethal potential has been stockpiled in the arsenals of the nuclear powers more than a million times greater in yield than the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and sufficient for the annihilation of everything living on our planet many times over. But even this does not seem to be the limit. Qualitatively new, even more devastating types of arms are continuing to be built, and preparations for the militarization of space are proceeding apace. The latest twist of the arms race spiral added by imperialism is threatening to cancel out everything that has been achieved hitherto in the disarmament sphere and to postpone indefinitely the realization of mankind's dream of the elimination of nuclear weapons. Instead of a realistic understanding of the catastrophic consequences of any use of nuclear weapons, the United States and its NATO allies have adopted the "limited" and "protracted" nuclear war doctrines and reserve the right to be the first to activate such weapons. They have blocked the very process of nuclear arms limitation and reduction.

The increased threat of war has brought about unprecedented proportions of the antiwar movement in the world. Prominent political, public and religious figures and scientists are calling for nuclear weapons to be internationally outlawed. The majority of peace-loving nonnuclear UN states insistently demand a halt to the nuclear arms race and the creation of a world free of nuclear weapons.

In the current situation, under the conditions of increased international tension and the increased nuclear threat, states possessing nuclear weapons do not have nor can they have any more important task than the formulation and adoption of joint measures to consolidate universal peace and the security of the peoples and curb the arms race.

The Soviet Union fully shares the concern of countries of the world and recognizes its historic responsibility as a nuclear power for the destiny of mankind. The USSR's main proposals in the sphere of nuclear disarmament are

aimed at averting the nuclear threat, halting the race in weapons of mass annihilation and their liquidation. They enjoy the broad support of the majority of states of the world community. Consistently implementing the Peace Program adopted by the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU congresses, the USSR in 1984 addressed to all nuclear powers the proposal for the immediate formulation of concerted positions on key questions of war and peace in the nuclear era. In his speech at a meeting with the electorate on 2 March 1984 K.U. Chernenko emphasized in this connection: "The policy of the powers possessing nuclear weapons is of particular significance in our time. The vital interests of all mankind and the responsibility of state leaders to present and future generations demand that relations between these powers be subordinate to certain rules." These rules would look approximately thus:

To regard the prevention of nuclear war as the main goal of their foreign policy. To prevent situations fraught with the risk of nuclear conflict. And in the event of such a danger arising, to conduct urgent consultations to prevent the eruption of a nuclear conflagration.

To renounce propaganda of nuclear war in any version thereof--global or limited.

To undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Under no circumstances to use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear countries on whose territory such weapons do not exist. To respect the status of nuclear-free zones which have already been created and to encourage the formation of new ones in various parts of the world.

To prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in any form; not to transfer these weapons or control over them to anyone and not to deploy them on the territory of countries where they do not exist; not to transfer the nuclear arms race to new spheres, including space.

Step by step, on the basis of the principle of equal security to strive for a reduction in nuclear arms right up to their complete liquidation in all varieties.

The Soviet Union long since made the said principles the basis of its practical policy. It is ready at any time to come to an arrangement with the other nuclear powers on joint recognition of such rules and the imparting to them of a mandatory nature. This would correspond to the fundamental interests not only of the countries participating in such an arrangement but of the peoples of the whole world.

I

The task of formulating a code of conduct of the nuclear powers has become a categorical imperative in the business of removing the threats which nuclear weapons entail for the peoples and human civilization as a whole. Opening the UN General Assembly Second Special Disarmament Session in 1982, UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar observed with alarm: "Today the Apocalypse is not simply a Biblical image. It has become a very real possibility. Never before in man's history has such a narrow margin separated survival from catastrophe."

It is estimated that in the wars of the 17th century in Europe 3 million persons died, in the 18th century over 5 million, in the 19th almost 6 million and in the 20th century WWI carried off approximately 10 million and WWII more than 50 million human lives. On the basis of the experience of WWI even V.I. Lenin concluded that war creates the danger of the "very conditions of human society's existence" being undermined.* This conclusion is particularly pertinent for the nuclear age. It is now a question not so much of the scale of destruction and human casualties as of man's biological survival as Homo Sapiens and of the preservation of life on Earth in general.

The leaders of the West's nuclear powers are not even ashamed to assert that it is merely thanks to nuclear weapons that it has been possible to maintain peace since WWII. However, it is owing to these weapons that the world has repeatedly been on the brink of nuclear catastrophe. In 1950, during the U.S aggression in Korea, the question of the possible use of atomic weapons on the battlefield was discussed at the highest level in Washington's political and military circles. The American plan for a nuclear attack on the USSR--Dropshot--is well known. In 1962, holding its breath, the world followed the development of the Caribbean crisis. In 1968 U.S. President L. Johnson was close to making the decision to use nuclear weapons in Indochina. In 1973, at the time of the Near East conflict, the United States declared a nuclear alert, making it understood that it was ready in the event of an escalation of military operations to activate nuclear weapons. In 1980, during the Iranian-American crisis, Washington declared its readiness to activate nuclear weapons in the Persian Gulf zone. According to a Brookings Institution study, in the period 1946 through 1975 the United States direct or indirectly expressed on 19 occasions a threat to use nuclear weapons. President Carter's PD 59 sanctioned the waging of a "limited" nuclear war in all parts of the world. "Nuclear pressing" has become the predominant line in the R. Reagan administration's policy.

It has adopted a strategy of direct confrontation between the United States and the USSR globally and regionally, the main gamble, moreover, is being made on the preparation for and waging of nuclear war. New arms systems--the MX and Trident 2 missiles, B-1B bombers, the invisible Stealth bombers and neutron weapons--are being created for this purpose, Pershing 2 first-strike weapons and cruise missiles are being deployed on the European continent and feverish efforts are being made to militarize space. Some \$2 trillion are being allocated for rearmament needs for the period 1985-1989.

High administration representatives, including the President himself, have openly declared that the United States is providing for the possibility of waging "limited" and "protracted" nuclear war. The recommendations of scientists connected with the Pentagon are aimed at victory in nuclear wars. In particular, K. Gray of the Hudson Institute plainly recommends that nuclear war not be feared and that victory therein be prepared. "As distinct from

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," Vol 36, p 396.

Armageddon--an apocalyptic war which could conclude the history of mankind-- nuclear war could have a broad outcome spectrum."*

Having made the course of power confrontation with the USSR and other states the cornerstone of foreign policy, the Reagan administration broke up the Soviet-American negotiations on limiting and reducing strategic arms and nuclear arms in Europe. The cult of strength and the defense of nuclear weapons developed into the foreign policy credo formulated in the regrettably celebrated pronouncement of former Secretary of State A. Haig that "there are things more important than peace."

Under pressure from peace-loving forces demanding an unequivocal definition of its attitude toward questions of nuclear war the R. Reagan administration has now been forced to declare that nuclear war cannot be fought and that the United States advocates the removal of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth. However, all Washington's practical actions testify to the reverse. The yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) for 1984 "The Arms Race and Arms Control" emphasizes in this connection: "Directives in the defense sphere determining the directions of the development of the armed forces for the next 5 years... indicate that if restraint does not work, the United States will be faced with the task of gaining the ascendancy in a nuclear war and concluding the war on terms favorable to itself."**

In the hysterical atmosphere of accelerated military preparations incidents connected with nuclear weapons have become more frequent. Despite the Pentagon's attempts to conceal the facts from the American and world public, in 1980 over 30 of the 100 accidents connected with nuclear weapons were made public. Many experts are now forced to acknowledge that a nuclear war could begin in unsanctioned fashion. The huge quantity of diverse types of tactical nuclear weapons deployed in Europe and Asia could be activated in the "smoke of war" without authorization from above and become the detonator of a global nuclear war.

Many political and public figures are also being forced to seriously come to terms with the possibility of the development of a conflict of nonnuclear states into a nuclear war if one of them creates nuclear weapons. A. Dann, an American expert on nonproliferation, insistently recommends: "The time has evidently come for closer cooperation (of the USSR and the United States-- V.D.) in the solution of problems of regional conflicts whose escalation could lead to a local nuclear clash and direct confrontation between the United States and the USSR."***

The impending threat urgently demands of the nuclear powers as the main foreign policy priority that they seek to avert nuclear war. The goal of the USSR's foreign policy is to preserve peace and prevent war. The Soviet state's main efforts throughout its existence, beginning with Lenin's Decree on Peace,

* FOREIGN POLICY, Summer 1980, p 14.

** "The Arms Race and Arms Control 1984. The Shorter SIPRI Yearbook," SIPRI, London, 1984, p 40.

*** A. Dann, "Controlling the Bomb. Nuclear Proliferation in the 1980's," New Haven and London, 1982, p 174.

have been geared to its achievement. The constitution of the Soviet state proclaims the strengthening of peace our country's official philosophy and makes it incumbent upon all state authorities and all Soviet citizens to abide unswervingly by the ideas of peace.

On the initiative of the USSR the UN General Assembly 36th Session adopted in 1981 the declaration "Averting Nuclear Catastrophe," which said, in part. "The highest duty and direct obligation of the leaders of states possessing nuclear weapons is to operate such as to reduce to nothing the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict." At the UN General Assembly Second Special Disarmament Session the USSR solemnly undertook not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and called on the other nuclear states to follow its example. The declaration condemning nuclear war as a most heinous crime against the peoples and as the flouting of man's primary right--the right to life--was adopted at the 38th Session of the initiative of the USSR.

In the 1970's, in the period of relaxation of tension, the USSR's consistent policy aimed at removal of the nuclear threat led to the conclusion of a whole number of agreements on this problem. In 1973, during the Soviet-American top-level meeting, the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War was signed. In article I the parties declared that "the aim of their policy is removal of the danger of nuclear war and the use of nuclear weapons" and that "they will act such as to prevent the emergence of situations capable of causing a dangerous exacerbation of their relations and to avoid military confrontations in order to preclude the outbreak of nuclear war between them and between each party and other countries." However, the United States' current policy has proven profoundly contrary to the letter and spirit of this agreement: "limited" and "protracted" nuclear war doctrines are proclaimed as if it did not exist. The Agreement Between the USSR and France on the Prevention of the Accidental and Unsanctioned Use of Nuclear Weapons was officially drawn up in 1976 by way of an exchange of letters. The Agreement Between the USSR and Great Britain on the Prevention of the Accidental Outbreak of Nuclear War was signed in 1977.

II

Under current conditions it is exceptionally important to achieve general agreement on the complete prohibition of propaganda of nuclear war in any version thereof--global or "limited".

The propaganda of the "permissibility," "possibility" and "justification" even of nuclear war being conducted by militarist circles is fraught with the risk of serious negative consequences. Primarily such propaganda undermines the already fragile atmosphere of trust between countries of different sociopolitical persuasion. It promotes a further buildup of the pace of the nuclear arms race and the kindling of militarist hysteria. Such propaganda serves as a kind of "cover" for the "near-nuclear" countries which are endeavoring at any price to provide themselves with nuclear weapons. Propaganda of nuclear war is also dangerous in respect of the fact that it creates a certain stereotype of thinking whereby atomic war is virtually equated with conventional war. The true threats connected with the use of nuclear energy for military purposes are lost sight of here, and sometimes the

catastrophic consequences of a nuclear conflict are deliberately glossed over. Public deliberations concerning the "permissibility" or "customary nature" of nuclear war lower the barrier of responsibility for politicians and military figures, primarily those who have access to the "nuclear buttons" or those on whom the adoption of decisions depends.

Such propaganda is particularly dangerous in connection with the global deployment of intermediate-range missiles and diverse tactical nuclear weapon systems. The number of persons with direct access to the "nuclear buttons" increases sharply under such conditions. Simultaneously the boundaries of "uncertainty" and "absence of control" are expanding inasmuch as, given extraordinary circumstances, exercising effective control over numerous nuclear weapon systems and the corresponding supervision of persons who at their own responsibility could activate nuclear weapons is highly difficult.

In the Soviet Union, as is known, any propaganda of war, even more, propaganda of nuclear war is prohibited by law. Article 28 of the constitution records directly: "In the USSR propaganda of war is banned." Soviet military doctrine is of a purely defensive nature. The mass media disseminate material emphatically condemning nuclear war in all its manifestations.

A different picture is observed in Western states, where playing up the "WWIII" situation has become virtually the favorite subject of many commentators, political pundits and military experts and even a subject of extensively cultivated children's games. It was in the United States, beginning in the mid-1940's, that plans were born one after the other for waging nuclear war against the USSR. Mention may be made in this connection of such plans as Charioteer, Cogwheel, Fleetwood, Dropshot and so forth.

It is not surprising that the U.S. mass media have throughout the postwar period been reiterating the proposition that America is ready to use its nuclear might to crush any enemy. Disquiet cannot fail to be caused by the fact that in the 1980's practically open propaganda of nuclear war is indulged in in the United States by people arrayed in military uniform with general's shoulder straps and officials holding key positions in the White House. The pronouncements of high-ranking American officials concerning the "possibility," "probability" and even "inevitability" of nuclear war acquire a particularly ominous meaning against the background of the feverish arms race and material preparations for the waging of nuclear war. Thus at a conference on U.S. naval strategy held in June 1984 in Newport (Rhode Island) J. Lehman, secretary for the navy, declared that delivering a nuclear first strike is the basis of U.S. military-strategic doctrine. The winner, he added, will be whoever opens fire first. Lt Gen B. Trayner, who spoke at the same conference, declared that in his opinion a "limited" nuclear war between the United States and the USSR is "inevitable" in the present century even.

President Reagan's notorious "joke," when before the start of a speech on 11 August 1984 at his ranch in California he said into the microphone: "Fellow Americans, I am pleased to inform you that I have signed a law outlawing Russia forever. Bombing begins in 5 minutes," serves as the most graphic example of Washington officials' plainly irresponsible, cynical attitude toward

propaganda of nuclear war. These words of the President horrified the hardened technical specialists and experts who prepared the broadcast. They shocked the broad public both in America and throughout the world. Such an utterance was not fortuitous. It was the consequence of the deliberations of the President and his entourage concerning the "permissibility" and "acceptability" of the use of nuclear weapons which have continued throughout Reagan's term of office. In 1981 and 1982 representatives of the administration spoke repeatedly of the possibility of a "warning nuclear blast" and "victory in limited nuclear wars".

The powerful wave of the antinuclear movement is now counterposed to the propaganda of nuclear war. Its representatives are concentrating their efforts on exposing the militarists' dangerous myths concerning the "permissibility" of waging "limited" nuclear wars and the possibility of "winning" a global nuclear war. Meanwhile prominent scientists of countries of East and West have repeatedly reached the joint conclusions that in the event of a nuclear being unleashed catastrophic consequences await mankind and biological life on the planet itself. The planet's peace-loving forces are demanding unconditional renunciation of the propaganda of nuclear war and the immediate recognition by statesmen of the nuclear powers of their direct and personal responsibility for averting the nuclear threat.

III

In a situation where nuclear weapons have not yet been banned in international law and when the process of the production and stockpiling of nuclear warheads is continuing intensively, an exceptionally important role is assumed by the task of finding effective ways to prevent the use of nuclear weapons. For this reason the precisely recorded undertaking of the nuclear states not to be the first to use nuclear weapons would be of particular significance.

A reality of the nuclear age is that nuclear weapons do not lie as an immobile heap in states' warehouses but are deployed in combat positions and could be activated at once in the event of the start of military operations. The temptation to be the first to use nuclear weapons even on a limited scale for the sake of achieving military advantages on the battlefield threatens to lead to catastrophic consequences--global nuclear war. Despite the fact that nuclear war cannot be limited and that it will have no winners, actual military plans of the United States and NATO are still being built on the premise of the possibility of the first use of nuclear weapons. For the material support of the military-strategic doctrines forms thereof are being created which specialists have christened first-strike weapons. Among these are the MX, Trident 2 and Pershing 2 missiles.

The threats of first use of nuclear weapons are spurring the race therein, poisoning the international atmosphere to an extraordinary extent and hampering the achievement of agreements on limiting and reducing the nuclear potential. It was precisely the deployment of the Pershing 2 first-strike weapons in a number of West European countries which was the main reason for the breakdown in 1983 of the American-Soviet negotiations on limiting and reducing nuclear arms in Europe.

Despite the support for the Soviet initiative concerning no first use of nuclear weapons by the overwhelming majority of UN members, the United States and the other NATO nuclear states are still refusing to assume analogous commitments. This question has now become a subject of extensive and detailed discussion among the world's public and potential figures. Can the first use of nuclear weapons be justified from the military, political and moral viewpoints--this is the question which is at the center of heated debate in the West.

The main argument of sober-minded politicians in support of an undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is that the current military doctrine of the United States and NATO is of a suicidal nature. Nuclear weapons, which are allegedly intended to ensure the security of peoples of Western countries, in fact guarantee in the event of their use both annihilation of the population and the catastrophic devastation of territory. "The right to self-defense is not unlimited.... Whatever the considerations and whatever the circumstances, there can be no justification for the use of nuclear weapons, which will not only wipe out--completely indiscriminately--the armed forces and population of the belligerents but also inflict irreparable damage on the states dependent on these parties and also on neutral countries not even involved in the conflict. The doctrine of first use of nuclear weapons is now being questioned by prominent religious, political and military figures,"* the book "No-First-Use," put out by the SIPRI, sums up.

The need for a revision of the nuclear strategy of the United States and NATO is now also being stated for all to hear by certain prominent political and military figures who in the past provided for its implementation. Among them are former U.S. Defense Secretary R. McNamara, G. Smith, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, G. Kennan, well-known diplomat and politician, and M. Bundy, national security adviser of President J. Kennedy.

Together with neutralizing the risk of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict a commitment on no first use would knock the ground from under the concept justifying continuation of the arms race and the creation of systems for a disarming first strike and the waging of nuclear war in so-called theaters. Given the said commitment, an entire class of nuclear arms with the clearly expressed functions of conducting offensive operations would prove simply unnecessary. Its adoption would contribute to a lowering of the level of nuclear confrontation and a strengthening of trust between nuclear states.

At the same time this would promote an accord on questions of nuclear disarmament and would contribute to the cause of the nonproliferation of such weapons. "Mutual commitments of the United States and the Soviet Union not to be the initiators of an atomic war could strengthen collective rules in respect of what is permissible and what is impermissible in the conduct of the nuclear powers. To the extent to which they devalue the significance of nuclear weapons they would lessen the interest in their acquisition (by other countries--V.D.)," Prof M. (Brener) of Pittsburgh University (United States) claims.**

* "No-First-Use," ed. by F. Blackaby, J. Goldblat, S. Lodgaard, SIPRI, 1984, pp 23-24.

** Quoted from "Arms Control. The Multilateral Alternative," ed. by E.C. Luck, New York, 1983, p 173.

The United States and the other NATO nuclear powers frequently declare that they cannot undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons inasmuch as the Warsaw Pact allegedly has superiority in conventional arms. First of all, the facts and figures testify to the complete groundlessness of such an assertion. Furthermore, the USSR and the other socialist countries also advocate the limitation of conventional arms: in 1983 they proposed to the NATO countries the conclusion of an agreement on no first use of both nuclear and conventional arms and military force in general.

In cases where the arguments of the opponents of the said commitment appear dubious the "main trump card" is placed on the table: as long as nuclear weapons exist, commitments concerning nonuse thereof are unreliable. Prof L. Friedman (Britain) asserts: "Whatever solemn promises are given in peacetime, there are no guarantees that they will retain their force in time of war." In his opinion it is hardly possible to "formulate rules of conduct of military operations which would guarantee that nuclear weapons will not be used."*

Responding to such "arguments," the well-known Mexican politician A. Robles emphasizes that they completely ignore the significance of international law in the strengthening of general security: "Of course, it may be assumed that commitments concerning no first use of nuclear weapons could be without significance if it is believed that it would be difficult to observe them at the height of military operations. But if we support such a proposition, we should also bury international law as such...."** Considering that the majority of UN members annually calls for the nuclear powers to assume such commitments, Robles points out: "From the moral and political viewpoints a situation where mankind's survival depends solely on the interpretation of the concept of 'security' by a few states is absolutely intolerable."***

Recognition of the impermissibility of first use of nuclear weapons could be an important point of departure in measures to strengthen international security, the ultimate goal of which is to preclude the very possibility of nuclear catastrophe. If all the nuclear powers followed the example of the USSR, this would be a tangible step in the relaxation of the present tension. Mutual commitments of the nuclear powers not to be the first to use nuclear weapons would create the prerequisites for banning nuclear weapons and embarking on a radical solution of the problem of nuclear disarmament.

IV

Commitments of the nuclear states under no circumstances to use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear countries on whose territory there are no such weapons would also be of importance for averting the threat of nuclear war. The majority of international affairs specialists is now of the opinion that

* "No-First-Use," p 68.

** Ibid., p 104.

*** Ibidem.

countries which have undertaken not to have nuclear weapons in accordance with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (1968) deprive themselves of their own volition of the possibility of resorting to such weapons in the event of a confrontation with states possessing such and for this reason have the right to demand of the nuclear states as compensation for the renunciation of the acquisition of nuclear weapons observance of such a rule as the nonuse against them of nuclear weapons. A whole number of industrially developed countries is insisting on the urgent need for this in the United Nations and at various international conferences of nonaligned states.

Considering such demands perfectly legitimate, the Soviet Union solemnly declared at the UN General Assembly First Special Disarmament Session in 1978 that it would never use nuclear weapons against states which renounce the production thereof and do not have such on their territory. In the course of the General Assembly 33d Session the USSR proposed the conclusion of an international convention on a strengthening of nonnuclear states' security guarantees. Despite the support for this proposal by the majority of countries and the repeated appeals of subsequent General Assembly sessions for an acceleration of the elaboration of the convention, the United States, Britain and France are still blocking the achievement of the corresponding agreement at the Geneva Disarmament Conference. The basis of Washington's negative approach is the endeavor to also pursue "atomic diplomacy" in respect of nonnuclear countries, preserve freedom of action in nuclear preparations and reserve for itself the possibility of waging "limited" nuclear wars on others' territory. The American intermediate-range Pershing 2 and cruise missiles which are being deployed in West Europe have not only an eastern but also a southern thrust: they could be used for nuclear blackmail of African and Near East countries. Similar functions are performed by American forward-based missiles deployed in the Far East and Southeast Asia region. The concentration of large-scale U.S. naval forces with nuclear potential in the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian oceans serves the same purposes.

In a situation where the Damocles' sword of nuclear catastrophe is descending ever lower over the world all nonnuclear countries are confronted sharply with the question: how to protect themselves against the consequences of nuclear war if it cannot be averted? Under the conditions of the increased nuclear threat a basic way of strengthening these states' security is legal recognition of their nuclear-free status and the creation of zones free of nuclear weapons. The key propositions of the concept of such a zone, which have been formulated by the international community, are now perfectly specific: the nonnuclear states which participate in the zones undertake not to produce or acquire and not to allow the deployment, even temporarily, of nuclear weapons on their territory, while the nuclear states assume reciprocal commitments--to respect their nuclear-free status and not to violate it and to renounce the use and the threat to use nuclear weapons against the countries which are a part of the zone. Such a "balance of commitments" would really ensure the effectiveness of nuclear-free status.

Currently the movement for the creation of nuclear-free zones extends to all regions and continents without exception--America, Africa, Asia, Australia and Europe. Annual sessions of the UN General Assembly regularly adopt resolutions approving the idea of the creation of nuclear-free zones, which

now also have a basis in international law. The legal recognition of such a zone in Latin America occurred for the first time in 1967--the Tlatelolco Treaty banning nuclear weapons in this region was signed. The right to create nuclear-free zones was reflected in article VII of the Nonproliferation Treaty. The final document of the UN General Assembly First Special Disarmament Session emphasized that the achievement of agreements and treaties between states of the corresponding areas on the creation of nuclear-free zones is an important disarmament measure and that the formation of such zones should be encouraged as a component of the efforts whose ultimate goal is a world entirely free of nuclear weapons.

In accordance with its high-minded policy, the Soviet Union fully supports the aspiration to the creation of nuclear-free zones. The USSR subscribed to Protocol II of the Tlatelolco Treaty, which provides for the nuclear states' undertaking not to threaten and not to use nuclear weapons against the countries participating in the zone. It has emphasized repeatedly its readiness as a nuclear power to assist the formation of nuclear-free zones in other regions of the world.

Commitments to observe the Tlatelolco Treaty were also assumed by the other nuclear states--the United States, Britain, France and the PRC. At the same time the United States declared that it reserved the right to transport nuclear weapons across the territory of Latin American countries, which is a violation of the zone's nuclear-free status. It is opposed to the creation of such zones in North Europe, the Balkans and Central Europe and is against conversion of the entire European continent into a zone free of nuclear weapons, both intermediate-range and tactical. Giving reasons for their refusal, the United States and the West's other nuclear states refer to the fact that such zones are incompatible with NATO strategy, which provides for first use of nuclear weapons.

Instead of respect for the existing and encouragement of the formation of new nuclear-free zones, the United States is demanding that its NATO bloc allies be prepared for the deployment of nuclear weapons on their territory and is threatening to cancel out the nuclear-free zone of a whole number of states which actually exists. A striking example of such negative practices is the Pentagon's repeated violation of the three nonnuclear principles officially proclaimed by Japan--"not to have, not to produce and not to import nuclear weapons." Essentially there are no guarantees that the United States is not averse to canceling out even the nuclear-free status of the nonnuclear countries where it has military facilities. Recognition in international law of the new nuclear-free zones would be the sole barrier in the way of such nuclear expansion in respect of others' territory.

Nonnuclear states which do not have nuclear weapons on their territory have every legal and moral right to demand that the nuclear states respect and not violate their nuclear-free status and give treaty guarantees that they will not use nuclear weapons against them under any circumstances. For its part, the Soviet Union has emphasized repeatedly that it is ready at any time to embark on the recognition of such guarantees in international law with any nonnuclear country.

The policy of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons is intended to occupy an appreciable place in the preservation of peace, the consolidation of international security and the curbing of the arms race. A situation must not be allowed to arise where on the one hand measures to lessen the threat of nuclear war are adopted and, on the other, nuclear weapons crawl over our planet.

Enlargement of the "nuclear club" is fraught with the risk of an undermining of international stability unpredictable in scale and nature and the most serious consequences for the security of all countries and regions. An increase in the number of nuclear states would also make extraordinarily complicated the solution of questions of nuclear disarmament. Yet by the mid-1980's more than 20 countries have come to possess the capability of creating nuclear weapons. According to an expert estimate, by the year 2000 there will be 40 such "near-nuclear" states.

According to the same estimate, by the year 2000 a quantity of plutonium will have been obtained from the operation of nuclear power stations in nonnuclear countries sufficient for the manufacture annually of 30,000 atom bombs, each equal in yield to the bomb dropped on Nagasaki. In this situation there is a sharp increase in the role of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty as the basic international-law and political barrier in the way of the spread of nuclear weapons. At the same time it has to be considered that 40 states, including two nuclear powers--the PRC and France--still remain outside of the treaty's framework. They also include a whole number of countries with a developed nuclear industry--Israel, South Africa, Pakistan, Brazil, Argentina.

Such "near-nuclear" countries as Israel, South Africa and Pakistan, which with the aid and direct connivance of a number of Western states have approached very close to the creation of nuclear weapons, are causing the world community particular concern. The policy of the United States and other NATO nuclear states of close military-political cooperation with these countries naturally raises the question of their true attitude toward the problem of nonproliferation. All this dictates the urgent need for all nuclear states' observance of the commitments to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons in any form and not to transfer such weapons or control over them to anyone.

An undertaking by the nuclear states not to deploy nuclear weapons where they do not exist currently would also contribute to nonproliferation to a considerable extent. After all, it is no secret that it is precisely their deployment on the territory of one country which is party to a conflict which could bring about the retaliatory response of the other and serve as a motive for the creation of their own nuclear weapons. The involvement of nonnuclear states in the orbit of military preparations inevitably stimulates their aspiration to create their own nuclear weapons in order to deliver themselves from "nuclear tutelage". Now the number of countries capable of creating such weapons includes states and territories on which they are deployed. These include the FRG, Italy, Japan, South Korea and other American bloc allies. The very integration of nuclear weapons in the armed forces of military blocs facilitates the process of nonnuclear countries' acquisition of the skills of handling them.

At the same time an undertaking by the nuclear states not to deploy such weapons on the territory of countries where they do not exist would also contribute to stabilizing the strategic balance between them and would neutralize the inevitable mechanism of retaliatory measures according to the "action--counteraction" principle. This would reduce considerably the spread of the nuclear threat to new regions of the world.

At the UN General Assembly 33d Session in 1978 the Soviet Union submitted the proposal for the nondeployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of states where they do not exist currently. More than 100 countries supported this proposal, and only the United States and its NATO and ANZUS bloc allies and also Japan were opposed. The United States rejected the USSR's proposal concerning the nondeployment of nuclear weapons in the Persian Gulf zone and also on the territory of Mediterranean nonnuclear states. The United States and the other nuclear states of the West adopted a negative attitude toward the idea of a constriction of the geographical parameters of the deployment of nuclear weapons and the creation of peace zones in a number of regions. With 1,500 foreign bases and over 12,000 nuclear weapons deployed abroad the Pentagon is opposed to any steps which would create barriers to its use of its nuclear forces. The American military is now openly developing plans for the deployment of nuclear weapons, including intermediate-range missiles, in the Near and Far East and on the African continent. Another nuclear power--Britain--with the help of the United States is creating a base for its nuclear forces on the Falklands, France has similar bases in the Indian Ocean. Such activity of the West's nuclear powers, which aspire to draw other states into the orbit of their military preparations, is causing legitimate concern for their security in a considerable number of nonnuclear states, American allies included. The majority of the world's nonnuclear states are clearly demonstrating their negative attitude toward the United States' "nuclear presence" and insistently demanding firm guarantees that their territory will not be used for nuclear preparations.

Mutual commitments of the nuclear powers not to transfer the nuclear arms race to new spheres could play an important part in narrowing the "geography" of this race. It is a question primarily of space. Legal precedents for such a restriction exist in international practice--the removal of Antarctica, the sea bed and ocean floor and also space from the sphere of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and their conversion, essentially, into zones free of nuclear weapons.

However, in spite of the existing accords, the U.S. military is now making feverish efforts to militarize space and turn it into a military proving ground and a "star wars" arena fraught with the risk of nuclear catastrophe. In 1984 President Reagan signed PD 119, in accordance with which the United States began the accelerated implementation of a program of R&D into options of the deployment in near-Earth orbit of so-called "defensive" systems, which in practice are of a manifestly aggressive nature.

Washington's military-space plans are directly contrary to the 1967 treaty on the principles of states' activity in the study and use of space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, and to the obligations imposed by the Soviet-American ABM Treaty.

The Soviet Union is an emphatic opponent of a contest in a race in any arms, space included. Hopes that via space it is possible to pave the way toward military superiority are built on illusions. Urgent steps of all the nuclear powers are needed to ensure that the process of the militarization of space not assume an irreversible nature. The question of preventing the militarization of space is a general problem of vital importance for all states. The nuclear states must recognize the entire extent of their responsibility in the nonextension of the arms race to new spheres, including space.

VI

The question of coordinating the nuclear powers' approaches to the accomplishment of the task of nuclear disarmament has arisen more acutely than ever by the mid-1980's. According to SIPRI data, even now approximately 50,000 nuclear weapons are stockpiled in the world. Nonetheless, the race in this sphere continues. The programs for the building of the MX and Trident missile systems which have been initiated in the United States are reason to believe that the number of nuclear warheads will increase by 2,000 annually in the latter half of the 1980's. The other nuclear powers are building up their potential at an accelerated pace. Britain and France are planning a fourfold increase in their nuclear might. China also is stepping up the pace of nuclear preparations.

Is it possible to halt the nuclear arms race and turn it back? A fatalistic assessment of the prospects and actual opportunities of ending the nuclear arms race is currently widespread among the West's politicians and scientists. The authors of the book "Living With Nuclear Weapons," which was published in 1983 under the aegis of Harvard University (United States), claim that man, like Prometheus, who stole fire, is doomed to eternal suffering from the acquisition of nuclear weapons and that deliverance therefrom is impossible since the "once lost human 'nuclear innocence' can no longer be restored."* Such a philosophy is capable of justifying an absolutely uncontrolled nuclear arms race in all directions. The current building of the nuclear forces of the United States, Britain and France is essentially moving in these directions.

Of course, solving the problem of nuclear disarmament is becoming increasingly difficult with every succeeding year. Together with the obstacles being erected by the opponents of disarmament there are many objective difficulties emanating from the inordinately increased nuclear potentials and the existence of several nuclear powers. At the dawn of the "atomic age" these problems could have been solved far more easily. If the United States had supported the proposal put forward by the Soviet Union in 1946 on the banning forever of the production and use of nuclear weapons and the destruction of stockpiles thereof, mankind would not today be encountering such difficult problems. But this by no means signifies that at the current stage there are

* "Living With Nuclear Weapons," The Harvard Nuclear Study Group (A. Carnesale, P. Doty, S. Hoffman, S.P. Huntington, J.S. Nye, S.D. Sagan), New York, 1983, p 5.

no opportunities for ending the nuclear arms race. The Soviet Union has emphasized repeatedly that the human mind, which has created monstrous machinery of destruction, is capable of finding the way to dismantling it and releasing mankind from the nightmare thereof. It is now, when states have stockpiled huge nuclear potentials and the arms race is not only continuing but increasingly gathering pace, that it is essential for the nuclear states to display high vigilance in the approach to problems of disarmament.

A pessimistic evaluation of the results of international politics in the disarmament sphere may be encountered frequently among scientists in the West. Thus J. Schell, the author of the book "The Fate of the Earth," believes that the influence of the American-Soviet agreements concluded in the 1970's in the strategic arms limitation sphere on the arms race process is the "equivalent merely of the impact of aspirin on a patient in urgent need of surgery."*

Indeed, the nuclear arms race has not ended. But this by no means testifies to the futility of negotiations to limit and reduce arms. If we examine individual Soviet-American agreements, it has to be emphasized here that, for example, without the ABM and SALT-I treaties, this race would have been more intensive. It is perfectly obvious that it was precisely the United States' refusal to ratify the SALT-II Treaty which opened the floodgates for the accelerated nuclear arms buildup. The Soviet Union has always emphasized that it is an emphatic opponent of an approach according to the "all or nothing" principle and that it is necessary to strive step by step for a reduction in nuclear arms as far as their complete liquidation. At the UN General Assembly Second Special Disarmament Session the Soviet Union presented a proposal for the elaboration, adoption and stage-by-stage implementation of a nuclear disarmament program. This program could have incorporated: a halt to the development of new nuclear weapon systems; an end to the production of fissionable material for the creation of various types of nuclear weapon; an end to the production of all nuclear warheads and their delivery systems; a gradual reduction in stockpiles of nuclear weapons, including delivery systems; and the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union has stated repeatedly its readiness--on a reciprocal basis with the United States--to embark on radical steps to reduce nuclear arms--both strategic and intermediate-range. In the course of the Soviet-American strategic arms limitation and reduction talks the Soviet Union proposed a 25-percent reduction in the overall might of the strategic forces and agreement on the complete deliverance of Europe from nuclear weapons, both intermediate-range and tactical, and also on the complete liquidation of all arms--strategic, intermediate-range and tactical.

The effectiveness of nuclear disarmament negotiations largely depends on the goals of the participants. If the negotiations serve as a screen for continuation of an arms race intended to break up the existing balance of

* J. Schell, "The Fate of the Earth," New York, 1982, p 108.

forces and to justify the permissibility of the use of nuclear weapons, they are, as experience shows, futile. The SIPRI yearbook emphasizes in this connection: "If the countries are attempting to achieve a certain form of nuclear superiority, arms control negotiations are an empty waste of time...."* The justice of this is confirmed, in particular, by the entire experience of Soviet-American negotiations on this problem.

The realities of the nuclear age dictate that one's own security cannot be achieved at the expense of the security of others and on the paths of an arms race in an attempt to secure superiority for oneself. Former U.S. Secretary of State C. Vance emphasizes: "The most important aspect of security for the superpowers--security against nuclear war--cannot, as it turns out, be determined by rivalry. Their security must be based on an unprecedented degree of cooperation. It must be joint security."**

A most important condition of the effectiveness of steps in the disarmament sphere is the participation in the negotiations and the agreements which are formulated of as broad a circle of states, nuclear particularly, as possible. "It would be unrealistic to expect the United States and the USSR to proceed far along the path toward nuclear disarmament if other countries continue to perfect and expand their nuclear missiles. It is reasonable to expect that the first steps will be taken by the two great nuclear powers. But in order to maintain effective control over nuclear arms and achieve greater progress on the way toward disarmament it is essential that they be joined by the other nuclear powers," the report of the Independent Disarmament and Security Commission chaired by O. Palme emphasizes.***

Nuclear disarmament is also aimed at preventing the risk of the appearance of nuclear weapons in other countries. The interconnection between an end to the nuclear arms race and the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons was formulated in article VI of the Nonproliferation Treaty. At the conferences to study its effect in 1975 and 1980 the nonnuclear states emphasized the need for the nuclear powers to fulfill their reciprocal disarmament commitments. The lack of results in nuclear disarmament threatens to become a turning point in the influence which the Nonproliferation Treaty is designed to exert on curbing programs for the building of nuclear weapons by the "near-nuclear" states.

UN General Assembly sessions and other representative international forums have emphasized repeatedly that the nuclear powers should take immediate steps to put an end to the nuclear arms race once and for all. The final document of the UN General Assembly First Special Disarmament Session plainly points out: "The stockpiling of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, today represents more a threat to than protection for peoples' future. For this reason the time has come... to embark on a quest for security via disarmament...."

* "The Arms Race and Arms Control," p 40.

** C. Vance, "Hard Choices. Critical Years in America's Foreign Policy," New York, 1983, p 418.

*** "Security for All. Program of Disarmament," Moscow, 1982, p 162.

The nuclear age inexorably dictates new security criteria. Not preparations for nuclear war but the adoption of effective measures to prevent it. Not propaganda of nuclear war but exposure of its catastrophic consequences, not reckless threats to be the first to use nuclear weapons but banning their use altogether. Not the spread of the nuclear arms race to new spheres but the creation of nuclear-free zones. Not the stockpiling of nuclear arms but their reduction as far as their complete liquidation. Such are the basic props of reliable security in the nuclear age.

The Soviet Union's initiative--for the formulation and observance of a peace code in the conduct of the nuclear powers--has been extensively approved and supported. At the UN General Assembly 39th Session the overwhelming majority of states appealed to the nuclear powers to respond to the USSR's proposal and immediately formulate joint principles and rules of behavior which would form a basis for removal of the threat of nuclear war and for ensuring peace on our planet.

Operating entirely in accordance with the code of conduct of the nuclear powers which it has proposed, the USSR put forward throughout 1984 a whole number of initiatives of exceptional importance aimed at curbing and ending the nuclear arms race. K.U. Chernenko's replies to questions of THE WASHINGTON POST published on 18 October 1984 formulate a program of serious, practical and honest negotiations on the most urgent issues pertaining to a halt to the arms race and the strengthening of security. They include:

Embarking on negotiations for the purpose of formulating and concluding an agreement preventing the militarization of space, including complete renunciation of antisatellite systems, with the establishment, as of the start of the negotiations, of a mutual moratorium on the testing and deployment of space arms.

Freezing all the nuclear powers' existing nuclear arms quantitatively and qualitatively. The USSR and the United States could first of all come to an arrangement between themselves concerning a freeze of their nuclear arms and thereby set the other nuclear powers an example.

Concluding the formulation of an agreement on the complete and general banning of nuclear weapon tests.

Following the example of the Soviet Union, the other nuclear powers would undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

There are also, of course, other important questions which require solution and the application of actual efforts and not just words about a readiness for negotiations not underpinned by practical deeds.

The world has changed radically. Problems in it cannot be solved by force. A transition to a policy of realism, common sense and practical interaction in the solution of the problems confronting mankind is essential.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984

8850

CSO: 1816/9

CURRENT PROBLEMS CONFRONTING ECOLOGISTS IN FRG

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 84 (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 53-62

[Article by V. Granov: "The Greens: Ideology and Reality"]

[Text] Given the sharp deterioration in economic conditions in the developed capitalist countries, a variety of "alternative" movements began to take shape in the 1970's. Youth and women's organizations, "rural communes," ecology and antinuclear movements, so-called psycho-emancipatory currents, from the "social therapists" right through the champions of a "sexual revolution," and others which arose in the communities, cities and provinces of West European countries were ascribed to them. As a counterweight to the official policy of the authorities and the platforms of the ruling parties, they put forward their own or, as they said, "alternative" proposals and projects.

According to data of the West German Marxist R. Steigerwald, among the participants in the "alternative" movements in the FRG at the start of the 1980's were 12 percent of craftsmen and tradesmen, 40 percent of employees and other representatives of the middle strata, 45 percent of people of the free professions and 3 percent of workers. According to other information, almost 15 percent of students and seniors in the FRG, that is, approximately 1.3 million young people aged 14-21, sympathized with the protest movement. The potential base of dissatisfaction among the youth is even broader. In 1981 the FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU published the results of a poll (1979) which testify that in the FRG 700,000 young people aged 17-23 out of 5.4 million felt themselves to be "outcasts" from society. A further 2 million declared that they were dissatisfied with the social practices in the country.¹ In other words, half of the FRG's young people are dissatisfied with the existing system. The situation is similar in other Western countries. Increasingly substantial older age groups, again mainly belonging to the middle strata, are being enlisted together with the youth in the "alternative" movements.

At the frontier of the 1980's the Greens current had moved to the forefront among the "alternative" movements. It arose as a protest movement against environmental pollution and the plunder of natural resources, but soon passed beyond the framework of "pure" ecology and addressed many other urgent problems for bourgeois society. The leading place in the Greens' activity was occupied by the struggle against nuclear catastrophe, which contributed

greatly to their popularity, particularly among the young people and in the middle strata of the population. In Italy, Belgium and certain other states the Greens sent their representatives to parliament. They gained the biggest victory in the FRG. In 1983 the Greens Party obtained 27 seats in the Bundestag elections, thereby ending the monopoly of the "traditional" parties: the CDU/CSU, SPD and FDP. In the summer of 1984 the Greens scored a considerable success at the elections to the European Parliament, to which a group of their representatives was returned. The Greens are assertively participating in actions against the deployment of American missiles in West European countries and demanding that the governments renounce the production, deployment and use of nuclear weapons. This position is supported by all friends of peace. In response to an appeal by P. Kelly, representative of the FRG Greens Party, K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, emphasized: "...We share your concern at the possibility of the use of nuclear, chemical and other weapons. There is every reason for such concern...."²

The founders of the movement called themselves "greens" because this is the color of living nature and life; it is further clarified that the Greens are united by a "fear of the extermination of life" and an aspiration to act in its defense. But it is precisely on the main question--how to act in defense of man's life and happiness--that the movement's positions are still to a large extent far from clear. Different trends are struggling within the current, and there is much that is unsettled and contradictory therein.

The currents of petty bourgeois radicalism of the 1950's-1970's, which emerged in the opposition-minded petty bourgeois and middle strata of the population, mainly among the youth, may be considered the Greens' predecessors. This applies primarily to the "new left" student movement of the 1960's. "All the most important elements of the youth revolution of the 1960's may easily be detected in the ecology movement," (G. Tallert), a theoretician of the Greens, says. There is a bit of exaggeration in this statement. But undoubtedly the Greens have borrowed many of the propositions and, primarily, the basic points and reasoning of the criticism of modern bourgeois society from the "new left" and their philosophical fathers--H. Marcuse, T. Adorno, J.-P. Sartre and others. Some of the theoreticians inspiring the "new left" like (A. Gorts) in France now inspire the Greens. It is not difficult to find in the present "radicals" the anarchism, neo-Marxism and vulgar materialism characteristic of the "new left" of the 1960's. Former "new left" activists are performing a pronounced role among the greens.

At the same time a number of social democratic ideas, primarily the idea of the "constructive," reformist path of surmounting capitalism and advance toward the petty bourgeois socialist ideal, has found soil in this new current. "It would be the profoundest... mistake to believe that our Greens are merely a new edition of the student crisis of the 1960's...", the social democratic sociologists J. Strasser and K. Traube, who have drawn close to the Greens, declare as a counterweight to (G. Tallert). "People joining the ecology movement," they continue, "are seeking primarily a solution of entirely tangible problems and pondering the formation of alternative ideas and their realization."³ Many social democrats, mainly young people, unhappy with their parties' integration in the structure of state-monopoly capitalism, have supplemented the ranks of the Greens.

The combination of anarchic and reformist ideas is, as observed among the Greens, a frequent phenomenon in history. It becomes possible in connection with the common (petty bourgeois) theoretical and social base of anarchism and reformism. Part of the middle urban strata, the intelligentsia and the petty proprietors--such is the support of petty bourgeois radicalism and to a large extent of social democratic reformism also. It is these strata which are the principal participants in the Greens movement.

Quite rapidly, within a few years, the Greens united in their ranks the majority of active participants in the "alternative" movements. And today the terms "alternative" and "Greens" are virtually synonymous.

Why was a movement which at first made of paramount importance ecological problems able to occupy the leading positions in the broad spectrum of "alternative" currents? Several circumstances contributed to this. In densely populated developed capitalist countries with their huge production machinery, as a result of the predatory actions of the monopolies, the plunder of natural resources and the poisoning of the atmosphere, the soil and water-storage basins had reached danger level. The media and the official authorities were forced, interpreting these processes in their own way, to sound the alarm. A real shock was caused at the start of the 1970's in the West by the appearance of reports of scientists of a number of countries united in the Club of Rome predicting that in the not-too-distant future civilization would be threatened with collapse owing to a shortage of energy, food and raw material and the poisoning of the biosphere. The gloomy prophesies were seemingly corroborated by the outbreak of the oil crisis in 1973, when fuel prices leaped several times over, and later, in the course of subsequent increases, rose high above this level even. The crisis revealed the fact that the times of reckless use of cheap fuel had passed. The increase in oil prices complicated still further the position of the capitalist economy. It was painfully reflected in the living standard of broad strata of the population since it led to a spurt in prices of all commodities. Ecology problems thus became a subject of policy and entered each home in the bourgeois world as a cause of new anxieties and concerns. The Greens movement, which put ecology problems at the center of its activity, was the reaction of part of the community to the new phenomena of social reality.

The Greens' vision of ecology problems lay basically in the channel of the bourgeois-liberal ideas of the Club of Rome and the vast amount of literature on these questions which appeared subsequently. The basic content of their postulates consists of the following. Mankind has up to now developed production thoughtlessly, and people have cared only for their own well-being and subordinated all activity to one goal--production growth. They are now paying for their sins. Man has given birth to a monstrous demon--technology--which in ever increasing proportions is devouring the vital resources of our small planet and poisoning and rendering unfit for life the air, water, and the land and the entire habitable environment. If this process is not stopped, the modern Moloch--technology--will ultimately swallow up its creator also. Intelligent life and, probably, everything living will come to an end. "God is dead, total production has arisen in His place," H. Gruhl, former Bundestag deputy from the CDU/CSU bloc and a leader of the Greens movement in

its initial stages, wrote, not concealing his despair. "Just as in the Middle Ages all thoughts and values were directed toward the other world, in the same way they are concentrated today on material growth; doubling growth and doubling yet again is now the goal.... What this means it is impossible to explain; it transcends the possibilities of reason."⁴

The Greens see the reasons for the said disasters in the domination of technology and its most dangerous, in their view, offspring--economic growth. The big monopolies are becoming a target of their sharp criticism, but not as the most developed embodiment of the private-ownership order of things but as the monstrous personification of the all-devouring "demon of technology". It is not so much capitalism which is criticized as the "industrial society," where technology plays the part of the focal point of evil born of people, but subsequently having risen above them and enslaved them. The way out of the situation is seen in a halt to or, at least, a sharp reduction in economic growth.

The petty bourgeois comprehension of the problem is erecting a barrier between the need for protection of the natural environment on the one hand and technical progress and economic growth on the other. The main thing--the need to transform the bourgeois order of things into a socialist order--is being relegated to a secondary position.

For only a society free of egotistic, private-ownership interests is capable of coping with the problem of the contradiction between the ecology and the economy. Operating on planned principles and in the interests of all people of labor, the socialist society is capable of mobilizing resources inaccessible to capitalism for the rational growth of production on a healthy ecological basis and, primarily, of sparing mankind fantastic arms spending and channeling these resources into the satisfaction of people's truly urgent needs. Only socialism can remove forever the threat of the most terrible ecological catastrophe--nuclear war.

The Greens, however, are seeking a "third way" and propose the creation of a "countereconomy," which is an "alternative" both with respect to the Western, capitalist, and Eastern, socialist planned economy. Their ideal, which they term the "ecological economy," is a decentralized economy of small communities operating on renewable, ecologically "clean" types of energy and closed-cycle waste-free production facilities. They conceive of the "countereconomy" in the form of a federation of self-governing communes--cooperatives in industry and agriculture satisfying requirements as far as possible from their own production. The Greens are "opposed to the labor process wherein economic power rules." They support a democratic economy of the communities in which "interested persons themselves make the decisions of where to produce what and when."⁵

Whence the negative attitude toward a state's large-scale production, which engenders the domination of "economic power" and is allegedly disastrous for freedom of the individual. Counterposed to it are cooperatives--self governing communities--as the sole counterweight to the merger of small-scale enterprises into big ones. It is not difficult to observe that these are the renovated ideas of Proudhon and Kropotkin with which petty bourgeois reformers

hoped to transform capitalist society. Polemicizing with these ideas, K. Marx showed that fundamental changes of the social system "may be achieved only by way of the transfer of the organized forces of society, that is, state power, from the capitalists and landowners to the producers themselves."⁶ The nature of the cooperatives is determined by the predominant mode of production and form of ownership in the society. Cooperatives inevitably "reproduce and have to reproduce the shortcomings of the existing system."⁷ V.I. Lenin, in turn, observed that cooperatives under capitalist conditions afford the working class an opportunity to improve its position and prepare it for the role of organizer of economic life under socialism. At the same time, however, "the improvements achieved by the cooperatives are confined within very narrow bounds," "the cooperatives, as purely commercial establishments and by virtue of the pressure of the conditions of competition, have a tendency to grow into bourgeois joint-stock companies" and, finally, "the cooperatives, not being a means of direct struggle against capital, are capable of engendering and do engender illusions to the effect that they are a means of solving the social question."⁸

In the opinion of one theoretician of the Greens, the development of cooperatives signifies not the hiring of labor by capital but of capital by labor. In actual fact, however, if a cooperative attracts capital to expand production, purchase new property, swallow up other cooperatives and so forth, it is acting as a collective capitalist, and the cooperative in these cases operates within the framework of capitalist relations as a cell of the bourgeois society. There is nothing socialist in such a cooperative, and it is subject to all the antagonisms and accidents of capitalist existence, like any capitalist enterprise.

The ideas that cooperatives are by nature obstacles in the way of the development of large-scale industry are mistaken to the same extent. They are subordinated to the general logic of the development of production and the concentration and centralization of capital and gravitate toward amalgamation in stronger economic organizations.

The Greens rightly see the capitalist monopolies as the source of ecological and other social disasters. But capitalist monopolies are merely a historically transient form of large-scale production. Big enterprises are the logical result of the development of the production forces. With the removal of capitalism large-scale industry remains. The 50-year-plus experience of building socialism confirms that large-scale production, given the currently foreseeable trends of the development of technology, will remain in the classless society also the leading, decisive form of organization of the production forces. More, under the conditions of this society it will acquire new scope. The plan-oriented nature of social development under socialism helps combine the progress of the production forces with social interests.

Experience also shows that the rapid development of large-scale production does not remove small and medium-sized enterprises from the scene. They have their advantages: proximity to the consumer, the possibility of working with local raw material or large-scale industry waste, the fuller use of manpower resources and so forth. The scientific-technical revolution is opening new opportunities for the creation of small and medium-sized works on a modern technical basis (automation, electronics and so forth), but only as a complement to large-scale works or as a component of large industrial complex.

Critics of the Greens believe that the creation of an economy of independent small communities, if realized in practice, would inevitably lead to reduced production and a deterioration in the quality of many commodities and would provide no economies in raw material and energy resources since large-scale production remains more economical and cheaper. As a result the economy of small communities would result in a decline in the living standard and a reduction in the social gains of the working people.

The economic self-sufficiency of a small community, even if it is assumed that it is built on a technically modern, "electronic" base, is a manifest utopia. In the "countereconomy" society the autonomous cooperatives would find themselves face to face with economic spontaneity. The sole alternative to central authority remains the "free market," with all its crises, unemployment, price spurts and such.

Just as far from reality is the proposition concerning "renunciation of the high degree of the division of labor nationally and internationally." Within the national framework it is proposed solving the problem, as we have seen, by the creation of independent communities, within an international framework "by a departure from the orientation toward the world market" and a "lessening of world trade" insofar as it is believed that the international division of labor merely consolidates the oppression of one part of the world by another.

The exacerbation of tension in the social life of the capitalist world at the start of the 1980's, which was brought about on the one hand by the deterioration in economic conditions and, on the other, by the aggressive policy of the Washington administration and its allies, could not have failed to have been reflected in the ideological principles and actions of the Greens. Having begun their activity as ecologists, they are expanding the framework thereof and joining actively in the polemics surrounding other issues. The logic of life and facts inevitably leads to this. The concerns for conservation of the natural environment reveal its direct dependence on the overall political situation and government policy in domestic and international affairs. The demands for the prevention of the plunder of natural resources prove to be inseparably connected with the question of power. Problems of the ecological support for life grow into the political task of struggle against nuclear war--the most terrible ecological catastrophe.

The radicalization of the movement led to the departure therefrom of certain bourgeois-conservative figures like H. Gruhl. New young, decisive people are being promoted. The movement is assuming more organized forms. In a number of countries parties are emerging from the motley, loose conglomerate of numerous organizations, groups, currents and such.

Political realism is blazing a trail in clashes with anarchist postulates. "We are an antiparty party," P. Kelly declares.¹⁰ Having created a party, the Greens do not want to be such. "We are neither left nor right, we are Greens and are fundamentally unlike either"--this motif is reiterated over and over and varies in the program documents and speeches of Green figures. "'Party loyalty' and 'class interests' do not today entirely predetermine the citizen's political choice," (V. Byurklin) formulates this thought.¹¹

The Greens are repelled by the actual circumstances of bourgeois reality, but understand them in their own way. They see how the boundaries between bourgeois parties are becoming increasingly transparent and provisional and how difficult it is, for example, to detect an appreciable difference between Democrats and Republicans in the United States and liberals and conservatives in other Western countries. In the same way the differences between bourgeois and social democratic parties on many questions of domestic and foreign policy are small. At the same time new currents are emerging frequently uniting people who belonged prior to this to different parties. Whence the conclusion that the "classical" criteria and all former political values no longer operate and that "parties are dying".

What to the Greens appears to be a crisis of parties in general is in fact a crisis of the bourgeois party-political system. "Party loyalty" here is indeed being violated increasingly often. Voters voting for the social democrats far from always subsequently approve of the actions of the leadership of these parties, particularly when these switch from opposition to government and, forgetting the election promises, harness themselves with all diligence to the chariot of the bourgeois machinery of state. The same occurs with the strata of working people which vote for bourgeois parties, but increasingly often do not accept their policy on many issues. The general deterioration in the situation in the bourgeois camp is expanding the ground for protest movements against the policy of the leading "traditional" parties and for the creation of new coalitions and social currents in which the growing political ferment of the masses is finding an outlet.

But the regularities of the historical process are not being rescinded. It is merely a question of a loss of faith in customary, bourgeois ideas and values. The strata of the population which believed in the possibilities of capitalism are gradually coming to recognize its hopelessness and disastrous nature. This is frequently an agonizing, painful process in which despair and hope, old illusions and revolutionary impatience, a rejection of former idols and a reformist half-baked approach and timidity are mixed.

All this is also characteristic of the "alternative" ideas concerning the state. "The Greens do not set themselves the goal of winning power," P. Kelly declares.¹² "Ecologists adhere to a dual strategic orientation--operating against the state and without the state," the French ecologist D. Simonnet formulates the same thought.¹³ The need for the state is rejected on the grounds that its interests are incompatible with the free individual. The Greens also interpret the conflict of the classes in their own way. Now, they believe, it is not the classes of the haves and have nots which are counterposed but the establishment and the anti-establishment, that is, those who control and enjoy all the privileges of a controlling elite and those opposed to it. This allegedly is the difference between the "old" and the "new" left.

The conflict of the classes is thus converted into a conflict of personalities, and the problem of ownership into one of control. These ideas are far from new. The "revolution of managers," who had allegedly replaced the former owners of capitalist property as arbiters of the fate of the modern world, was written about back in the 1940's.

The shifting of the focus of social criticism to problems of management permits the bourgeoisie to introduce, as it is concerned to do, within the framework of management problems essentially fundamentally different problems of the capitalist and socialist state and to ascribe to the different systems identical "organic defects". "Both systems are versions of an alienated society of factories and offices oriented toward destructive economic growth," the FRG Greens' program, for example, declares.¹⁴

The Greens agree that the bourgeois state is an "instrument of oppression at the service of the ruling class." But voices are also heard to the effect that even more disastrous is the influence of state which "appears the most social". State institutions' assumption of concern for the individual reduces, it turns out, "the significance of personal responsibility" and leads to the "atrophy of individual autonomy".

The ideal of the Greens is ecosocialism or, as P. Kelly defines it, "ecological, self-governing, emancipated socialism"¹⁵ Progress toward it is conceived on the paths of reformation of the bourgeois order. "The transformation process," J. Strasser and K. Traube assume, "will occur not without bitter conflicts and not without the use of force even. But to portray it in the form of a classical (French or Russian) revolution would be naive.... Undoubtedly, the working class will not perform therein the decisive role which it performed in the social battles in the recent past."¹⁶

Specifically it is a question of the territorial, community structure of control and the autonomous control of enterprises by their personnel. The latter has already been discussed. As far as community self-government is concerned, its basic cells and basis elements are called the village, neighborhood and settlement. The ideal version is the commune. The most important thing for the Greens, P. Kelly believes, is work on the building of ecological residences and solar collectors and the organization of self-help centers and social protection.¹⁷

The practical results of this activity are very modest. In 1983 in the FRG, where the "ecosocialists" enjoy the biggest successes, there were 10,000-12,000 so-called "alternative projects" in the form of workshops, small-scale trading establishments, cooperatives and so forth. Each employed 5-10 persons, mainly young people. While approximately 100,000 persons participated in "alternative projects" altogether.

What is the structure and efficiency of such projects? R. Steigerwald's work adduces material published in the FRG on this score. Only 10-12 percent of the total number constitute production projects in the form of craftsmen's workshops, printing works, rural communes and such. Projects operating in the services sphere account for the largest proportion (approximately 70 percent). These include grocery and book stalls, taverns and snack bars, medical and psychotherapeutic assistance and child care groups and so forth. Finally, political projects constitute approximately 20 percent: tenant committees, various youth, women's and other groups, associations and other "civil initiatives".

Even more indicative is the "political economy," so to speak, of all these projects. Barely 40 percent of them exist primarily on their own resources and only partially cover the shortfall thanks to a variety of relief. The remaining 60 percent live mainly thanks to subsidies and donations. As far as remuneration is concerned, in half of the projects their participants exist entirely thanks to income from other sources (husband or wife, parents, friends, unemployment benefits or social assistance fund payments and so forth). In 30 percent of the projects wages are paid only to a few (one-two for the most part) participants. Only in 20 percent of the projects do all the participants receive a scanty payment. As a whole, one-fourth of the projects' active participants (that is, not more than 25,000) live thanks to them, while three-fourths exist thanks to social assistance.

Small-scale production does not withstand competition. The attempts to build it on an extra-economic basis are proving in contemporary bourgeois society as unsuccessful as before. And all "community self-government" is an impracticable business since it lacks both political and economic prerequisites. What are left are feeble hopes for a voluntary renunciation of "traditional thinking stereotypes based on the cruelest competition and a thirst for prestige and domination."¹⁸ It is therefore necessary to reckon with realities and amend the original postulates. Such a revision is noticeable in respect of a number of standpoints. The majority of "ecosocialists" agrees today that it should be a question not of halting economic growth but of imparting new content to it. For example, M. Maren-Griesebach rejects the accusations that the Greens aspire to technical and social regression. "The Greens are skeptical in respect of technology," she writes, "but they understand technology." Although the Greens do not, as before, "want power," they nonetheless "seek methods of exerting political influence... as a consequence of which it is necessary to participate in the struggle for power." They are, as before, of course, "strangers to any hierarchy". But "insofar as power always presupposes something over which it has to be exercised, be it nature, people, individual opinions, desires, inclinations... it is constantly connected with this dubious hierarchy. Of course, in the home there must be levels, but the lowest level is just as important and valuable as the upper level...."¹⁹

Renunciation of violence is, as before, a fundamental principle. But it is explained here that "the principle of the nonuse of violence does not abridge the fundamental right to self-defense and includes the possibility of social resistance in all its numerous versions...." Incidentally, it is explained here that when they speak of resistance, they refer to such forms as the sit-down strike, "'live' cordons on the roads, an obstacle to means of transport."²⁰ Skepticism in respect of the need for political organization also remains, but no longer impedes the creation of their own party, although they call it "antiparty".

The main thing is that the Greens are joining increasingly assertively in the discussion and solution of a broad range of political problems. And the most important of them is peace. In a number of Western countries the Greens have succeeded in becoming one of the leading forces in the protest movement against nuclear war, which is of unprecedented scale and intensity. Their vigorous actions have contributed much to the scale of the peace marches,

demonstrations at the American missile bases and thousands of other antiwar actions. The Greens actively advocate a policy of peace, the consolidation of peaceful coexistence and the independence and self-determination of all peoples. They demand the complete destruction of nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons, renunciation of the use of space for military purposes, the disbandment of military blocs, with withdrawal of American missiles from Europe and its conversion into a zone free of nuclear weapons.

The maturity of the movement itself is growing and a process of the internal polarization of its participants is under way simultaneously in the acute political struggle in respect of the most important issue of the present day. Reactionary forces from outside and from within are attempting to blunt the anti-imperialist pointedness of the movement. Imperialist special services are sending provocateurs into its ranks and attempting to implant their agents and initiate under the flag of the Greens actions of an anti-Soviet, anticommunist thrust. The concepts concerning the "equal responsibility of the two superpowers," the United States and the USSR, "for the tension reigning in the world"; concerning the fact that the Soviet Union should embark unilaterally on dismantling its intermediate-range missiles; and so forth, which are prevalent among part of the Greens, are being stimulated for this purpose.

The antinuclear protests of the Greens represent a pacifist movement. They are operating sincerely in support of peace. But its participants do not connect the reason for the nuclear threat with the social, class bases of the society in which they live and operate. Whence the inconsistency and dual nature of a number of their demands and protests.

Like right-reformist "democratic socialism," "ecological socialism" is a further non-Marxist alternative to scientific socialism, promoted in the petty bourgeois environment of developed capitalist countries. It is the latest version of the symbiosis of socialism and capitalism and an attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable realities of our time.

But the main point may be discerned through the vagueness and indistinct nature of the Greens' views--the antimonopoly and anti-imperialist sentiments and trends, which are growing increasingly often into criticism of the foundations of the bourgeois order. This is a nonproletarian protest against the inefficiency and inhumanity of capitalism. Although the Greens speak of their intention of maintaining an "equal distance" between capitalism and real socialism, their criticism of capitalism indisputable predominates.

This is why the evolution of "alternative" trends is causing growing disquiet in the West's upper circles. An entire arsenal of weapons is being activated to "neutralize" the current and confine it to a moderate reformist framework. Pressure on the Greens is being stepped up in the mass media, and warnings are being heard concerning its "leftward slide". Attempts are being made to influence the movement's leaders in an anticommunist, anti-Soviet spirit.

Simultaneously wide-ranging maneuvers are being undertaken for the purpose of reducing the Greens' support in the strata of the population following them. The social democratic parties, which have lost some of their supporters to the Greens, are active here. With regard for these sentiments, the ecology part of the social democrats' programs is being expanded. The social democratic parties' decision to advocate a renunciation of the deployment of American missiles in West Europe should, they believe, attract to their side many supporters of the Greens.

What are the Greens' prospects under these conditions? How stable and viable will this current prove? Will it strengthen or disappear from the scene, as was the case with their predecessors, the "new left" of the 1960's, for example?

Life will provide the answer. Meanwhile we may say the following. Despite all their complexity and contradictoriness, the "alternative" currents reflect the profound and diverse process of the stimulation of the masses in the capitalist world. Significant nonproletarian strata are refusing to follow the bourgeois-liberal and social democratic parties, which have become integrated in the system of state-monopoly capital. They feel cheated and are seeking a spokesman for their interests closer to them.

In certain countries the Greens have caught these sentiments and have been able not only to hold out but also strengthen their positions. Where, on the other hand, the social democrats have been able to keep the pacifist currents under their control, as Labor has in Britain, for example, putting forward more emphatic demands for disarmament and removal of the nuclear threat, the Greens have been unable to show what they can do.

As far as the communists are concerned, they always support nonproletarian protest movements when it is a question of democratic demands and actions against the domination of capital. The common aspiration to defend peace is sufficient grounds for joint actions. Communists march in a single front with all who aspire to slow down the arms race and ease the military danger. In an era of fundamental social change, when new generations and social strata and new parties and organizations are joining the revolutionary process, the joint actions of the forces of socialism, democracy and peace constitute a most important condition of social progress.

FOOTNOTES

1. FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, 2 November 1981.
2. PRAVDA, 30 May 1984.
3. J. Strasser, K. Traube, "Die Zukunft des Fortschritts. Der Sozialismus und die Krise des Industrialismus," Bonn, 1981, p 19.
4. H. Gruhl, "Ein Planet wird gepluendert. Die Schreckensbilanz unserer Politik," Frankfurt-am-Main, 1975, p 12.

5. See "Sinnvoll Arbeiten--solidarisch leben. Gegen Arbeitslosigkeit und Sozialabbau," Cologne, 1983, p 7.
6. K. Marx, F. Engels, Works," Vol 16, p 199.
7. Ibid., Vol 25, pt I, p 483.
8. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," Vol 19, p 310.
9. See "Sinnvoll arbeiten--solidarisch leben....," pp 6, 9.
10. DER SPIEGEL, 14 June 1982, p 47.
11. See POLITISCHE VIERTELJAHRESSCHRIFT No 4, 1981, p 361.
12. DER SPIEGEL, 14 June 1982, p 52.
13. D. Simonnet, "L'ecologisme," Paris, 1979, p 119.
14. "Sinnvoll arbeiten--solidarisch leben....," p 6.
15. DER SPIEGEL, 14 June 1982, p 56.
16. J. Strasser, K. Traube, Op.cit., p 292.
17. DER SPIEGEL, 14 June 1982, p 52.
18. "Die Gruenen: Das Bundesprogramm," Bonn, 1980, p 5.
19. See M. Maren-Griesebach, "Philosophie der Gruenen," Munich, 1983, pp 81, 110.
20. "Die Gruenen: Das Bundesprogramm," p 5.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984

8850

CSO: 1816/9

VARIOUS THIRD WORLD 'SOCIALIST CONCEPTS' CRITIQUED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 84 (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 88-95

[Article by A. Kaufman: "Socialist Concepts in Asian and African Emergent Countries: Basic Types and Evolution Trends"]

[Excerpt]

II

To the first direction, which within the framework of the proposed classification is of a national-democratic nature, pertain socialist teachings of the traditionalist type. These are to a large extent "national socialisms" containing appreciable elements of traditionalism, national distinctiveness and religious ideology. The ideological concepts of the ruling groups of a whole number of countries of Tropical Africa and Asia belong to this direction.

Thus according to the program documents of Kenya's ruling party--the Kenya African National Union (KANU)--its main aim is the building of "Kenyan socialism," by which is understood equal opportunity, guaranteed work for all working people, universal suffrage, state planning of the economy and state control over the means of production and the sale of commodities.¹ "Kenyan socialism" alludes to the achievement of some well-being without fundamental transformations in the basis and superstructure of society. A prominent African ideologist, J. Kenyatta, first president of Kenya, declaring that KANU ideology is "African socialism," wrote: "We must formulate our own standards and ideals based on our culture and on African socialist philosophy, according to which each person performs his duty with respect to his neighbors and the community, while the community is, in turn, the source of his well-being."² "The term 'African socialism'," a KANU document says, "defines the African political and economic system as strictly African. It is not imported from any country and is not a copy of any foreign ideology. At the same time, however, it is capable of using useful and acceptable elements from any source."³

Here, as in other documents of Kenyan ideologists, general historical regularities are ignored, while the foundations of the new African society are seen in the family and the community and the distinctive cultural values. Paramount importance is made of the particular stability of local economic, ideological and political institutions based on the community. It should be

borne in mind that concepts of international and African social democracy and national reformism exert a big influence on the theory and practice of the KANU Party. Despite the "Kenyan socialism" proclaimed by the party, local capital has strengthened its positions appreciably in the country in recent years, while the state sector is still very weak.

The concept of "national socialism" of J. Nyerere, president of Tanzania and leader of the Revolutionary Party (Chama Cha Mapinduzi), is largely more radical than the views of the Kenyan ideologists, although some of its elements proceed from the same "perennial African values". For a number of years J. Nyerere was profoundly influenced by the ideas of "African socialism". This was expressed in the fact that he relied on the community with its patriarchal relations as the basis of the socialist society in Tanzania. Considering contemporary African society classless, J. Nyerere emphasized "African exclusiveness".

However, as the class struggle in the country intensified approximately as of the mid-1960's, the views of Tanzanian ideologists began to undergo a pronounced evolution. This was reflected primarily in the adoption in February 1967 of the Arusha Declaration. Having become the program of socioeconomic development, the declaration proclaimed as its goal "the building of socialism given reliance on one's own forces," initiating the implementation of a number of measures in the economic, social and political spheres. "In order to build and strengthen socialism," this document says, "it is essential that the basic means of production belong to the peasants and workers and be under their control through the government and cooperative organizations."⁴

The program document "The Party's General Line Geared to the Defense, Strengthening and Further Development of the Tanzanian and African Revolution" was adopted in February 1977 in development of the Arusha Declaration. It spoke of the party's leading role in the "building of the socialist society" and the need for its conversion in the future into a people's party. This idea was reflected in the statutes of the Revolutionary Party which were adopted at that time, which note that the building of socialism requires strong and cohesive political leadership.

Despite the great difficulties which Tanzania has encountered on the way to realization of the development programs, considerable positive changes have occurred in the country. Recently the Revolutionary Party has achieved a strengthening of its ranks and increased its numbers and role in sociopolitical life. The interparty ties of the Revolutionary Party and the CPSU are broadening. A plan of party relations between the CPSU and the Revolutionary Party for 1984-1985 providing for a broad exchange of party delegations and other measures aimed at a further strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the two parties was signed in Dar es Salaam.

The statutes of the dissolved Democratic Party of Guinea adopted at the 11th congress in November 1978 and also the pronouncements of A. Sekou Toure, former leader of the party and president of the country, give an idea of the content of the socialist theories of the traditionalist direction of Guinea's ideologists prior to the military coup. These statutes proclaim as the basic

goals "the liberation and complete emancipation of the African peoples and confirmation of their national distinctiveness," "the removal of all forms of exploitation" and "the creation of a socialist society under the conditions of social justice, democratic progress and peace."⁵ In Sekou Toure's opinion, in Tropical Africa the concept of "working class" implies "the sum total of the working people's masses representing the production forces, within which hired working people--workers and employees--constitute in respect of the other working people a relatively privileged small group."⁶ Believing that the entire Guinean people, by virtue of their national homogeneity, represent a class and that the working class represents the working section of the "people-class," Sekou Toure included the workers and peasants within one class, which he called the "working people's class". It should be noted in this connection that it is precisely this idea, in which the concept of classes is eroded, which forms the basis of the renaming of the Democratic Party of Guinea into the State of Guinea Party.

Assertions concerning the inapplicability of scientific socialism to African conditions and a quest for specific African forms of social development may be found in the program documents of Ghana's Provisional National Defense Council and the Democratic Union of Malian People in Mali. Even such prominent African ideologists as Kwame Nkrumah and F. Fanon, although meeting scientific socialism half-way, nonetheless absolutized the national specifics of African countries, considered the peasantry here the main revolutionary force and thus failed to divest themselves of a number of reformist and nationalist ideas.⁷

It may be considered as a whole that at the basis of the still quite stable traditionalist concepts of socialism in the group of Tropical African countries is an exaggeration of national-historical singularities and a quest for various forms of "African socialism" which allegedly go beyond the framework of the common regularities of the building of a new society. We should see in the appearance and development of these theories a reflection of the truly specific conditions of the development of the states of the region, including profound socioeconomic backwardness, the strength of traditional institutions and the preservation of communal ownership, which is seen as the economic basis of socialism, and the peasantry as the purveyor of socialist principles.⁸ It is fitting to recall here F. Engels' words about the fact that "to the immature state of capitalist production and immature class relations corresponded immature theories."⁹

The "Burmese socialism" concept and also the theory of "Indonesian socialism," whose author was Sukarno, the outstanding figure of Indonesia's national liberation movement,¹⁰ are associated with the theories in question to a certain extent.

The concept of "Burmese socialism" is expounded in a number of documents of the country's leadership, basically in the Revolutionary Council's Political Declaration "The Burmese Way to Socialism" and the philosophical platform of the ruling Burma Socialist Program Party "The System of Correlation of Man and His Environment".¹¹

The Political Declaration, which was formulated under the certain influence of scientific socialism and the experience of the socialist countries and which proclaims renunciation of the capitalist development path and the removal of man's exploitation of man, interprets socialism as a certain prosperity and the establishment of a society "economically secure and morally improved in which all people live in peace and prosperity."¹² The nation here is regarded as the sole social force, outside of classes. As the main social support the document gives pride of place to the peasantry and emphasizes the need for self-improvement and moral betterment and other moral principles.

As far as the platform is concerned, it bears as a whole the imprint of the profound influence of the ideology of Buddhism and also traces of the influence of other nonscientific concepts, including anthropologism, rationalism and pragmatism. However, the predominant source is Buddhism and its tenets. This is, naturally, inevitably reflected in practice, which is distinguished in a number of instances by contradictoriness and inconsistency.

Initially considerable socioeconomic changes occurred in Burma. However, the emphasis on the particular "Burmese way of development" began to strengthen in the statements of the country's leaders as of the mid-1970's. The pace of the transformations dropped sharply, and there was a discrepancy between the proclaimed programs and actual practice, which led to a certain social stagnation. This was also reflected in foreign policy, the basis of which was made the baseless proposition concerning an "equal" attitude toward the two "world blocs". The erroneousness of this concept, particularly under the conditions of the proclaimed policy of a socialist perspective, is that it ignores the contrast of the two social systems in the world and the international content of the socialist states' foreign policy.

The traditionalist socialist concepts assuming the form of "national socialisms" do not, as already observed, regard the proletariat as a revolutionary-transforming force. Here lies their definite conservatism. For this reason the transition of "national socialism's" ideologists to positions of scientific socialism is a far from simple process and will be connected to a considerable extent with the capacity for a critical interpretation of their own experience and its correlation with the objective requirements of their countries' social development.

III

The second direction of socialist theories within an individual country framework is distinguished by national specifics. Nonetheless, it would seem possible to distinguish the main features of this revolutionary-democratic direction: rejection of capitalism as a social system; the perception of certain propositions of scientific socialism, particularly its economic teaching; recognition of the role of the people's masses in the historical process; active cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries; actual implementation of the proclaimed reforms in various spheres of social life.

Mention should be made here primarily of the concepts of the National Liberation Front (FLN)--the ruling party in Algeria--and the National Front for the Defense of the Revolution on Madagascar.

The ideology of the FLN has undergone a considerable evolution, the basic landmarks of which are connected with the adoption of such documents as the 1962 Tripoli Program, the 1964 Algerian Charter, the FLN Appeal of 19 June 1965 and the National Charter of 27 June 1976.

The gains of the Algerian revolution and the basic directions of its further deepening are enshrined in the 1976 National Charter, which is the FLN's program ideological-political document.

The charter observes that the idea of the choice in favor of socialism was formulated in Algeria back in the course of the long national liberation struggle and emphasizes that "the need arises for the organization of forces capable of seeing the revolution through, building socialism and defending it."¹³ It does not distinguish the workers as the class which is the purveyor of the socialist ideal and cites the following forces interested in socialism: the working people of the cities, the poor peasants, the working youth and the intelligentsia. The charter says that the gains which have been achieved and the measures which are outlined are changing Algerian society in the direction of socialism, which "provides a clear answer to the problems of our time." "Socialism in Algeria," this document goes on to say, "is not an arbitrary process and not a system brought in from outside... but a vital process with its roots in the struggle for national liberation and closely connected with the nascent nation and its formation."¹⁴ Proclaiming as a principal task of the revolution an end to man's exploitation of man, the charter proceeds from the need for nationalization of the private ownership of means of production, agrarian reform and the establishment of worker self-management.¹⁵ Algeria has scored considerable successes in these spheres.

The FLN Party, which the FLN statutes declare to be the "sole party of the country," sets as its goal "the building of socialism within the framework of national values and Islam."

The program documents of Algerian revolutionary democracy, although not having escaped the influence of religious ideology, an underestimation of the role of the working class and its party in the revolutionary process and certain nationalist developments, undoubtedly represent an important step forward in the development of sociopolitical thought in the country.

A referendum on 21 December 1975 in the Democratic Republic of Madagascar approved two important documents, which reflected the revolutionary-democratic views of the country's leadership. These were "Charter of the Malagasy Socialist Revolution" and the Constitution of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar. The charter, which proclaimed a policy of a socialist orientation, observes: "Socialist revolution is the sole possible path for us of rapid economic, social, humane and harmonious development. Our entire policy should be aimed at creating the base and conditions for the building of socialism."¹⁶

The National Front for the Defense of the Revolution, which, according to the constitution, is the country's leading political force, was founded on Madagascar on 3 December 1976. It incorporated several parties, including the Congress Party for Malagasy Independence (AKFM) which was founded in 1958 on the initiative of the communists and which in 1962 proclaimed as its ideology scientific socialism. The AKFM, which is represented in the Supreme Revolutionary Council, the Popular National Assembly (parliament) and in the government, actively supports the country's socialist orientation. AKFM General Secretary (Zh. Rabesakhala) declared in his speech at the 26th CPSU Congress that the wealth of experience of the building of socialism is of great interest for Madagascar's revolutionary and democratic forces.¹⁷

The concepts of Malagasy revolutionary democracy are gradually being enriched with socialist content. The measures being implemented in the country go beyond in terms of their sociopolitical consequences the framework of the tasks of the democratic, national liberation revolution. Intruding upon capitalist relations, they are aimed at tackling a number of fundamentally important tasks of social development on the path of a socialist orientation.

The concepts of the Syrian Ba'th Party, which is headed by H. Assad, a prominent leader of the Arab national liberation movement, are closely associated with the second direction.

According to the 1973 constitution, the Syrian Arab Republic is a "sovereign socialist popular democratic state." In accordance with Ba'th Party concepts, important socioeconomic and political transformations have been accomplished in the country: the major industrial enterprises, banks and insurance companies have been nationalized, the leading role of the state sector is being strengthened and certain reforms in agriculture have been implemented.

Syria is pursuing a consistent anti-imperialist policy in the international arena, firmly counteracting Israeli aggression, which is supported by the United States, striving for the achievement of a just all-embracing settlement in the Near East and participating actively in the nonaligned movement.

The progressive National Front, which was created in the country in March 1972 and which incorporates the Syrian Communist Party, has adopted its own program document--a charter. It contains an appeal to the people to struggle against imperialism and Zionism, strengthen relations with the progressive Arab regimes, develop cooperation with the socialist states, primarily the Soviet Union, in every way possible and rally the ranks of all national-progressive forces oriented toward implementation of the proclaimed social transformations.

IV

The most consistent part of revolutionary democracy (Angola, Mozambique, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Socialist Ethiopia and others), which adopting scientific socialism, is creating vanguard parties, which are building their activity on the organizational and ideological principles of Marxism-Leninism, may be attributed to the third direction.

Outlining the basic directions of the country's development, in the People's Republic of Angola the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) Central Committee Third Plenum in October 1976 defined the building of socialism as its main goal. In a statement of 31 January 1977 the MPLA Central Committee Politburo pointed out that the program of the Angolan revolution provides for the creation of the material-technical base of socialism on the basis of the implementation of profound socioeconomic transformations in the interests of the broad people's masses, a fundamental reorganization of production relations and liquidation of the exploiter classes. The statement emphasized that the country was faced with creating a party of the working class armed with the teaching of Marxism-Leninism.

The First MPLA Congress in December 1977 transformed this organization into the MPLA-Labor Party and adopted its program. It emphasizes that the party is guided by the scientific ideology of the proletariat--Marxism-Leninism--will develop relations with the world revolutionary movement, primarily with the socialist community countries, and intends in all its activity to firmly and unswervingly abide by the principles of proletarian internationalism.¹⁸ The report at the congress of A. Neto, who was elected chairman of the MPLA-Labor Party (J.E. dos Santos was his successor), emphasized that the building of socialism requires the creation of a working class party which, guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism, would become the leading force of the Angolan people.¹⁹ Describing the current stage of the revolution in Angola, A. Neto defined it as popular-democratic, in the course of which the conditions for the transition to socialism are being created.

The decisions adopted by the MPLA-Labor Party on questions of party, state and economic building testify that the revolutionary transformations in Angola in the direction of socialism are acquiring an increasingly firm foundation and that the role of the working class in this process is growing. The constitution of the People's Republic of Angola, which says that the MPLA-Labor Party is the vanguard of the working class, was ratified at the start of 1978.

The mass national-revolutionary organization in Mozambique, FRELIMO (the National Liberation Front), under whose leadership the country's independence was gained in June 1975, was transformed at its third congress in 1977 into the FRELIMO Worker-Peasant Party. The adopted new program says that the party is guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and sets as its task the building in Mozambique of socialism. The working class is regarded as the foremost and leading force of the socialist reorganization of society. The program determined the main directions of the party's domestic and foreign policy activity. Profound socioeconomic transformations are envisaged in the economic sphere aimed at the creation of the material-technical base of socialism. Among the main directions of foreign policy activity attention is drawn to the utmost development of Mozambique's relations of friendship, mutual assistance and cooperation with the socialist countries. S. Machel, chairman of the FRELIMO Party Central Committee, who addressed the congress, emphasized that the party had arrived at the adoption of Marxist-Leninist teaching as the ideological basis in the course of long anti-imperialist struggle and attentive study of the experience of the Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist countries.²⁰

Having analyzed the situation in the country and the course of the party's accomplishment of the tasks formulated by its preceding congress, the Fourth FRELIMO Party Congress held in April 1983 confirmed the party's choice of the socialist development path.²¹

The 1970 PDRY Constitution proclaims that the state sets as its goal society's development along the path of socialism in order to create the conditions for the complete liquidation of man's exploitation of man. In October 1975 the National Front Joint Political Organization adopted a program which opted for scientific socialism as the theoretical and scientific basis of its practical activity and proclaimed the working class the leading force of the revolution. The program contains the following two important conclusions: the basic characteristic of the modern era is the transition from capitalism to socialism; the transition of economically backward countries to socialism in the contemporary period cannot be accomplished without reliance on the socialist states.²²

The constituent congress of the Yemen Socialist Party (YSP) was held in October 1978 in Aden, and its program and statutes, in which the party is characterized as the vanguard of the working class, peasantry and other strata of the working people guided by the teaching of scientific socialism, were adopted. The program emphasizes that, relying on the theory of scientific socialism and the world experience of socialist building, primarily in the Soviet Union, and utilizing and enriching its own revolutionary experience, the YSP sets as its goal the completion of the stage of national-democratic transformations and the leading of the people to the building of socialism. Foreign policy, this document says, is aimed at the broadening and deepening of all-around cooperation with the socialist countries, the strengthening of international relations with the world communist and workers movement and the consolidation of ties to peoples fighting for national liberation and social progress.²³

The creation of the YSP was a major success of the country's revolutionary-democratic forces and an important stage on the way to the continued deepening of revolutionary transformations and the combination of the national-democratic revolution with the ideas of scientific socialism.

The Second YSP Congress in October 1980 summed up the previous 2 years of the party's work and adopted measures for the continued implementation of the planned course. A.N. Muhammad, general secretary of the YSP Central Committee, chairman of the Supreme People's Council Presidium and prime minister of the PDRY, who delivered the report at the congress, emphasized that under the conditions of the complex situation in the Arab world and in the international arena the further organizational and ideological-political strengthening of the party on the basis of scientific socialism and proletarian internationalism was essential.²⁴

Important ideological-political changes have occurred in Socialist Ethiopia.²⁵ After the ouster in September 1974 of the feudal-monarchical regime, an army national-revolutionary grouping in the shape of the Provisional Military Administrative Council (PMAC) headed by Mengistu Haile Mariam came to power in the country. In March 1976 the PMAC promulgated the Program of the National-Democratic Revolution in Ethiopia. This document proclaimed as the main goals of the Ethiopian revolution the country's complete liberation from

feudal oppression and imperialist dependence, the liquidation of bureaucratic capital and the creation of the prerequisites for the transition to the building of the foundations of socialism. The program also set the task of the organization of a party of the working class guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism.²⁶

A single political center--the Commission for the Organization of the Party of Working People of Ethiopia (COPWE)--was instituted to this end in December 1979. Its tasks included leadership of the work on the creation of a vanguard party of the working people, dissemination and propaganda of the idea of Marxism-Leninism and the political and ideological education of the masses. The COPWE Central Committee headed by Mengistu Haile Mariam was elected at the first congress of the commission in June 1980.

The commission initiated wide-ranging activity with respect to the training of activists and leading workers of the future party and the political enlightenment of the masses. Groups were organized everywhere in which the principles of Marxist-Leninist teaching were studied and the appropriate literature, primarily the works of K. Marx and F. Engels and V.I. Lenin, was published.

Constituent party meetings and conferences were held in January-August 1984 at industrial enterprises and in state establishments and academic institutions, military units and cities and villages, the leading bodies of the party organizations were created and delegates to the party's constituent congress were elected.

The party's constituent congress, which took place in September 1984, proclaimed the creation in the country of a vanguard party whose activity would be built on the principles of Marxism-Leninism--the Ethiopian Workers Party. The congress adopted the program and statutes of the Ethiopian Workers Party and elected its leading bodies, and Mengistu Haile Mariam was elected general secretary of the party Central Committee.

The Ethiopian Workers Party has adopted a policy of the creation in the country of the material and spiritual conditions for the building of the foundations of the new society and the transformation of the state-political system into a people's democratic republic.

The ideological-political views of the revolutionary democracy of Congo and Benin may also to a certain extent be put among the ideological concepts in the four countries examined above.

The important political changes in Angola, Mozambique, the PDRY and Ethiopia have been accompanied by revolutionary socioeconomic reforms. Mention should be made primarily here of the liquidation of large-scale landowning and large-scale and medium-sized private capitalist ownership, limitation of the activity of foreign monopolies and the removal from political power and activity of bourgeois-landowning elements. Such steps are leading to a new alignment of socio-class forces, stimulating development in a socialist direction, contributing to the growth of the working class' political role in the revolutionary process and accelerating its combination with the ideas of scientific socialism.

The consistent implementation of progressive transformations in the countries of the group in question and the profound social changes are creating in them, despite all the undoubted difficulties and contradictions of development, real opportunities for these countries' transition in the foreseeable future to socialism. Of course, any national liberation revolution contains in its actual historical embodiment an aggregate of various, mutually interwoven political trends. However, as distinct from the first two directions of socialist thought, where it is possible to speak of great instability of each social level which has been reached, the third direction is quite stable and socially clearly expressed.

Thus socialism in the emergent Asian and African countries, both as theory and as practice, despite existing internal and external difficulties, is taking increasingly deep root. The socialist orientation of a whole number of states has become, having demonstrated its viability, a historical reality and a most important political factor of these states' social progress. International support on the part of world socialism and the creative assimilation of its wealth of historical experience are contributing to the strengthening of the positions of the countries which have opted for a development path in a socialist direction.

FOOTNOTES

1. In Soviet scientific literature the KANU Party, together with the ruling parties of the Ivory Coast, Malawi, Zaire, Cameroon, Gabon, Niger and others, is sometimes attributed to the authoritarian parties of a capitalist orientation. They are distinguished from liberal-bourgeois political groupings by aspirations to a one-party state and reliance not only on private-economic but also state capitalism. The ruling groups of some of these countries (Kenya, for example) conceal the pro-capitalist course with slogans of the building of "African socialism". The positions of the pro-capitalist elements connected with the civil service and the state sector are strengthening here, and the growth of a local rural and commercial bourgeoisie frequently connected with the traditional elite can be observed (See "The Developing Countries: Regularities, Trends, Prospects," Moscow, 1974, p 346 and also p 350)--Editor.
2. EAST AFRICAN STANDARD, 30 April 1962.
3. See "African Socialism and its Application to Planning in Kenya," Nairobi, 1965, p 1.
4. "The Arusha Declaration and TANU's Policy on Socialism and Self-Reliance," Dar es Salaam, 1967.
5. "XI-eme congres national du P.D.G. Discours d'ouverture prononce par le camarade President Ahmed Sekou Toure," Conakry, 1978.
6. A. Sekou Toure, "Promotion Kwame Nkrumah Seminaire--de formation ideologique de l'annee universitaire," Conakry, 1972, p 253.

7. See R.A. Ul'yanovskiy, "Political Portraits of Fighters for National Independence," Moscow, 1980.
8. See N.D. Kosukhin, "Formation of Ideological-Political Strategy in African Countries of a Socialist Orientation," Moscow, 1980.
9. K. Marx, F. Engels, "Works," Vol 19, p 194.
10. Sukarno's socialist teaching amounts to the following: "Indonesian socialism" is a social system providing for national revival, economic development and well-being and social justice for all. The "class" and "class struggle" concepts and the objective regularities of the transition of society to socialism are inapplicable under Indonesia's conditions inasmuch as the Indonesian nation is "spiritually united". Taking this as a basis, he strove for national consent and peace on the paths of the "mutual cooperation of the classes". Thus Sukarno's idea of national unity was of the nature of the preaching of class harmony and the community of interests of all social forces. He himself defined "Indonesian socialism" as a mixture of ideas borrowed from various sources. This was the reason for the eclectic nature of his theory and its subjectivist, petty bourgeois nature, which predetermined the profound contradictoriness of Sukarno's political course. See on this M.S. Kapitsa, N.P. Maletin, "Sukarno. A Political Biography," Moscow, 1980, pp 141-229; S. Adams, "Bung Karno penjambung lidah rakyat Indonesia," Djakarta, 1965, pp 100-101.
11. See "The Burmese Way to Socialism (The Policy Declaration of the Revolutionary Council)," Rangoon, April 30, 1962; "The System of Correlation of Man and His Environment. The Philosophy of the Burma Socialist Programme Party," Rangoon, 1963.
12. "The Burmese Way to Socialism...", p 2.
13. "National Charter of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic," Moscow, 1976, p 11.
14. Ibid.
15. See *ibid.*, p 14.
16. "Charte de la Revolution Socialiste Malgache tous Azimuths," Tananarive, 1975, p 9.
17. See "Greetings to the 26th CPSU Congress," Moscow, 1981, p 367.
18. See JORNAL DE ANGOLA, 1 February 1977.
19. See *ibid.*, 11 December 1977.
20. See S. Machel, "Relatiro do CC da FRELIMO ao III congresso," Maputo, 1977, p 3.

21. See on vanguard parties in Angola and Mozambique O.V. Martyshin, "African Revolutionary Democracy," Moscow, 1981.
22. See "Program of the National Front Joint Political Organization at the Stage of the National-Democratic Revolution," Aden, 1975, pp 8, 10 (in Arabic).
23. See "Material of the First YSP Congress," Moscow, 1979.
24. ARBAATASHAR OKTOBR, 12 October 1983 (in Arabic).
25. See Ye. Denisov, "Ethiopia--Step Into the Future" (MEMO No 11, 1984).
26. See "The Programme of National Democratic Revolution of Ethiopia," Addis Ababa, 1976.
27. Mengistu Haile Mariam, "Important Stage of the Ethiopian Revolution" (KOMMUNIST No 13, 1984, p 98).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/9

FRENCH-USSR WWII COOPERATION AGAINST 'ANGLO-SAXONS' RECALLED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 84 (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 96-104

[Article by K. Zuyeva: "Soviet-French Cooperation in Time of War and Time of Peace"]

[Text] "You cannot argue with history and geography"--this aphorism should not be forgotten. Indeed, failure has always attended those who have disregarded the lessons of history and ignored geographical realities. There are sufficient examples. Of course, history does not repeat itself, and geographical location cannot be of identical significance at different stages of the development of one and the same state. However, both these factors contain constants making themselves felt most negatively if they are not taken into account.

Such a constant value for almost a century has been the cooperation between Russia and France and, after the Great October Socialist Revolution, between the Soviet state and France. It was brought into being by the certain alignment of forces on the political map of Europe and the existence of a threat to both countries on the part of Kaiser and then Hitler Germany. A striking page in this cooperation is the joint struggle of the Soviet and French peoples against Hitler fascism.

The Soviet Union contributed actively to the revival of independent France and its gradual return to participation in the solution of cardinal international and European problems. The documents (many published for the first time) of the second edition of the collection "Soviet-French Relations During the 1941-1945 Great Patriotic War"* are convincing testimony to this.

I

The geographical location of the two countries framing Europe east and west, the lack of common borders reducing the possibility of direct confrontation and the long existence in the center of Europe of a focal point of aggression created a situation wherein the fate of Europe and the world as a whole largely depended on the degree of cooperation between France and Russia and France and the USSR.

* "Sovetsko-frantsuzskiye otnosheniya vo vremya Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny 1941-1945," Vol 1, 1941-1943; Vol 2, 1944-1945, Moscow, 1983.

The inconsistency with which France's ruling circles sought ways to strengthen its security ultimately led to the country ending up in isolation face to face with an aggressor armed to the teeth. Its position was immeasurably more vulnerable than that of, say, Britain, which is separated from Europe by the Channel, which at that time served as quite a considerable obstacle for enemy armies. This was not even myopia but the ruling circles' considered betrayal of national interests.

The result was a tragedy of the people the like of which had not been seen in their history. The most that could have been hoped for by the French rulers who pushed their country under the heel of Germany was the role of colony. Incidentally, Hitler had the same and, at times, a worse role in store for other European states also.

Could the fascist aggression have been halted and the lives of tens of millions of Europeans been saved? Numerous studies of this question, including those of military historians and specialists, testify that this was perfectly feasible. One thing was lacking--the political will to cooperate with the Soviet Union. It appeared to the country's ruling circles, blinded by class hatred of the socialist world, that the destruction of the USSR with Germany's help was worth any losses. The tragedy in which such calculations resulted for many peoples, the French included, confirmed that a disregard for historical realities in favor of the selfish class interests of the bourgeoisie threatens the perdition primarily of those who forget this.

The shameful defeat in the war, the humiliating armistice and the collapse of all political institutions of the Third Republic were the result of the policy which had been pursued on the eve of WWII by France's ruling circles. It was with good reason that they were nicknamed the "gravediggers".

However, the French people could not reconcile themselves to the defeat. A struggle against the occupiers, the heart of which were the French communists, began. The call to resistance was heard from London also. This was the voice of "free France," the voice of Gen C. de Gaulle.

The high-handedness with which the British and the Americans operated in respect of "Free-France" is well known from the "Military Memoirs" of the general himself. However, the documents published in the collection testify that subsequently de Gaulle was inclined to minimize their sharpness somewhat. The cables of I.M. Mayskiy, the Soviet ambassador in Great Britain, and A.Ye. Bogomolov, envoy attached to the allied governments in London, in 1941-1942 are an eloquent indication of this (Vol 1, pp 53-54, 62-63, 81-84). The relations of London and Washington with de Gaulle assumed such a dramatic nature that in the summer of 1942 the general even raised the question of the possibility of rebasing the military forces and leadership of "Free France" from Britain to USSR territory (Vol 1, p 96).

During the war de Gaulle demonstrated an ability to size up the situation of his country correctly and rise above the narrow class prejudices typical of the majority of France's leaders in power in the prewar years.

In turning to the support of the Soviet Union he was displaying concern for his country's national interests. Even then he foresaw that the victorious conclusion of the war would inevitably confront the USSR and France as continental European powers with "tasks which the Anglo-Saxon countries will not always be able to understand and take into consideration."

General de Gaulle's pronouncements concerning Soviet-French cooperation are distinguished by sober-mindedness and realism, to which his speech on London radio on the occasion of the smashing of the German-fascist forces at Moscow, in particular, testifies. This speech has been quoted many times and will continue to be quoted by all who turn to the history of the Franco-Russian and Franco-Soviet alliance. "To our common misfortune," he declared, "impediments and counteractions born of intrigue and misunderstanding have been encountered far too often throughout the centuries on the path of Franco-Russian alliance. Nonetheless, the need for such an alliance becomes apparent with each new turn of history" (Vol 1, p 64).

The Soviet Government, which followed with close attention the activity of the "Free France" National Committee from the time it emerged, supported this movement as soon as de Gaulle's representatives proposed the establishment of relations with it. The Soviet Government gave the movement unconditional support at all stages of its activity right up to its conversion into the Provisional Government.

At a difficult time for "Free France," in the spring of 1942, when the British and the Americans were ready to consent to a change in the movement's leadership, the Soviet Government's statements concerning a desire to see the French people's sovereignty "fully restored and France reborn in all its former grandeur and brilliance" contributed to a definite extent to a normalization of relations between the French on the one hand and the British and the Americans on the other (Vol 1, p 92). Furthermore, a cable of the USSR People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs to Ambassador I.M. Mayskiy gave a categorical instruction against participating in any attempts to "curb" de Gaulle. The Soviet Government even expressed a readiness to consent to recognition of the "Free France" National Committee as the Provisional Government irrespective of the position occupied by Britain and the United States on this questions. In conversation with "Free France" figures Soviet representatives constantly emphasized that the USSR was not contemplating a "reorganization of the world without France's participation." The Soviet Government declared the need for the country's revival and the restoration of its position as a great power (Vol 1, pp 87, 91).

Taking account of de Gaulle's wish, it agreed, in particular, to accept any French military unit on the Soviet-German front. The "Agreement Between the Representative of the Red Army Command and the Representative of the Military Command of Fighting France on the Participation of French Air Force Units in Operations in the Soviet Union" was signed on 25 November 1942 in Moscow. The French side undertook to provide French military pilots for an aviation squadron incorporated in a Soviet military unit, and the Soviet side made available the materiel and additional personnel "to ensure its maximum success in combat work" (Vol 1, pp 128-130).

The "Normandie" squadron was the Western allies' sole military unit which operated on the Eastern Front (the Soviet Government turned down W. Churchill's proposal to transfer British military units to the Caucasus).

Numerous documents published in the collection testify strikingly that during the war both Gen C. de Gaulle and his representatives considered precisely the Soviet Union the savior of the European peoples from fascism and constantly stated the decisive significance of the victories of Soviet arms in the struggle for their liberation. Unfortunately, this fact, which was so obvious for the participants in the heroic events, is now being called in question in the West, by some people in France included.

De Gaulle actively supported the Soviet Union's demand for the opening of a second front. It is highly symptomatic that on this most important question the USSR and France occupied similar positions, which attested the community of their interests. The general considered an allied landing in France perfectly feasible in 1942 even and declared the need for "complete support for the military efforts of the Red Army" (Vol 1, p. 99). French representatives sharply criticized the British and the Americans for delaying the landing. When it was finally carried out (Soviet troops were at this time already at the gates of Germany), France barely escaped the lot of an occupied country, which the British and U.S. governments wished to impose on it (and this despite the fact that the French Provisional Government was already in existence). Only the assertive, enterprising position of the Soviet Union, which at the Moscow conference in October 1943 had not supported such intentions of Washington and London, prevented their realization.

Under the impression of the tragic events which they had just experienced many French politicians began even at the height of the war to display considerable interest in ensuring when it was over that conditions be created precluding any possibility of a repetition of German aggression in the future. This position met with complete understanding on the part of the Soviet Government. It was it which initiated the inclusion of a French representative in the European Consultative Commission, which was set up specially to study problems connected with the future of Germany. The French viewpoint on the German question was set forth by de Gaulle during the Soviet-French negotiations in December 1944. He advocated the establishment of new borders for Germany along the Oder and Neisse in the East and along the Rhine in the West and internationalization of the Ruhr basin, which it was contemplated putting under international control (Vol 2, pp 161-164). De Gaulle addressed to the Soviet Union an initiative for the formulation of a joint draft of the bases of a peace settlement with Germany.*

The fate of the Ruhr district was finally determined at the Berlin conference of heads of the three powers, which decided to leave the Ruhr as part of Germany. However, the French continued to insist on the need for a considerable weakening of Germany by way of depriving it of the right to freely dispose of the industry and resources of the Rhine-Westphalia region.

* See C. de Gaulle, "Memoires de guerre. Le Salut. 1944-1946," Paris, 1959, p 194.

In the course of the Soviet-French negotiations on the conclusion of a trade agreement in December 1945 the Soviet Government was handed two voluminous memoranda on political and economic aspects of the problem of the Ruhr and the Rhine district which unequivocally pointed to the possibility of the appearance in Germany of revanchism and militarism. It was for this reason, the French side believed, that it should have been deprived--with the aid of political and economic measures--of the material basis for the pursuit of an aggressive policy in the future (Vol 2, pp 452-470).

France considered an important element of ensuring European security a firm alliance with the USSR, which General de Gaulle defined as a historic necessity (Vol 2, p 221). This alliance was made official with the signing on 10 December 1944 of the Alliance and Mutual Assistance Treaty--incidentally, the sole treaty concluded by France with another great power during the war* (Vol 2, pp 208-210).

On the 40th anniversary of the signing of the treaty we cannot fail to recall the words spoken by de Gaulle at a meeting of the Provisional Consultative Assembly following his return from Moscow: "The Alliance and Mutual Assistance Treaty which France has concluded with Soviet Russia corresponds to a trend which has become natural and traditional in both countries by virtue of the difficulties which they encounter in European politics. It is an act of union consolidated between two great powers of the continent not only for the purpose of waging war until total victory but also for ensuring that Germany, after its defeat, not be in a position to cause harm. Finally, this treaty is a symbol of the aspiration of Russia and France to close cooperation in all actions leading to the establishment of the future status of Europe.... For France and Russia to be united means being strong, being separated means being in danger. Indeed, this is an immutable condition from the viewpoint of geographical location, experience and common sense" (Vol 2, pp 219-221).

And although subsequently the country's ruling circles did not take advantage of all the opportunities which the treaty afforded French diplomacy, France perceived the first results of its conclusion immediately: despite the fact that WWII had begun for it in rout and capitulation, it ended it as one of the five great victor-powers, signing together with the USSR, Britain and the United States the act of Germany's capitulation and also together with them and China the act of Japan's capitulation. In accordance with the proposal of the Soviet delegation, at the Dumbarton Oaks conference in August 1944 France was included among the permanent members of the Security Council of the future United Nations. At the Yalta conference, in which France did not participate owing to the opposition of the United States (Roosevelt believed that de Gaulle's presence would have complicated the negotiations), it granted an occupation zone in Germany and a seat on the Control Council. As far as Churchill's position was concerned, in the spirit of the traditions of British diplomacy he played a dual game: while assuring the French of

* A supplement to this treaty was the Soviet-French trade agreement of 29 December 1945, in accordance with which the sides granted one another most-favored-nation status. On the basis of this agreement the Soviet Union, despite the difficult food situation, supplied France with 500,000 tons of grain. Addressing a French Communist Party Central Committee plenum in April 1946, Jacques Duclos declared that this assistance had driven away "the specter of starvation which has been hanging over the country" (Vol 2, pp 546-547).

his support during the conference, which was held behind closed doors, he declared that France "should not and will not participate in these allied meetings" since its contribution to the common cause had been too negligible.*

Together with the USSR, Britain and the United States, France signed the Declaration on the Defeat of Germany and also on the institution of the International Military Tribunal. In accordance with the decision of the Berlin conference, it was invited to take part in the work of the Council of Foreign Ministers and the Reparations Commission. On the basis of agreements prepared by the European Consultative Commission it acquired an occupation zone in Austria and a place in the allies' control mechanism for this country.

Speaking on 26 April 1945 at the conference in San Francisco, the USSR people's commissar for foreign affairs emphasized that France was one of the great powers constituting the anti-Hitler coalition as "a powerful world force in the postwar period also" (Vol 2, p 311). Consistently supporting its aspiration to restore its status as great power, the Soviet Union expressed the hope that it would continue to play an important part in maintaining the postwar peace and also in the creation of a system of European security, which would correspond to the interests of both the Soviet Union and France. The speech of the head of the French delegation at the conference in San Francisco spoke of his country's duty to contribute in every way possible to "the mutual understanding of the big allied powers not because this creates defenses capable of defending peace" but also because it is essential "to build a world in which the germs of a future conflict will be destroyed" (Vol 2, p 317).

II

Cooperation between the Soviet Union and France during the war is an example of the fact that, despite the interruptions and deviations, it is a historical necessity. V.I. Lenin even spoke of this at the dawn of the Soviet state's existence, when he emphasized that "any rapprochement with France is extremely desirable for us."** Soviet-French cooperation in the 1960's-1970's also attests the same. That the Soviet Union and France were at the sources of detente is not fortuitous. It was these states which initiated the process of all-European cooperation, thanks to which an atmosphere was created in Europe which contributed to the solution of a whole number of cardinal problems.

Relying on the experience of Soviet-French relations in the years of the struggle against fascism, General de Gaulle boldly moved as of the mid-1960's toward the restoration of cooperation with the USSR which has been buried under the accretions of the cold war. As far as the Soviet Union's approach to France is concerned, it has invariably been friendly. Even in the period when the Franco-Soviet dialogue was essentially suspended the USSR made repeated attempts to revive it.

* "The Soviet Union at International Conferences of the 1941-1945 Great Patriotic War Period. Collection of Documents," Moscow, 1979, Vol 4, pp 73-119.

** V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," Vol 45, p 237.

As a result both the USSR and France once again found themselves partners in the business of an improvement in the European situation. The interaction which on each occasion has been necessary at abrupt turns of history played its positive part now also. During General de Gaulle's visit to the USSR in June 1966 he declared: "...There exists a reality from the viewpoint of policy and feeling just as ancient as our two countries connected with their history, geography and the fact that there have never been any essential complaints between them.... It stands to reason that their alliance in the world wars and, in particular, the very great role of the Soviet Union in the decisive victory in WWII merely reinforced in Frenchmen the feeling of this solidarity."*

More than 30 political, economic, scientific-technical and cultural agreements were signed throughout the 1960's-1970's between the Soviet Union and France. A whole number of agreements approach very closely in terms of their importance the level of treaties. These include the 1966 Soviet-French Declaration, the 1970 Soviet-French Protocol, the 1971 Principles of Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and France and the 1979 Program of the Continued Development of Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and France to the Benefit of Detente and Peace. They record the principles of peaceful coexistence as the basis of mutual relations and formulate the mechanism of bilateral political consultations and meetings. Particular importance is attached to the understanding contained in the Soviet-French Protocol that "in the event of situations arising creating, in the opinion of the two sides, a threat to peace and a breach of peace or causing international tension, the governments of the USSR and France will enter into contact with one another immediately for the purpose of coordinating their positions on all aspects of such situations and the measures which would make it possible to cope with such situations."

The principles of cooperation enshrined in the Soviet-French documents were made the basis of a number of sections of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which was signed on 1 August 1975, which 30 years after the victory over Hitler Germany consolidated on the continent the results of WWII and confirmed the indissolubility of the brokers that have taken shape in Europe.

Soviet-French cooperation in the 1960's-1970's was an example of how, given mutual political will, it is possible to contribute effectively to a consolidation of the principles of peaceful coexistence in the relations of states with different systems and serve the safeguarding of world peace and the strengthening of international security and detente. At the same time this experience, as in the war years, demonstrated the importance for France of cooperation with the USSR from the viewpoint of securing the country's national interests, pursuing an independent foreign policy and participating in the solution of the international problems on which the fate of war and peace depends.

* "Soviet-French Relations 1965-1976. Documents and Material," Moscow-Paris, 1976, pp 18-19.

The creation on the European continent of an atmosphere of peace, trust and cooperation retains its relevance both for the Soviet Union and for France in our day also.

A positive stimulating role in international affairs was performed by the joint Soviet-French statement on detente. At the UN General Assembly 32d Session the USSR raised the question of the extension and consolidation of detente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war. A draft submitted by the Soviet Union was based largely on the content of the above-mentioned statement of the Soviet Union and France on detente. The General Assembly's adoption on the basis thereof of the Declaration on the Extension and Consolidation of the Relaxation of International Tension was an important contribution to the accomplishment of the UN's main task--ensuring international peace and security.

III

By the end of the 1970's, despite the successes which had been scored by this time in detente policy--and to a large extent precisely as a consequence of these successes--the endeavor of reactionary imperialist circles, primarily of the U.S. Administration, to break up the structure of relations between states with different social systems which had evolved on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and to change the military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States in favor of the latter began to make itself felt increasingly strongly.

This coincided with appreciable internal political changes in France. A bloc of forces of the left headed by the French Socialist Party (PSF) came to power in the May-June 1981 elections. The party's election program contained a whole number of positive features. It was noted, in particular, that the PSF advocates a continuation of the detente process, implementation of the Final Act of the Helsinki conference, the disbandment of military blocs and active participation in the disarmament process and an expansion of cooperation with the socialist countries.

However, the new government's steps in the foreign policy sphere have revealed a palpable gulf between the PCF program and Paris' practical activity in the international arena. The government's first diplomatic actions were aimed at convincing its NATO partners of its loyalty to the cause of "Western solidarity," and a further tilt in the direction of "Atlantism" was discerned. On the most important questions--East-West relations, the strategic balance, the deployment of American intermediate-range missiles in Europe--France has essentially adopted a position of support of the United States.

Policy in respect of the socialist community countries, particularly the Soviet Union, is also being revised in a negative spirit. There has been an interruption in the work of the mechanism of Soviet-French political cooperation which had been created over the preceding 15 years. There has essentially been a certain "dismantling" of Soviet-French relations, which could not have failed to have inflicted losses on detente policy and the development of the all-European process begun in Helsinki.

Reluctant to allow a further deterioration in bilateral relations, the Soviet Government has acted soberly and calmly. "In displaying restraint," Yu.V. Andropov emphasized on a conversation with the publisher of the magazine DER SPIEGEL, "we are guided by the broad interests of Soviet-French relations which have taken shape over a long time and the interests of the preservation of detente in Europe." The Soviet Government has declared repeatedly: it will not be a participant in, even less the instigator of the destruction of what has been achieved by the joint efforts of the two countries and peoples in the cause of detente and the strengthening of security.

Endeavoring to halt the process of the arms race in Europe--on a continent which is already oversaturated with all types of weapons--the Soviet Union has put forward a whole number of specific constructive proposals concerning arms reduction, at the Geneva negotiations on intermediate-range missiles in Europe included. It is well known that while paying lipservice to the successful completion of these negotiations, Paris in practice refused to consider the French intermediate-range nuclear missiles part of the overall count of the NATO countries, which could not have contributed to such success. It is also well known that the Soviet Union, together with the other Warsaw Pact countries, sent a proposal, to the French Government also, on the assumption of a commitment on the nonuse of force in relations between members of the two military alliances. But neither did this initiative find a positive response among Paris officials.

At the same time, however, Soviet-French economic cooperation has been maintained and expanded. France and a number of other West European countries opposed the R. Reagan administration's attempts to disrupt their mutually profitable economic relations with the Soviet Union, particularly the "gas-pipes" contract, failing to respond on this occasion to the transatlantic appeals for "Atlantic solidarity".

President F. Mitterrand has spoken repeatedly of France's interest--from the viewpoint of its genuine national interests--in continuation of the detente process. Speaking at a press conference on 16 November 1983, he called the Soviet Union a great country which enjoys great influence in the world and declared the need "to look for possibilities of a resumption of the East-West dialogue."* During a visit to Yugoslavia in December 1983 F. Mitterrand considered it necessary to emphasize: "France knows its history well and remembers that it is obliged to the great Russian people primarily for the freedom which it now has. Despite the fact that there have been instances of a mutual lack of understanding between us, we have managed to avoid a clash of interests. France supports this traditional friendship and believes that it can be preserved. We know that in order to develop relations between our countries for the good of peace throughout the world what is necessary primarily is a dialogue between the Soviet Union and France."**

* LE MONDE, 17 November 1983.

** Ibid., 17 December 1983.

The Soviet-French top-level meeting in June 1984 testified to the French side's desire to maintain fruitful contacts with the USSR at various levels. "The exchange of opinions on international problems....," K.U. Chernenko observed in this connection, "enables us, I believe, to speak of the mutual aspiration of the Soviet Union and France to greater mutual understanding and, possibly, to the exertion of parallel efforts for an improvement in the international situation and the strengthening of an atmosphere of trust. This applies to continuation of the process of all-European cooperation, including the work of the Stockholm conference, in whose success both states are interested. This also applies to the quest for ways to regulate centers of tension and military conflicts, primarily in the Near East and Central America, which are seriously disquieting to the USSR and France. I daresay I will not be mistaken if I say that at the present, very critical stage of international development the peoples expect of the Soviet Union and France an active contribution to an improvement in the situation in the world and a lessening of the military danger."

The negotiations showed that despite the difference which exists in the approaches to certain important international problems, both sides maintain close positions on a certain range of issues. It is primarily a question of preventing the transfer of the arms race to space, the banning and liquidation of chemical weapons and the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. They advocated the further development of Soviet-French economic and scientific-technical relations to the benefit of joint actions to overcome the difficulties which arise with respect to specific issues and the firm observance of the commitments assumed.

Having participated in WWII in the ranks of the Resistance, during his visit to the USSR the French president visited Volgograd. He honored the memory of the Soviet fighters who gave their lives in one of the most gigantic battles in man's history, which, in his words, "decided the fate of the world". Mitterrand recalled the friendship between the Soviet and French peoples, which had been "forged over centuries". The French president declared the need for unification of the efforts of the Soviet Union and France in the building of peace.

In the Soviet Union the negotiations with the French president were evaluated as useful. "The results of the visit," the CPSU Central Committee Politburo report on the meeting said, "open greater opportunities, if both sides aspire to this, for a considerable expansion and deepening of Soviet-French relations in the sphere of foreign policy cooperation, economic relations and scientific-technical and cultural exchange. This creates the prerequisites for a further stimulation of the policy of detente and struggle for the strengthening of peace and security in Europe and throughout the world."

The Soviet Union advocates a solicitous attitude toward the assets in Soviet-French mutual relations which have been built up over decades and believes that the cooperation of the two countries will continue to exert a positive influence on the development of the international situation both in Europe and throughout the world. The historical experience of cooperation between the USSR and France, which have made an inestimable contribution to the establishment of peaceful relations on the European continent, speaks in support of this.

At the end of October 1984 the public of both countries extensively commemorated the 60th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the French Republic. Of course, the world situation has changed fundamentally in the decades which have elapsed. But the need to maintain good relations between our states, maintain loyalty to the ancient traditions of friendship of the two peoples and to work jointly for the good of European and international peace remains invariable. The further expansion and deepening of cooperation between the USSR and France corresponding to mutual national interests are important precisely now, when through the fault of imperialist forces and reaction there has been a sharp deterioration in the international situation.

"The Soviet Union sincerely offers just one way," K.U. Chernenko emphasized, "the way of peaceful coexistence, the way of mutually profitable international cooperation.... We are prepared for dialogue, prepared to cooperate actively with the governments and organizations which wish to work honestly and constructively in the name of peace."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/9

CONFERENCE ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS IN EUROPE HELD IN PRAGUE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 84 (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 105-118

[A. Kokeyev report: "Against Militarism and Revanchism"]

[Excerpts] The international scientific symposium "Danger of the Trends of Militarism and Revanchism in the Political Circles of a number of Western Countries" was held 17-21 September 1984 in Prague. Representatives of 12 European socialist and capitalist states participated. Among them were prominent historians, military specialists and lawyers.

The welcoming remarks to the participants were addressed by (Z. Snitsel), vice president of the CSSR Academy of Sciences.

The participants in the symposium analyzed comprehensively and in depth the nature and actions of the imperialist forces spurring international tension.

The working session, which was devoted to an examination of the problem "Militarist Trends in the West's Policy--Serious Threat to the Cause of Peace," was opened by Prof J. Pudlak, director of the Institute of International Relations (CSSR). He noted the high degree of topicality of the symposium: even in the comparatively short period of preparation for it a number of events had occurred pointing to the growing threat of militarism and revanchism. High-ranking officials had for the first time in many years again taken part in revanchist gatherings in the FRG. Sensing the increased support, the revanchists have begun to demand increasingly brazenly a revision of the postwar settlement in Europe and to question the existing borders. The final restrictions on West Germany's production of strategic bombers and long-range missiles were lifted in the summer of 1984 at the Western European Union session. Such phenomena are causing justified disquiet among all to whom the interests of peace and security are dear.

The spearhead of the militarist policy of the United States and NATO is aimed primarily against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Nor are the developing states spared this threat. Since the latter half of the 1970's the U.S. military-industrial complex has been the dominating factor in determination of the military policy and strategy not only of this country but also of the entire North Atlantic alliance. The intensive process of military-industrial integration in West Europe is another characteristic feature of this period.

Two most important realities cannot be lost sight of upon an analysis of the trends of modern militarism. One of them is that socialism has reached a stage which guarantees not only its continued existence but also the growth of its influence on objective processes of world development. Thus the opportunities for imperialism to realize its strategic plans militarily have now been restricted to a considerable extent. On the other hand, the resolve of the most reactionary forces to exact class revenge in respect of real socialism, the developing countries and the workers movement in the capitalist countries, not stopping short at the use of military force here, has increased. Under present conditions the connection between militarism and revanchism has strengthened even more, and both trends are stimulating one another even more actively.

Class revanchism as a whole is underpinned by the territorial revanchism of certain capitalist countries, primarily the FRG and Japan. The revanchist aspirations of West German and Japanese imperialism are inseparably connected with anti-Sovietism and anticommunism.

Particular disquiet is being aroused in the CSSR by the manifest revival of revanchist trends in the FRG, where territorial claims are being accompanied openly by demands for a change in the social setup and political system in the East European socialist countries. Adenauer's proposition to the effect that "the solution of the German problem" in aggregate with the solution of "the problem of self-determination of the peoples of East Central Europe" is the prerequisite for "real peace" in Europe has again been dragged into light. Ignoring the letter and spirit of the treaties which the FRG has concluded with the socialist countries, Bonn has again begun to talk about the "legal legitimacy" of the 1937 borders of the German Reich.

As is known, the mere mention of revanchism causes irritation in the present West German leadership, which accuses the socialist countries of unleashing a "propaganda campaign" against the FRG. We are well aware that the overwhelming majority of West German citizens wished to live in peace and friendship with all neighbors and to develop economic, cultural and other relations with them; and that compared with the honest Germans who have learned the lessons from the bitter past the revanchists represent a minority. It is by no means their numbers which are causing disquiet. The fact that the most consistent fighters against Nazism, primarily the West German communists, are being subjected to persecution and discrimination while former Nazis occupy responsible positions in the civil service, the justice organs, the educational system and so forth cannot fail to instill concern. Peace supporters are being persecuted and subjected to slanderous attacks while the proponents of revanchist concepts and the opponents of the postwar settlement in Europe enjoy the blessing of high-ranking statesmen of the FRG.

Proceeding from the regrettable experience of the past, we are obliged to pay close attention to the phenomena and trends which have been noted, which could, as occurred in the 1930's, assume threatening proportions if they are not opportunely and effectively rebuffed.

The participants in the symposium heard the report of Prof A.N. Yakovlev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), "Dangerous Axis of American-West German militarism". It noted that in the current extraordinarily complex international situation, when the problem of war and peace has become extremely acute, a precise analysis of the extent of the threat to peace and the nature of the forces which are increasing the danger of war is particularly important.

The alliance of American and West German militarism is again moving to the forefront of this development, which is disastrous for the cause of peace. As was the case in the cold war years, Washington and Bonn are endeavoring to turn West and Central Europe into the main arena of the military-political confrontation with socialism. The roots of today's policy of the United States and the FRG undoubtedly go back deep into the history of the complex and multilevel relations between the West's two major powers. The highly developed industry of both countries, the high degree of the concentration and monopolization of capital, the domination of the financial oligarchy and the close cooperation of their leading concerns have brought the United States and Germany even closer together since the Kaiser's times.

Immediately after WWII the Western powers headed by the United States, in spite of the commitments they had assumed, embarked on a revival of German militarism. Back on 16 April 1945 a number of American newspapers published information received confidentially that a day earlier "a group of members of the U.S. Administration had adopted the decision to turn Germany after the war into a bulwark against Russia." Guided primarily by this goal, after 1945 the ruling circles of the United States, Britain and France led matters step by step toward the division of Germany. The United States displayed the greatest interest in frustration of the Potsdam decisions and the sabotage of a peaceful settlement of the German question.

In September 1950 the governments of the West's victor-powers adopted a decision on the "limited and controlled armament of West Germany" and its participation in the "joint armed forces," that is, in the NATO system. The actual implementation of a program of the country's remilitarization began.

Following the collapse of the "European Army" agreement in 1954, agreements on the remilitarization of West Germany, the creation of a 500,000-strong West German army and its incorporation in the North Atlantic bloc were hurriedly prepared and signed on the initiative of the United States. In May 1955 the FRG officially became a member of this military-political alliance.

After the FRG had joined NATO the process of its remilitarization accelerated considerably. Slogans of restoration of the 1937 borders and "reunification," by which was understood absorption of the GDR, were made the cornerstone of Bonn's political aspirations. By the start of the 1960's the FRG's ruling circles had achieved recognition of these demands on the part of the Western allies, primarily the United States.

By this time the policy of revanche in combination with the growth of militarism had turned the FRG into the main threat to peace and security in Europe and the main support on the continent of the American cold war strategists. The FRG's attempts to acquire, relying on the military alliance with the United States, nuclear weapons assumed a particularly dangerous nature. The plans to create so-called NATO "multilateral nuclear forces," which were being developed and discussed persistently in NATO at the start of the 1960's, served this goal.

In conjunction with the United States the FRG played an important part in the decision adopted by NATO in December 1960 to lower the bloc's "nuclear threshold" in Europe, that is, the NATO bloc's first use of tactical nuclear weapons against the Warsaw Pact countries.

The course of development of international events forced the West German leadership, however, to make adjustments and revise many of its calculations. The "from a position of strength" policy failed inasmuch as the correlation of forces in the world had changed increasingly in favor of socialism, and the socialist system as a whole and the GDR in particular had strengthened.

The process of an "agonizing reappraisal of values," which led to the formation of an SPD/FDP government, which associated the FRG with European detente, was not only prolonged but also very painful and complex. The conclusion of treaties with the USSR, Poland and other socialist countries appreciably broadened the FRG's possibilities of maneuver and strengthened its independence in respect of other Western countries, including the United States. However, the predominant feature in Bonn's foreign policy remained the aspiration to close military-political alliance with American imperialism and to reliance on Washington in its European, including "eastern," policy. The policy of support for NATO and the strengthening of the FRG's positions in this militarist bloc remained unchanged. Thus the "Declaration on Atlantic Relations," which said plainly that the development of allied armed forces cannot be changed "in the course of present or future negotiations" with the socialist countries, was approved in June 1974. This period, in particular, is characterized by the fact that West German generals and officers came to occupy considerably more often important command positions in NATO's integrated (joint) armed forces.

It was precisely on the initiative of the FRG that NATO's "dual decision" of 1979 on the deployment in West Europe of new American first-, "preemptive"-strike nuclear weapons--108 Pershing 2 launchers and 464 ground-based cruise missiles designed to upset the existing balance of nuclear arms in Europe in NATO's favor and change the strategic situation to the detriment of the security of the USSR and the other socialist countries--was prepared by the joint efforts of Bonn and Washington. All the Pershing 2 launchers and 96 cruise missiles are to be deployed on FRG territory. The process of their deployment began at the end of 1983, as is known. This was the start of a new stage, far more dangerous than in the past, of the FRG's military-political cooperation with the United States

Thus the American-West German "axis" had and continues to have a very solid economic and political foundation. Its roots go back far into history. And its revival in the postwar period, like the recent stimulation in a different situation and with a different correlation of forces, was no accident.

The current openly aggressive, strictly confrontational policy of American imperialism, which took shape under the influence of contradictory impulses and diverse causes, the most important of which is imperialism's reluctance, based on a false assessment of the correlation of forces and the prospects of its evolution, to acquiesce in the socioeconomic changes which have occurred and which are constantly occurring in the world, is pushing mankind toward the edge of the nuclear abyss. Naturally, this policy is encountering the growing resistance of the peace-loving forces, and its proponents need allies and sympathizers both at home and abroad.

This is why the extreme right forces of the United States are now linking up with an activeness unusual in recent decades with rightwing conservative political and military circles of the FRG. The orientation of the West German Government is increasingly being adjusted to Washington's aims, while it itself is finding itself increasingly markedly captive to the most reactionary and adventurist circles of modern imperialism.

The militarist alliance of Bonn and Washington is brought about by the singularities of the FRG's military-political development. First, the FRG in the military-political aspect is a central component of NATO's European structure. Second, West German militarism relies on a powerful economic and technology base. Third, it is a direct neighbor of socialist community countries and from the military viewpoint is "targeted" in the main strategic direction. Fourth, FRG militarism has taken in many of the old Prussian-German traditions, which are so well and regrettably known to the peoples of Europe, particularly East Europe. Fifth, the West German ruling elite is putting its hopes in a consolidation of the ties linking it with bellicose transatlantic forces as a means of strengthening the positions of imperialism in the world are rallying its forces in the struggle against world socialism. Furthermore, while adhering to somewhat different tactics to Washington Bonn is also preaching a policy of strength, calculating that the West's constantly growing military potential will force the socialist countries into unilateral concessions in the process of East-West dialogue.

The FRG's ruling circles are leading their country along a path of military preparations which considerably exceed defense requirements. However, these measures are organically inscribed in American militarist plans and actions, and this means that the country and its future are directly dependent on the aggressive strategy of the Washington administration. At the same time contradictions are also inevitably being manifested in the American-West German alliance. The ineradicable rivalry is making its mark both on the political possibilities of West Germany and on the military cooperation of Washington and Bonn. Each partner is pursuing his own, by no means always concurrent, aims and each is endeavoring to pull the chestnuts out of the fire with the other's hands.

Washington is seeking from Bonn not only a constant rise in military spending (3-4 percent in real terms annually) but also an expansion of the servicing of the American units stationed on West German territory and also of those which could be transferred to West Europe additionally in the future. The leadership of the United States and NATO periodically puts forward demands for the FRG's participation in military operations outside of NATO's operational zone and is pulling it into Washington's "crisis strategy". This, is however, by no means meeting with active support on the part of the FRG. Contradictions are also being caused by many other circumstances, including the United States' reluctance to transfer large-scale arms orders to the West European partners.

The FRG Government would like the United States to abandon the plans to conduct military operations of any kind, "limited" included, on its territory since this is fraught with the danger of the country's complete annihilation. It sometimes tries to avoid new large-scale financial outlays connected with the implementation of a number of NATO programs. It longs, however, for more equal relations with the United States in military matters and in the political sphere.

Under these conditions the U.S. Administration is taking new steps to enmesh the FRG in the web of Atlantic military relations. It is gradually kindling nationalist sentiments in West Germany, engaging essentially in a reanimation of revanchism. Speaking in the White House on 17 August 1984 to a deputation of Americans of Polish extraction, R. Reagan, for example, declared: "Passive acquiescence in the subjugation of the peoples of East Europe cannot be an acceptable alternative." This is nothing other than an open call for the liquidation of the socialist system in the countries of this region. Three days later Secretary of State G. Shultz, repeating his Stockholm escapade, proclaimed: "We will never be reconciled to the idea of a divided Europe."

West German revanchism grows out of American "revisionism," as this phenomenon is called in the West, and is closely associated with it. The American-West German militarist "axis" is thereby connected with nationalist, revanchist slogans and aims, and its danger, because of this, increases many times over. Further development in the same direction is capable of leading to serious negative changes in the entire structure of European relations and harming European security and the security of the socialist community countries.

The said process is developing against the background of the interrelations of the two most important centers of imperialist rivalry--the United States and West Europe--which occupy a central place in the global structure of international relations. A certain exacerbation of relations has been observed in recent years in the political, economic and military-political spheres between the leading West European countries and the United States. The same hegemonist pretensions which form the basis of its policy in respect of the socialist states and the developing countries may frequently be discerned in Washington's approach to its West European competitor-partners. The West European countries are assigned the role of "junior partners" in the United States' global antisocialist and neocolonialist strategy.

The role of assistants is by no means causing rapture in the ruling circles of the West European states. Despite the difference in the political courses of individual West European countries, they are united in their aspiration to pursue an independent policy, which in many important aspects differs from American policy. The latter is leading to an exacerbation of interimperialist contradictions and strengthening the centrifugal trends in interallied relations.

These contradictions are being manifested particularly distinctly in the sphere of the United States' military-political relations with its European allies. The "flexible response" doctrine, which has been adopted officially and which operates within NATO, reserves for the United States the right to decide when and how to use nuclear weapons. This situation does not now correspond to the views and evaluations to which the political leaders of West European countries adhere. Attempting to find a way out of this situation, they took the path of the closer linkage of their countries' security with that of the United States. However, they soon had serious fears that, in the event of the nuclear threshold being crossed, matters could be "limited" to the use of tactical nuclear weapons, which would mean the total devastation of West Europe and the annihilation of its population. It is this which has been the main reason for the cautious attitude of the representatives of a number of West European countries toward the confrontational trends in U.S. policy and the unprecedented rise therein of the role of military strength, particularly in relations with the socialist countries.

The West European countries' approach to relations with their senior partner has for this reason been characterized recently by an increase in differences and disagreements, which are the reflection of differences in their objective interests in a whole number of spheres.

All this is forcing U.S. ruling circles to increase attention to the European direction of their policy, to attempt to make more effective use of the means of influencing the European allies at their disposal and to try and draw closer the most valuable and "loyal" of them. And the FRG, naturally, is moved to the forefront here.

Representatives of the Reagan administration do not miss an opportunity to express satisfaction with Bonn's political conduct and to emphasize the concurrence of the two countries' policies on most important international problems. The press conference of U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz during his visit to Bonn and also the recent festivities on the 300th anniversary of the arrival of the first German settlers in Pennsylvania may serve as an example.

An analysis of American-West German relations shows that, despite the intensification of the competitive struggle and the growth of contradictions on a broad range of problems, a trend toward the joint actions of the two leading powers of the capitalist world against the forces of socialism and social progress is predominant. This trend has been expressed in the development of far-reaching military cooperation which is aimed against the USSR and its allies and which is assuming the nature of "special relations" between the United States and the FRG.

There is broad unanimity in American ruling circles in the evaluation of military-political cooperation with the FRG as an important component of global American strategy, which, as has been made public repeatedly, anticipates the use of West German territory as a springboard for possible military operations in Europe in order to reduce the risk of the destruction of its own industrial and military centers. The United States is forcing the FRG to pay a hundredfold for its interest in maintaining close allied relations with it.

The basis of Bonn's entire Western policy, primarily of the relations with the United States, is invariably the class community of interests and the endeavor to align the allies with realization of its central political task--to change the situation which has taken shape in German affairs since WWII and "decide" the so-called "German question," having liquidated the socialist achievements in the GDR.

The consolidation of the FRG's positions in West Europe in recent years has introduced qualitatively new features to American-West German relations. Bonn is essentially ousting Great Britain from the positions of privileged partner of the United States, which is, in turn, being used for a further strengthening of the FRG's leadership in the EEC.

Imparting paramount significance to relations with the United States and NATO, the CDU/CSU and the FDP are emphasizing in every possible way their spiritual community with the United States and expressing solidarity with American actions. Prominent SPD representatives (E. Bahr and others) accuse the present government with complete justification of speaking with the voice of an American ventriloquist. Under the cover of pseudo-peace-loving demagoguery military cooperation between the FRG and the United States has been raised, as pointed out earlier, to a new, higher level.

The American-West German militarist alliance is today acquiring threatening outlines. The policy of the achievement of military superiority over the Warsaw Pact is being pursued jointly. This adventurist policy is being given an ideological basis. American ruling circles' encouragement and support of nationalist and revanchist sentiments in the FRG and the incitement to violations of most important international accords recording postwar realities in Europe are of a particularly dangerous nature in this connection. A new military threat is maturing on German soil.

The present U.S. Administration is reviving and stimulating the traditional aspiration of the most reactionary circles of Western countries to "channel" the aggression of German militarism toward the East, the lamentary consequences of which history knows, and to furnish this aggression with arms and ideological cover based on the proposition of the "injustice" of the postwar political settlement. The ground is being prepared for a mortally dangerous experiment with the latest arms precisely on German soil. It is the duty of scholars to cogently show the yawning gulf between what is currently being said in Bonn and, more rarely, in Washington about an aspiration to peace and the West's practical preparations, a central place in which is invariably occupied by the American-West German militarist "axis".

The speech of Assistant Prof G. Stefanov (Institute of International Relations and Socialist Integration, Bulgaria) examined the most characteristic singularities of present-day militarism. Under the conditions of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, militarism, which is inseparably connected with anticommunism, has become a basic means of imperialist policy, which is attempting to change the course of social development. The arms race unleashed by imperialism, which is of unprecedented scale, is profoundly and dangerously deforming the entire system of international relations. The militarism of the United States and its NATO allies, which have raised in unprecedented fashion the level of military confrontation, is bringing mankind to the brink of war. The American militarists preach a strategy which presupposes the "legitimacy" of a "holy war" against world socialism and which admits the possibility of a first, "disarming" nuclear strike. The doctrine of "restraint," under the cover of which wide-ranging military preparations were implemented in the past, is also being cast aside here.

An important singularity of present-day militarism is the fact that it is developing on the one hand under the conditions of a sharp exacerbation of the military confrontation and, on the other, in an atmosphere of unprecedented progress in the development of science and technology. This is particularly dangerous since imperialism has always attempted to put the fundamental achievements of scientific-technical progress at the service of its aggressive policy. This has led to the creation and stockpiling of arms whose use could in a matter of minutes or hours threaten all of mankind with total physical annihilation. The prospect of even more dangerous development in this direction becomes very real in connection with the United States' intentions of extending the arms race to space. The question of war and peace is today the most important question for all countries and peoples without exception for the solution of all other problems depends on its solution.

The basic categories of international relations--peace and war, international and national security, attack and defense, victory and defeat, belligerent and nonbelligerent and so forth--have changed radically and been suffused with new content. Today the question of war and peace has become a question of preservation of human civilization.

Prof D.M. Proektor (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO) dwelt on certain questions of the West European countries' military policy at the current stage. He observed that the policy of the Reagan administration, which is oriented toward a "crusade" against socialism, has had differing responses both in liberal, democratic and conservative, militarist circles of West Europe.

The first it has prompted to step up efforts to preserve peace and seek alternative concepts of security and ways of preserving detente under the new conditions. For the second it has become a signal for a stiffening of the confrontation, the accelerated development of the West European military potential, a revival of the old policy and slogans of the 1950's-1960's period and also the renunciation of a number of important provisions of the Final Act of the All-European Conference in Helsinki.

In studying the new conservative trends and views in the sphere of the military policy of certain leading West European countries it has to be seen that they do not correspond to the objective state of affairs, particularly in the evaluation of the causes and essence of the complication of East-West relations. They are seen not in the obvious and indisputable switch of American military policy onto the path of global military hegemonism and attempts to create the conditions for "victory" in a nuclear war but in the notorious "growth of the Soviet threat" to West Europe, which is absurd in the political, military and other respects.

B. Rychlowski, deputy director of the Polish Institute of International Issues, observed that the actions of the allied powers in the periods of WWII and the postwar settlement have in our day become a subject of conscious falsification on the part of reactionary political forces. They are attempting to distort the past in order to disrupt the present and shape the future at their discretion. The Yalta conference of the leaders of the three powers of the anti-Hitler coalition held in February 1945 has been the central target of such attempts. The conference examined the question of the future fate of Germany. It was a question of the creation of a security system which could effectively bar the possibility of new aggression on its part. For this purpose it was decided to demand of Germany unconditional surrender, to occupy it and to establish joint control over it. The principles of demilitarization, de-Nazification and democratization were made the basis of the future common policy in respect of Germany.

It is perfectly obvious to all realistic politicians today that peace in Europe may be preserved only in the event of no one encroaching on the existing borders and attempting to upset the political-territorial status quo.

L. Knorr, representative of the German Peace Union (FRG), noted the sharp increase in the role of military factors in the "security policy" of West Europe and, particularly, of the FRG and its reorientation toward greater support for the confrontational course being pursued by the United States. In FRG ruling circles detente is being interpreted increasingly as a possible means of overcoming the "division of Germany," and none other than Chancellor H. Kohl virtually reiterates Reagan's words to the effect that the main thing today is "freedom" and not peace. This "freedom" is the freedom of the monopolies to expand and derive profit by any means.

P. Stania, associate at the International Peace Institute in Vienna, described the institute's activity and the tasks confronting it. He cited a number of factors attesting the increased pressure of the United States and the FRG on Austria for the purpose of introducing it to NATO's militarist preparations.

(G. Kherde), member of the presidium of the Union of Antifascists of the FRG, illustrated in detail the activity of the revanchist associations and particularly their so-called "cultural policy," which enjoys increasingly broad political and also material support on the part of the official authorities. In the face of the growing influence of the revanchist forces inside the country the West German antifascists are actively extending cooperation with all progressive forces and organizations in the FRG and abroad for repulsing revanchism.

The symposium studied the problem "The Manifestation of Revanchist Trends in the Political Circles of Western Countries".

The paper of Prof A.D. Nikonov (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO) observed that revanchism as a political phenomenon appears in international relations in two basic varieties. One of them may provisionally be called "territorial revanchism". It has as its goal the forcible and unlawful return of territories which were lost earlier as a result, for example, of a lost war. This is revanchism of "local significance," so to speak. But there is also another variety thereof--social revanchism. Its contemporary disciples are attempting to impart to it a truly global nature. Such revanchism is manifested in the class-conditioned endeavor of the most reactionary imperialist circles to restore to themselves the positions in world politics and economics which were lost in the social battles of the 20th century. The stirring of revanchist elements in West Europe is being stimulated by U.S. ruling circles. K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, emphasized with all certainty: "In connection with the problem of security in Europe attention has to be drawn to the fact that revanchists of all stripes, inspired by Washington's example and encouraged by the appeals for an anticommunist 'crusade,' are raising their head."

A. Ackerman (France), representative of the International Federation of Participants in the Resistance, called for more attention to be paid to study of the problem of neofascism. All the conditions exist in contemporary capitalist society for the growth of fascist-type associations. Neofascism does not yet have a mass base in West Europe and cannot yet hope to come to power in any of its countries but, relying on nationalism and revanchism, it could spread with epidemic speed and assume threatening proportions.

Candidate of Historical Sciences A.M. Kokeyev (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO) adduced a number of facts testifying that influential political forces in the FRG, in spite of the treaty commitments which it had adopted in respect of the socialist countries, are encouraging the activity of a variety of revanchist associations. They have strengthened their positions noticeably recently in the FRG's central institutions, including parliament. Some 44 Bundestag deputies--almost one-third more than in the preceding parliament--represent associations calling themselves "East and Central Germany," by which is meant provinces belonging to the USSR and Poland and also the entire GDR. It would be a serious mistake not to take stock of the danger emanating from West German revanchism for the FRG's neighbors, the cause of peace in Europe and also for West Germany itself. Having noticeably stepped up their activity, the revanchists are attempting to kindle in the population the same great-German chauvinism and militarism which was once the cause of tragedy for many peoples of Europe and the whole world.

Prof G. Grasnik, deputy director of the Institute of International Politics and Economics (GDR), emphasized that the "crusade" against socialism announced by Reagan is aimed at "rolling back socialism". In the postwar period the leading role in realization of this strategy was assigned the FRG. In consenting to the division of Germany and the creation of the separate Bonn

state the leaders of the Western powers endeavored not only to erect a "bastion in the way of the spread of communist ideas in Europe" but also to lay the basis for the recreation of an imperialist Germany within the 1937 borders. Anticommunism and revanchism were at the cradle of the West German state.

The formation of the GDR and its successful development in fraternal alliance with the USSR and the other socialist community countries signified a severe defeat for world and, particularly, West German imperialism. However, the latter by no means lost hope of a revision of the results of WWII and expansion of the sphere of its domination eastward. A most important goal was liquidation of the GDR as a socialist state and the restoration on its territory of capitalist orders. To realize it the FRG, with the active support of the United States, attempted in June 1953 to provoke a counterrevolutionary putsch against the people's power of the GDR and thereby create a pretext for military intervention. These plans, as is known, failed.

The joint action of the Warsaw Pact states to protect the GDR's state border undertaken in August 1961 was of considerable significance. A strong barrier was erected in the way of the revanchist pretensions of West German imperialism. Under the conditions of the military-strategic balance, which had been achieved primarily by the efforts of the USSR, the West was forced to switch to more flexible forms and methods of implementing the strategy of social revanche. Thus at the start of the 1970's the "change through rapprochement" doctrine, which presupposed use of the detente process for gradually undermining the status quo in favor of imperialism, appeared. There was a corresponding change in the phraseology of the FRG's revanchist associations. The bellicose demands for a "new order in Europe" were replaced by demagogic arguments about "European unity under conditions of freedom". Whereas previously calls for the "liberation of the GDR" and the "settlement of border questions" with the aid of force had been heard, in time there came to be talk there of a "policy of patience" and a "nonviolent change of borders".

World realities and the aggressive peace-loving policy of the socialist community countries led to responsible politicians in the West, in the FRG in particular, recognizing to a certain extent the need for detente and peaceful coexistence. This process was reflected in the GDR's signing of treaties with the USSR, the GDR and other socialist countries and also of the Final Act of the All-European Conference--documents which recorded the permanency of postwar realities in Europe and the indissolubility of European borders.

Considerable changes have taken place in the social consciousness of the FRG, where a very broad movement of peace supporters has unfolded in the 1980's. At the same time it has to be seen that a certain part of the West German population is infected with the poison of revanchism and continues to harbor illusions concerning the "reunification of Germany," putting its hopes in U.S. support. Under these conditions ever increasing significance is attached to the concerted actions of the socialist community countries aimed at maintaining the military balance, a return to detente, a curbing of the arms race and the prevention of nuclear war.

Doctor of Legal Sciences V.V. Pustogarov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law, devoted his speech to the problem of the indissolubility of state borders as a guarantee of peace and security in Europe. Historical experience leads to the conclusion that a most important prerequisite of the preservation of peace is renunciation of encroachments on evolved borders and of territorial claims. For this reason a prominent place in the course of the postwar settlement in Europe was occupied by the peace-loving forces' endeavor to draw a line once and for all under territorial disputes and to make existing borders final and inviolable for all time.

The above-mentioned treaties concluded in the 1970's by the USSR, Poland, the GDR and the CSSR with the FRG were an important step in this direction. These documents enshrined in bilateral instruments in international law the borders of the subscriber-states which existed at the moment of signing (and which exist currently). The parties' assurances that they have no territorial claims on one another (and on other European states) and undertake to respect the territorial integrity of the parties to the treaties (and of all stated in Europe) were recorded. The treaties impose on their signatories obligations without any limitations or reservations; furthermore, they determine that the fulfillment of the commitments should be "unswerving," "unlimited" and "comprehensive". The treaties in question do not have provisions governing their effective periods or possible denunciation. In terms of the content of the commitments determined in them the treaties are permanent.

The said provisions enjoyed further development and treaty enshrinement in the Final Act of the All-European Conference. It distinguishes states' territorial integrity as an independent principle of international law, no less than the provision governing the indissolubility of borders.

Soviet people, including the younger generation, are raised in a spirit of respect for other peoples and in a spirit of respect for the borders and territorial integrity of other states. Something else is to be seen in the West. There are political forces there which, contrary to the letter and spirit of the Final Act and in spite of international treaties in force and the rules of international law, are demanding a reorganization of the state borders which exist in Europe.

Particular assertiveness is being displayed by the revanchist circles of the FRG. The FRG Government is not adopting here the proper measures to bring intrastate practice into line with existing international commitments. References to decisions of the constitutional court and current internal legal enactments cannot serve as justification for the policy being pursued by Bonn of support for revanchist forces which are flagrantly flouting the commitments to respect the indissolubility of existing borders and not advance territorial claims against neighboring countries.

Considering that the indissolubility of state borders is of fundamental significance for international peace and security, revanchist encroachments should be categorized in accordance with the standards of states' international responsibility as a serious violation of international commitments.

Candidate of Historical Sciences L.G. Istyagin (IMEMO) pointed to the regularity of the coincidence of the wave of neorevanchism in West Germany and the deployment on its territory and in a number of other West European countries of the new American first-strike weapons accompanied by an accelerated conventional arms buildup. Revanchism in the history of the FRG has always served as a nutrient medium for militarism and furnished it with specific goals and, to a certain extent, with a mass social base.

Prof (V. Khenishch), deputy director of the Institute of International Relations in Potsdam-Babelsberg (GDR), emphasized particularly that the deployment of the new American intermediate-range missiles in West European countries occupies a central place in the policy being pursued by the Reagan administration of the achievement of the military superiority of the United States and NATO over the USSR and the Warsaw Pact.

Washington's missile action is seriously detrimental to the entire set of the FRG's treaties with the socialist countries, which were made the basis of the process of European detente. Ensuring peace on the basis of recognition of the indissolubility of the postwar borders and renunciation of the use of force and the development of peaceful mutually profitable East-West cooperation in Europe are the core of these treaties.

A direct military threat emanates today from the territory of the Federal Republic to the territory of the USSR and other socialist countries. The key provisions of the European treaties are thereby jeopardized.

The speech of Doctor of Legal Sciences A.M. Larin (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law) was devoted to the problem of the unlawfulness of revanchism. Back in 1946 the UN General Assembly confirmed the principles of international law recognized by the statutes of the International Military Tribunal, which passed on the basis thereof its judgement on the Nazi criminals, and proposed that these principles be inserted in the general codification of crimes against peace and the security of mankind. Consequently, the statutes and also the judgement of the tribunal are effective written sources of international law.

The speech by R. Perry, member of the British Parliament from the Labor Party, contained an analysis of the domestic political situation in Great Britain and cogent criticism of the socioeconomic and, particularly, foreign policy of M. Thatcher's Conservative government, which supports the aggressive policy of the United States. Labor Party members are opposed to the deployment of American nuclear missiles on the territory of Great Britain and support the development of friendly relations with the USSR and other socialist countries.

The final day of the symposium's work was devoted to the subject "West Europe and Militarism". I. Balasz, deputy director of the Hungarian Institute of International Relations, dwelt on problems of the United States' mutual relations with its most important NATO allies and the particular features of the West European states' approach to the socialist countries. In recent years this bloc has implemented a whole number of measures aimed at breaking up the existing military balance in Europe and achieving military superiority over the Warsaw Pact. Among these were the long-term arms program approved in May

1978, the United States' refusal to ratify the SALT-II Treaty, which was signed in June 1979, NATO's so-called "rearmament" decision of December 1979 and the deployment in West Europe of new American intermediate-range missiles, which began at the end of 1983. All this testifies that despite the numerous statements concerning the need to maintain military-strategic parity and reduce nuclear arsenals, the leaders of a number of West European states which are participants in the alliance support the aggressive policy of the present U.S. Administration and are expressing, in particular, consent to the well-known "Rogers Plan," which provides for the accelerated modernization of NATO ground forces. There also has to be seen the West European states' as a whole passive attitude toward the American program for the militarization of space and the new, avowedly offensive "air-land battle" concept. In evaluating the policy of these states as a whole it is necessary to proceed from the fact that a high degree of their dependence on the transatlantic power is maintained in the military sphere.

At the same time relations between the United States and its NATO allies are not without serious disagreements. They are expressed, inter alia, in the different attitude toward the policy of detente and East-West trade-economic cooperation. In the said spheres the West European countries by no means always follow the strict precepts of the Reagan administration and frequently act in conformity with their own interests, which differ from those of the Americans. Despite the continuing tension, the political dialogue between the West European and socialist countries, at the top level included, has not been suspended. Albeit after long procrastination, it was nonetheless possible to successfully conclude the Madrid meeting and to convene the Stockholm conference on confidence-building measures, security and disarmament in Europe. In West Europe, particularly in the small countries, there is growing interest in the creation on the European continent of nuclear-free zones, which could correspond to the spirit of the All-European Conference in Helsinki.

Of course, the said positive features do not give us the right to ignore the threat brought about by the actions of the United States and NATO, primarily by the deployment of American intermediate-range nuclear missiles in West Europe.

An important element of detente in Europe is the normalization of relations between the two German states. The GDR's position on this question has always been based on the common policy for the entire socialist community of peaceful coexistence on the basis of recognition of sovereignty, equality and mutual respect. As far as the FRG is concerned, certain political circles have begun there to declare increasingly often that cooperation with the GDR should be developed such that it lead to the "reunification of Germany" on, of course, a capitalist basis. Responsible politicians in Bonn have begun to talk with representatives of avowedly revanchist organizations about the "legitimacy" of such imperial ambitions and the "invalidity" of the decisions adopted at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. Such pronouncements have met with the support of the most reactionary, militarist U.S. circles here, which aspire to prevent the development of detente trends in Europe.

Undoubtedly, constructive relations between the GDR and the FRG could make an important contribution to strengthening all-European cooperation and the interaction of states of the two systems in Europe. But this is possible only in the event of the nucleus of these relations, based on complete equality, being the problem of strengthening peace and averting the outbreak of a new war from German soil.

The revanchists, who have raised their heads in the FRG, are infringing the interests not only of the GDR and other socialist states but also of all European peoples since by their actions they are creating a threat to stability on the European continent. It is necessary to most emphatically rebuff the forces of militarism and revanchism and struggle for disarmament and the strengthening of East-West political dialogue and economic cooperation.

Candidate of Historical Sciences M.S. Ziborova (IMEMO) adduced specific data characterizing the military programs of the FRG. Having adopted a policy of building up their military potential, West German ruling circles have taken advantage of all existing opportunities for this--participation in NATO and cooperation with the United States, the integration processes in West Europe and their own scientific, technical and production resources. Currently the Bundeswehr is the bloc's strike force in Europe. The United States and the FRG are making the biggest contribution to the buildup of the West's aggregate military might. Both Washington and Bonn are resorting to the organization of propagandist antisocialist campaigns and dissemination of the "Soviet military threat" myth to justify their arms race policy to the public. Encouraged by other Western powers, Bonn's military preparations are inciting the development of hegemonist trends in FRG policy and undermining the foundations of peace in Europe.

(M. Mammukari), a participant in the Italian Resistance, noted that the abrupt intensification of anti-Sovietism and anticommunism in the policy of the United States and the leading NATO countries is contributing to the revival of revanchism and neofascism. Bourgeois propaganda, which is swelling the "Soviet military threat" myth, is influencing a considerable proportion of the population in West Europe, particularly in Italy. Particular significance is attached in this connection to work with the young people and their study and perception of the history and traditions of the Resistance.

Doctor of Historical Sciences B.M. Khalosha (IMEMO) revealed NATO's role as generator of the arms race and militarist trends in West Europe. A complex and ramified mechanism ensuring its participants' enlistment in the arms race on a long-term basis has been created and is operating within the bloc's framework. Militarist preparations of unprecedented scale are provided for by a 15-year program of military preparations adopted on the initiative of the United States under the cover of a propaganda racket concerning the "Soviet military threat" at the NATO Council session in Washington 30-31 May 1978. Such practice imparts increasingly great "inertial" force to the arms race process. In fact, winding or slowing down the implementation of such programs is a highly complex business. The West European countries participating in such programs are making considerably more difficult for themselves the possibility of a departure from the policy of continuous arms spiraling.

The change in the structure of the West European NATO members' military spending is an important feature. There has been a pronounced increase in the proportion of resources allocated for purchases of the latest arms systems and combat equipment. Thus, for example, of the \$80 billion spent by NATO's Eurogroup on military purposes in 1981, \$18.5 billion were earmarked for the acquisition of the latest arms models.

A particularly dangerous and extremely destabilizing channel of the nuclear arms race was opened by the deployment in a number of West European participants in the bloc of new American intermediate-range nuclear missiles. (A. Gottschalk) (Institute of Marxist Studies, FRG) pointed in his speech to the erroneousness of the assessments according to which allegedly solely under the latter's pressure is being pulled into a dangerous arms race and a policy of confrontation. The conventional arms race is bringing West German military concerns huge profits, and the deployment of American nuclear missiles is permitting Bonn to count on an increase in its influence in NATO.

Prof I.Ye. Gur'yev, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO, noted the truly scientific nature of the symposium, which made it possible to reveal a whole number of important facts and features and make a comprehensive and objective characterization of present-day militarism and revanchism. The present flareup of revanchism in the FRG is far from accidental. It is a phenomenon of the same order as "Falklands nationalism" in Great Britain and the swelling of chauvinism in the United States. All this serves to create an atmosphere in which aggression could be realized. Spurring international tension, present-day imperialism is conducting wide-ranging psychological indoctrination of the population in the West for the purpose of compelling it to perceive the ideas of the need to "roll back" and even "liquidate" socialism. Revanchism is being used for this also.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/9

MEMO SERIES ON CAPITALIST STATES: VOLUME ON ITALY

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 84 (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 134-136

[I. Levin review: "Modern Monopoly Capitalism"]

[Text] In the new work* of a group of leading Soviet specialists on Italy the main subject of study is the Italy of the critical period of the end of the 1960's through the start of the 1980's. In this time the country experienced the biggest upsurge of the mass workers movement in the history of the republic, an unparalleled shift in the alignment of political forces and two economic crises and entered a period of profound reorganization of the technical-organizational and territorial-sectorial structures of national production. In the analysis and evaluation of these changes the authors proceed not from the idea of the "Italian model of capitalism" (an approach always fraught with the risk of absolutization of national specifics) but from the idea of Italy as an organic component of world imperialism appreciably supplementing the panorama thereof with a number of characteristic features.

This research principle permeates the monograph, determining its very composition. The work in question is favorably distinguished from the preceding edition** by its opening special chapter on Italy's place in the modern world, which gives the reader a system of coordinates, as it were, making it possible to find and retain in the memory the country's significance in the sun total of world economic relations. Subsequently this "call" is successfully continued and developed by chapters on foreign economic and foreign policy relations (showing, inter alia, that the motives of Rome politicians' assertiveness in the processes of supranational integration have been dictated not only by the expansionism of the monopolies but also attempts "to stabilize the capitalist abutments on a broad foundation," which the Italian monopoly bourgeoisie lacks in its own country) (pp 374-375).

* "Italiya" [Italy], Ex. eds. Doctor of Economic Sciences N.P. Vasil'kov and Candidate of Historical Sciences K.G. Kholodkovskiy, Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Mysl'," 1983, p 413.

** See "Italiya (Ekonomika i politika stran sovremennogo kapitalizma)" [Italy (Economy and Policy of Present-Day Capitalist Countries)], Moscow, 1973.

Lacking the degree of monopoly maturity of British or, say, West German capitalism, Italy, as the book's material testifies convincingly, demonstrates a measure of development of state-monopoly structures and mechanisms not encountered in other Western countries. This feature, which makes it a kind of proving ground for a study of problems and trends of modern state-monopoly capitalism, justifies the allocation of the lion's share of the space in the monograph's "economic" chapters to an analysis of the forms, directions and means of influence of the state on economic life.

The statization of the economy in Italy is without parallel in the capitalist world not only in terms of scale (p 131) but also in terms of the diversity of forms and paths of the formation of the state sector and the methods of controlling it. It may be said that practically all types of nationalization known under capitalism have been tested here. Right up to the start of the 1970's the powerful sector of the statized economy, despite all its inherent shortcomings, demonstrated considerable dynamism and, at least in principle, combined flexibility of (state) control with negligible (state) outlays. In the situation of crisis, however, the condition of the state sector suffered a rapid deterioration, and its enterprises in terms of practically all indicators of economic activity moved to the end of the list of medium and large companies. The causes, as the study emphasizes, did not amount to merely to individual, albeit appreciable, mistakes in managerial decisions but also to the sharply increased burden of expenditure to save individual enterprises from bankruptcy. The very organizational-financial structure of the bulk of enterprises of the state sector (joint-stock companies with venture capital) proved vulnerable to the blows of the crisis, and control of them was gradually eroded by the "politicization, rather, Christian democratization" of this system (p 141).

There is also at the same time a deeper seam of causes explaining why the state sector became a factor of the stagnation of the national economy. These circumstances are examined in the section devoted to the dialectics of relations between the banks and industrial monopolies in the system of power of finance capital, which is entirely justified: it is precisely the banks, which undertake altogether approximately 80 percent of all credit-banking transactions in the country, which constitute the core of the state sector (p 81).

As a legacy from the times of the Great Depression of the 1930's with its catastrophic banking failures, a system of prohibitions on banks' acquisition of shares in enterprises' joint-stock capital remains. However, as of the end of the 1970's, the book rightly observes, the bulk of industrial companies and groups has again found itself strongly dependent on the major banks, which, "having extended to them enormous and uncleared credit, have virtually become the owners of a large part of big industrial capital" (p 89) It is probably worth adding to this important conclusion that while becoming the virtual owners of industry the banks (in practice major state banks) are not capable of influencing the courses of affairs at the enterprises other than by refusing credit.

Only in the given context evidently is it possible to correctly evaluate the struggle of the forces of the left, primarily the communists, for rationalization of the management of state enterprises, the extension of worker control and the introduction of democratic programming (pp 148-149). It is precisely such goals which have been put forward as a counterweight both to the neoliberal demand for a dismantling of the state sector and the tolerant attitude of the Christian Democratic Party (CD) (and, partly, of the socialists also) toward its arbitrary inflation.

The powerful mass workers movement showed itself in the 1970's to be a force capable of really influencing Italy's socioeconomic and political development. It is logically assigned the central place in the two chapters opening the second half of the book--on the evolution of the social structure of Italian society and the position and struggle of the working people. It is shown here that the processes of differentiation of the work force, which have accelerated precisely under the influence of the successes of the struggle of the proletariat, are leading to a considerable complication of the composition of the working class (particularly as a result of the preferential growth of its white collar faction and also heterogeneous marginal strata). This at times creates a certain social tension between individual detachments thereof and is reflected in the unity of its ranks (pp 214-217). The contradictoriness and complexity of the marginal strata, which "possess 'political potential,' while socially they do not form a homogeneous group," is rightly noted (p 226).

"A spirit of disputing the authorities... and the public initiative of individual professions, strata and groups of the population were manifested more strikingly in Italy in the 1970's than in other Western countries" (p 266) we read in Chapter IX (on the alignment of class-political forces and the political struggle). It performs in the monograph the role of bridge or link combining the empirically ascertained prerequisites of political action with its end result. The rapid politicization of the masses (the peak of which coincided not fortuitously with the peak of the electorate's move to the left) was a consequence of a whole number of factors, including secularization of the consciousness, the growth of the population's degree of information, the awakening of women to active social life and so forth. But its stimulus primarily was the "tremendous growth of the social assertiveness of the masses," which was manifested most graphically in the far-reaching strikes and other militant protests of the working people on the even and at the outset of the 1970's (ibid.).

At the same time it was precisely the scale and intensity of this struggle (which, we recall, grew originally out of the working people's acute dissatisfaction with the immediate economic and social conditions of existence) which made particularly pertinent the problem of "the correlation of material and nonmaterial requirements in the motivations of the oppositional and anticapitalist sentiments of the masses" and created "a threat of the actual divorce of the struggle for satisfaction of material requirements from the movement for democratic and socialist transformations" (p 269). Tracing the complexity and contradictoriness of the processes developing in the mass consciousness, the authors offer a convincing theoretical interpretation also

of the complex shifts in the alignment of political forces which occurred at the end of the 1970's, particularly the drift of part of the electorate from the communists to other parties which followed the PCI's unprecedented success in the 1975-1976 elections. In addition, the forecast of continued instability and the great probability of regular electoral shifts made on the basis of this analysis (p 274) was completely justified in the summer of 1984, when for the first time the PCI "overtook" the CD in terms of the number of votes received.

An ability to forecast, incidentally, is inherent in other sections of this chapter also (and in the book as a whole), of which one is easily persuaded if one turns, for example, to the analysis of such an ominous--and far from only Italian--phenomenon as political extremism and terrorism (pp 320-339). At the same time this analysis could, it would seem, have been even more fruitful had it been based on a more discursive investigation of the processes and factors of differentiation of the social structure of Italian society. This is discussed in the corresponding chapters, but manifestly insufficiently considering the scale and significance which the said processes have acquired.

Particularly unfortunate in this respect is the "hidden economy," as the zone of operations concealed from statistical accounting, administrative and trade union control and, frequently, from taxation is called in Italy. The significance of this sector is determined not only by its dimensions (from one-tenth to almost one-third of the GNP was, according to different estimates, being produced here at the end of the last decade) but also by the fact that the "hidden" economy has played the part of an important means of mobilizing the resources of Italian capitalism and intensifying the exploitation of the working class under conditions where many other paths to this goal could not have been used.

The work adduces information on the increased significance of the "informal" economy, as, in general, on the increased importance of medium-small enterprises and the processes of decentralization of production and expansion of the sphere of unregistered employment (pp 17, 28, 213, 216-217, 219-220, 224-227). However, these more or less fragmentary mentions of a "backstage" economy and its attendant phenomena can hardly be taken for the discursive investigation which the reader had a right to expect from the research group. Furthermore, Italy truly affords the broadest opportunities for study of this distinctive and, as is now clear, not only Italian symbiosis of the new with the traditional, the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution with the seemingly outmoded technical-organizational production structures and big business with enterprises of the semi-handicrafts type.

In combination with the reorganization of the technological basis of production which has developed the comminution of the large-scale enterprises, the expansion of the "hidden" economy and other processes stimulating differentiation of the work force appear--in accordance with K. Marx's thought--as "the combat weapons of capital against the workers' indignation."*

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," Vol 23, p 446.

However, the Italian workers movement far from immediately grasped the class meaning of the reorganization processes which were developing. Virtually through the end of the 1970's production decentralization and the "hidden" economy were being interpreted by the trade union and communist press exclusively as a manifestation of the recession and crisis and of the ruling class' incapacity for controlling the economy. This view of matters, as PCI leaders later acknowledged, complicated comprehension of the nature of the crisis and contributed to the advancement of incorrect aims.

Unfortunately, the reader may perceive an adherence to such views when the authors, for example, without any critical reservations, refer to the data of official statistics concerning the extraordinarily low proportion of the active population in Italy in the 1970's (pp 24-25, 209-210, 22). Yet results of research were made public in the middle of the decade which showed that considering the masses covered by "atypical" types of employment in the "informal" economy sphere, the percentage of the active population in the country was no lower than in other industrially developed capitalist states. In 1977 the National Statistics Institute was forced to introduce new, more differentiated criteria of consideration of the self-employed population.

As a whole, however, the portrait of Italy "at the turning point" is undoubtedly a true one and reveals to the sight not only the close and superficial but also the deep-lying, essential aspects of the problems of the crisis and the reorganization of present-day capitalism under the conditions of a specific country. Soviet Italian studies and, indeed, more widely--our social science engaged in the study of state-monopoly capitalism--have been reinforced by a valuable new study.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/9

BOOK ON LATIN AMERICAN IDEOLOGIES REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 84 (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 137-139

[I. Zorina review: "At the Precipice of Ideological Confrontation"]

[Text] In the complex spectrum of ideological-political currents of the modern world increasingly great importance is attached to the social thought of the developing countries. A serious attempt to outline the basic parameters of the ideological struggle and classify the most important ideological currents in Latin America has been made by the group of authors of the monograph in question.*

Prescribing the key of the whole book, its executive editor examines in the first chapter ideological development in the countries of the region against the background of the sociopolitical struggle, which, he believes, has passed through a number of basic stages in the past 20-25 years. Although their periodization proposed by the author fails, in our view, to absorb the entire diversity of contradictory processes, it focuses the reader's attention on the complex, variously-directed, intermittent nature of Latin American political development, which has included reformist evolution, acute clashes of "revolutionary and counterrevolutionary alternatives" (p 5) and, finally, the development as of the latter half of the 1970's of revolutionary, democratic processes, which have caused a new stimulation of the ideological struggle on questions of democracy and social progress.

It is not fortuitous, therefore, that so complex and diverse a palette of ideological currents in the region has been organized by the authors in a kind of line in which the location of each is determined primarily by its socio-class content. On the extreme right flank are the rightwing-authoritarian, corporativist and elitist-technocratic theories (the chapter's authors are N.S. Konovalova, Ya.G. Shemyakin, E.Ye. Kuznetsova and A.F. Shul'govskiy).

* "Sovremennyye ideologicheskiye techeniya v Latinskoy Amerike" [Modern Ideological Currents in Latin America], Ex. ed. A.F. Shul'govskiy, Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka," 1983, p 352. The book continues the series of works by this group devoted to ideological-political problems of the region. See "Revolutionary Processes in Latin America," Moscow, 1974; "Nationalism in Latin America: Political and Ideological Currents," Moscow, 1976; and "The Political System of Latin American Society," Moscow, 1982.

Then come the concepts of the "neocapitalist modernization" of social relations (E.Ye. Kuznetsova), the theory and practice of social democracy in Latin America (E.S. Dabagyan) and the ideology of the modern Christian movement (V.P. Andronova). This ideological line is closed on the left by the concepts of Latin American revolutionary democracy (A.F. Korovin) and left radicalism (D.S. Poskonina). A particular place is occupied by the "distinctive development" theories (T.V. Goncharova and A.K. Stetsenko).

The views and theories which are current in the region are examined, as a rule, on the basis of material of individual countries or political parties, currents and organizations. The main attention here is sometimes paid not so much to a theoretical analysis as a description of the social purveyors of this concept or the other, its application in sociopolitical practice and the ideological classification of this party or the other.

Characterizing the "intellectual arsenal" of the authoritarian-fascist regimes, the authors addressed the process of the "integration" of traditional and modern forms of right-extremist ideology (integrism, Hispanism, falangism, corporativism, elitist-technocratic schools and others). Having shown the strikingly expressed official functions of the latter, which is oriented toward the modernization of capitalism in a number of countries of the continent in the direction of structures of the state-monopoly type and the socially polarizing model, they then also reveal the strengthening reverse process--the "disintegration" of rightwing-authoritarian ideology.

The growth of the state-monopoly trends in the Latin American countries most "advanced" along the capitalist path and the expansion of the socioeconomic functions of the state predetermined in the 1970's and at the start of the 1980's ruling circles' higher-than-usual interest in the concepts and practice of the neocapitalist modernization of social relations. A special chapter of the monograph is devoted to these questions which comprehensively describes the practice of social maneuvering with the use basically of the theories of "social partnership," "participation" and other such ideas borrowed from industrially developed capitalist countries.

Social democratic theories and concepts, which became widespread in many countries of the region in the 1970's, contributed, the authors believe, to the consolidation of the reformist, including nationalist and populist, parties. Analyzing this national variant or the other of the "democratic socialism" concept, they show its similarity to the ideas of European social democracy concerning a "third" way for the developing countries and also in respect of a number of other key present-day problems. A definite contradiction is contained in the ideological platform of the Latin American social democrats, who claim on the one hand that their continent is an inalienable part of the West and, on the other, that it is they who "reflect the specific features of Latin America to the greatest extent" (p 207). In our view, the book fails to show the contradiction sufficiently fully, while the interpretation of the Latin American version of social democratism, on the other hand, is too broad. The mobile, but important distinction between social democratic ideology proper, albeit modified in a specific social environment, and national reformism is effaced given this approach.

Against the background of the so-called renewal process in the Latin American church the work examines the present-day singularities of differentiation in the milieu of the followers of Christianity. The analysis of the left-radical school of Catholic and Protestant thought--"liberation theology"--which became widespread in the 1970's not only in the countries of this region, evokes the greatest interest.

The devotees of this new ideological school, which by no means represents "a finished, integral theory" (p 248), advocate not simply the integration of the church in the process of social development but, interpreting the very nature thereof from progressive standpoints and recognizing the possibility of and need for the participation of the people's masses therein, aspire to formulate a common strategy of the liberation struggle of the Latin American peoples and the whole developing world. The singularity of "liberation theology"--the turning of many of its supporters--politically--to Marxism (p 249)--is qualitatively new. It is a pity, however, that the differing levels of the narrative prevented the researcher from concentrating on a content analysis of the new theological concepts themselves, which are already performing a role and which, it may be assumed, will have to perform an even bigger role in the ideological and political struggle.

The "distinctive development" theories, which have become widespread in Latin America in recent years, are not formally connected in the work with the "alternative development" concepts, which are becoming increasingly popular. However, in tracing their evolution from a historical angle the authors do not forget to include them in the "complex and contradictory world-outlook quest which has in the latter half of our century been determining the intellectual life of the majority of developing countries" (p 312). These ideological constructions have always had this outlet or the other in sociopolitical practice. And although they have not in any Latin American country assumed such a consummate and odious manifestation as in, say, Iran, nonetheless, here also "they have objectively played," according to the authors, "a negative part in the development of the revolutionary movement," despite their anti-imperialist and even anticapitalist thrust (p 315). In the last two decades these concepts have assumed a continental nature, and their content has been broadened to the point of substantiation of the "special way" of the region as a whole. Unfortunately, the authors are let down here by undue laconic brevity, and the attempts to inscribe the Latin American version of "distinctive development" in the social and theoretical thought of the developing world would not appear to be entirely successful.

Study of the problems of the national-cultural distinctiveness of Latin American countries (by no means signifying their autarky) and also the specific features of the development here of capitalism under the conditions of dependence (which also does not preclude effects of general world-historical laws of development) lent impetus to the birth in local soil of the "dependence theory". Thus an influential left-radical current of social and political thought evolved in the 1960's-1970's represented by an entire pleiad of bright sociologists, economists and political scientists. The book rightly notes that these theories, using modeling methods and structuralism as the methodological basis in their interdisciplinary studies, "having analyzed the complex of structures of the underdeveloped countries, attempted essentially

for the first time to formulate the regularities of their development, which they termed dependent development" (p 293). These ideological concepts took shape in the process of the mutual influence of various sociological, political, economic and philosophical teachings of the West and, although were of predominantly basically Latin American material, became widespread in other developing countries also. The turning, albeit frequently contradictory and eclectic, of Latin American theorists to the scientific categories of Marxism-Leninism contributed to this to a considerable extent. It has, however, to be noted that there are inaccuracies in the exposition of the genesis and evolution of "dependence theory," and there are objections to some propositions (the assertion, for example, that the "domestic colonialism" theory is merely the other side of bourgeois-reformist concepts) (p 281). As a whole, however, we undoubtedly have before us a serious attempt at a critical analysis of a most interesting direction of the social thought of the region.

Summing up, we would emphasize: the reader has acquired the first comprehensive study in national scientific literature of the basic ideological currents in contemporary Latin America, a characteristic feature of which is party-minded-journalistic pointedness. Naturally, in tackling the difficult task the group of authors has not been equally successful in everything. One perceives in the work a certain fragmentariness and mixture of styles. In some instances theoretical analysis has been superseded by a recounting of the political statements of individual leaders or quotations from documents (this, particularly, is the defect of the examination of the revolutionary democracy concepts). Uniform criteria are lacking in the definition of various ideological schools, and for this reason the spheres of the "docking" and interweaving between them are traced even more inadequately. The interconnection of various concepts and theories has not been properly reflected (although their "interchange" is traced in certain chapters), and without this it is difficult to recreate an integral picture of the state and development of the social thought of the region and its impact on ideological-theoretical studies in the developing countries as a whole. The main thing is that the book will assist a better understanding of the complex ideological-political struggle which is unfolding in our day in countries of the Latin America region and, it is to be hoped, will serve as the point of departure for extended research in an important field.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/9

TWO BOOKS ON CEMA-WESTERN TRADE REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 84 (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 139-140

[Ye. Yakovleva review: "Cooperation Is Essential"]

[Text] Economic relations between the socialist and capitalist countries have become an inalienable part of the world economy. They have played and continue to play a pronounced part in the reproduction process occurring within the framework of the world systems and the economy of individual countries. It is difficult to imagine modern international relations without them. And although through the fault of the United States and other imperialist powers the political situation in the world deteriorated sharply on the eve and at the outset of the 1980's, the economic cooperation of states of different socioeconomic systems continues. It is developing more slowly than in the detente period, it is true.

The books in question* are interesting in that they collate the experience of East-West economic relations in the 1960's-1970's, examine their present state and long-term political and economic factors and evaluate the long term.

The problems outlined in both works are analyzed on two levels: the regional-country level--the relations of the USSR and the European socialist countries with the United States, the EEC, European neutral countries and Japan; and the sectorial level--relations in the fuel-energy sphere, machinery and equipment production and the scientific-technical and credit-finance spheres and in the solution of global problems. An important aspect of the analysis are the possibilities of various forms of economic cooperation: agreements on a compensation basis, industrial joint labor, scientific-technical collaboration, joint enterprises and trilateral joint labor.

Particular mention needs to be made of the fact that in both works the development of East-West economic relations is linked with the process of socialist economic integration. The big successes of the fraternal countries in the sphere of specialization and cooperation, scientific-technical mutual

* I. "Ekonomicheskiye otnosheniya stran SEV s Zapadom (Strategiya, dolgosrochnnyye interesy, perspektivy)" [The CEMA Countries' Economic Relations With the West (Strategy, Long-Term Interests, Prospects)], Ex. ed. N.P. Shmelev, Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka," 1983, p 229.

II. L.A. Rodina, "Sotsialisticheskaya integratsiya i novyye formy sotrudnichestva Vostok-Zapad" [Socialist Integration and New Forms of East-West Cooperation], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka," 1983, p 157.

relations and multilateral forms of cooperation are creating the ground for more active relations with the West, including here the inclusion of capitalist firms in various projects being implemented in the course of socialist economic integration. The development of East-West economic relations frequently makes it possible to implement joint projects of the socialist states on a higher level. At the same time certain negative features which could in the future (if the appropriate measures are not adopted) serve as an impediment to socialist integration have also been revealed in recent years in the course of cooperation with the West. It is to the authors' credit that they raise these problems quite pointedly in their works and show the possible ways of solving them.

The works in question lead to an important conclusion: even under the conditions of the exacerbation of the political situation in the world East-West economic relations should not be wound down for economic cooperation between states of the two systems has been and remains the basis of their peaceful coexistence. It stands to reason that a most important condition of such cooperation is the abandonment of the policy being pursued by the West of discrimination against the socialist countries in business relations and the securing of a favorable political climate for their continued development.

Both books examine comprehensively the stages of the formation of the foreign economic policy of the United States and other capitalist countries in respect of the CEMA countries. Specific material showing the growth of the scale and forms of discrimination against the socialist countries on the part of the West has been scrupulously researched. Under these conditions, as the authors rightly note, the fraternal countries are faced with the task of a further improvement of the economic mechanisms of the control of foreign economic relations and the fuller coordination of their foreign economic policy with respect to the West.

The books undoubtedly provide an idea of the present state, problems and prospects of economic relations between the socialist and capitalist countries. I would like, however, to express certain wishes.

We would like to note first of all that the development of these relations cannot, in our view, be studied without regard for the economic cooperation of the socialist and developing countries. In the works in question, however, this issue is illustrated mainly in respect of trilateral industrial cooperation (II, pp 88-102), which is manifestly inadequate.

In speaking of the West European states' economic relations with the CEMA countries the authors confine themselves merely to four EEC members (France, the FRG, Italy and Great Britain). The six others remain outside of the framework of the analysis, which obviously does not afford the reader a chance to compose a complete picture.

The somewhat careless handling of figures is puzzling: in a number of instances identical phenomena for an adduced date are determined in different figures. This applies, in particular, to the data concerning the number of national and joint companies with the participation of socialist countries in the West (I, pp 91, 124, 160) and the number of East-West joint-labor agreements (I, pp 60, 124).

As a whole the books in question could be useful both for economists and people interested in the state of East-West economic relations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/9

U.S. BOOK HITS 'ARTIFICIAL OBSTACLES' TO U.S.-SOVIET TRADE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 84 (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 141-142

[Ye. Prokudin review: "Failure of the Policy of Pressure and Discrimination"]

[Text] Washington's officials' policy pursued in recent years of an exacerbation of relations with the Soviet Union has also been negatively reflected in trade between the two countries, which has been cut back and is experiencing stagnation. The use of economic "sanctions" as a means of political pressure on the USSR and attempts to confine trade relations to an artificial framework and revive an atmosphere of mistrust in business circles are being projected by the R. Reagan administration onto trade-economic relations between states with different sociopolitical systems. The appearance in the United States of the book "Common Sense in U.S.-Soviet Trade,"* which was prepared by the American Committee on East-West Accord, merits attention in this situation.

The collection in question, which is the second, revised edition (the first came out in 1979), includes 15 articles written by prominent American businessmen and well-known representatives of the academic world who are well acquainted with the subject under discussion. It is an attempt to analyze the realities of American-Soviet trade, particularly of the past 4 years, and without claiming to reconcile the various views which exist in this sphere in the United States, to present to Congress and the administration recommendations in the plane of elaboration of an appropriate policy for the future.

Examining these realities, R. Schmidt, president of the above-mentioned committee and vice president of Control Data, notes in the preface that, first, the absence of business relations between the two countries affords no benefits and, second, peace cannot be guaranteed merely with trade alone (p 2). It is indicative that the authors of the collection, soberly evaluating the strategic correlation of forces, are of the unanimous opinion that there is no sense in a deterioration of relations with the USSR by way of the pursuit of a "punitive" trade policy, which is ineffective from the viewpoint of the set goals and economically self-destructive.

* "Common Sense in U.S.-Soviet Trade," ed. by M. Chapman and C. Marcy, American Committee on East-West Accord, Washington, 1983, p 173.

The extensive scope of the problems in question is characteristic of the said work. The American specialists analyze the benefits and anticipated "dangers" for the United States of trade with the USSR and criticize a number of the illusions prevailing in government circles and connected therewith, particularly those forming the basis of "sanctions" policy. They attempt to determine the impact of trade with the West on the Soviet economy and examine practical impediments in specific spheres of trade exchange (technology transfers, the trade in grain, chemical goods, machine-tool products and others) and, what is of considerable importance, suggest ways of removing them.

The collection also includes extracts from a CIA report on the problems and prospects of the growth of the Soviet economy and conclusions from the study of the prospects for East-West trade in the 1980's prepared for the Trilateral Commission in 1982. There is also an article by former U.S. President R. Nixon here, which contains his arguments concerning the use of American economic might in relations with the USSR.

Speaking of the conditions for the development of trade with the USSR in the future, M. Forrestal, former president of the American-Soviet Trade-Economic Council, and its current president, G. Giffen, rightly observe that an improvement in political relations between the two countries should serve as a necessary precondition of its growth. However, the prospects of such an improvement are currently, they believe, not very promising. Even were this to be the case directly in the trade sphere, the authors believe, it would be essential to solve three groups of problems, to which pertain: removal of or a change in the discriminatory trade-credit legislation and also export-control legislation which is in effect in the United States; the adoption of measures to improve the exchange of information and business contacts; and guaranteed access to official credit and the American loan capital market. Concerning the latter condition, the opinion is expressed that "private sources of financing could cater for a bilateral trade volume of, probably, no more than \$10-15 billion" (p 17).

The experience of recent years has evoked in the United States criticism on many levels of Washington's use of economic "sanctions" to achieve political goals in respect of the USSR. Convincing refutation of the confusion and illusions on this score on the basis of the examples of the failures of the "grain embargo" and the "sanctions" against the Urengoy-Uzhgorod export gas pipeline and also practical recommendations for the future are a leading theme of the collection.

The most complete set of arguments attesting the futility of economic pressure on the Soviet Union is adduced in the article by Prof F. (Nil), executive vice president of the committee. He attempts to find an explanation why, despite the obvious and repeated failures, U.S. ruling circles have not yet abandoned the policy of economic "sanctions" in respect of the USSR. The professor rightly sees the reasons for this in the messianic zeal to "transform" other societies containing the illusion of American omnipotence and in a distorted idea of the USSR's economic potential which is profoundly rooted in the minds of certain circles in the United States (p 139).

K. Brookings, president of the World Perspectives publishing firm, also criticizes from similar positions the variety of prohibitions and restrictions on trade with the USSR which have been imposed by the United States in recent years. The author considers a manifest delusion the widespread opinion that in the detente period a "naive" United States, consenting to an expansion of trade, was allegedly "easily deceived by the USSR since it obtained little in exchange" (p 154).

In reality, in this period the Soviet Union was granted neither most-favored-nation status in trade, which is generally accepted in international practice, nor broad access to official credit, despite the trade agreement which had been signed in 1972. Agricultural export controls and restrictions on the sale of "strategic" commodities were maintained.

The author also repudiates the assertion concerning the USSR's alleged interest in obtaining from the West exclusively high-technology commodities. According to recent data of the U.S. Commerce Department, the proportion of this group of products constitutes little more than 10 percent of total Soviet imports from industrially developed capitalist countries, and, as a whole, there is no reason to believe that in the past 20 years the process of strengthening the USSR's economic and defense potential has been realized in more or less essential dependence on the alleged "generous flow of technology from the West" (p 158).

The article of M. Goldman, professor of economics and director of Harvard University's Russian Research Center, attracts attention. Proceeding from the fact that the Soviet economy, despite all its problems, is continuing to develop on its own basis and that the United States is no longer in a position to turn back the expansion of East-West economic cooperation, the professor reasonably proposes that the U.S. Administration adapt to these processes (p 57).

G. Kaiser, president of Kaiser Research, touches on a comparatively little-known aspect of Soviet-American trade--"reverse technology transfers". He attempts to change the idea rooted in the United States of some "backwardness" of Soviet technology and the USSR's "acute need" allegedly emanating therefrom to obtain technical innovations and scientific knowledge from across the Atlantic.

A group of articles by well-known representatives of business circles, the majority of which has long been participating in trade between the United States and the USSR and is persuaded of its mutual profitability, may provisionally be distinguished in the collection. Their authors include D. Kendall, president of Pepsico and former first American cochairman of the American-Soviet Trade-Economic Council, (S. Chilevich), president of (Chilevich) Corporation, W. Norris, chairman of the board of directors of Control Data, and G. Gray, president of the U.S. National Machine-Tool Manufacturers Association.

They all believe that in the economic plane trade with the USSR is profitable for the United States inasmuch as it contributes to the creation of additional jobs, an improvement in the balance of payments and a strengthening of the

dollar. The business world's interest therein objectively increases in line with the weakening of the United States' foreign trade positions, the unstable development of the country's economy and increased dependence on exports. The positive significance of trade on a strengthening of mutual understanding between the two biggest world powers is also of considerable importance, they believe.

It is indicative that the majority of authors of the book expresses a positive attitude toward the development of trade with the USSR and advocates the removal of the artificial obstacles in the way thereof erected by the American side.

At the same time a number of articles and material in the work in question still reflect, unfortunately, the continuing transatlantic illusions concerning the possibility of achieving by way of trade unseemly political goals in respect of the USSR. The appeal to common sense carried in the collection's title is evidence of the need to overcome these delusions and switch to an understanding of the fact that the principles of equality and mutual benefit should serve as the sole possible basis for the development of Soviet-American trade.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/9

INDEX TO ARTICLES FOR 1984

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 84 (signed to press 15 Nov 84) pp 150-157

[Text]

Issue

Bulletin on CPSU Central Committee Plenum

Speech of Comrade K.U. Chernenko, General Secretary of the
CPSU Central Committee

Speech of Comrade N.A. Tikhonov, Member of the CPSU Central
Committee Politburo and Chairman of the USSR Council of
Ministers

Speech of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, Member of the CPSU Central
Committee Politburo and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko

Appeal of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet
Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers to the Communist
Party and the Soviet People..... 3

REAL SOCIALISM AND WORLD DEVELOPMENT. SOCIALIST INTERNATIONALISM IN ACTION

The Top-Level CEMA Economic Conference

Statement on the Basic Directions of the Continued Development and
Deepening of the CEMA Members' Economic and Scientific-Technical
Cooperation..... 8

CEMA Declaration 'The Preservation of Peace and International
Economic Cooperation'

"On the Path of Magnificent Accomplishments (Results of the
Top-Level CEMA Economic Conference)"..... 9

"By a Policy of Communist Creation and Peace".....	6
N. Kapchenko, "Lofty Mission of Soviet Foreign Policy".....	12
Yu. Belyayev, "Production Potential of the Socialist Countries and Certain Ways of its Efficient Use".....	11
V. Grebennikov, "Bulgaria--Ways of Building Developed Socialism".....	10
A. Ivanov, "People's Poland--40 Years".....	9
G. Kirillov, "The GDR--35 Years".....	11
P. Navrozov, Ye. Plotnikov, "Soviet-Vietnamese Friendship--Factor of Peace and Creation".....	1
B. Poklad, "Romania: 40 Years Along the Socialist Path".....	9
V. Razmerov, "Viable Alternative".....	9
A. Taksabayev, "Mongolia's Socialist Path".....	12
MATERIAL TO ASSIST STUDENTS IN THE PARTY-POLITICAL TRAINING SYSTEM	
"Europe in the World Politics of the 1980's".....	2
V. Zagladin, "The Current International Crisis in the Light of Lenin's Teaching".....	4
A. Yakovlev, "Cancer of Imperial Ambitions in the Nuclear Age".....	1
O. Bykov, "Lenin's Peace Policy and its Embodiment in the Activity of the CPSU".....	3
N. Kapchenko, "Lofty Mission of Soviet Foreign Policy".....	12
K. Brutents, "The Nonaligned Movement in the Modern World".....	5
G. Vorontsov, "The United States, NATO and the Euromissiles".....	11
E. Kuz'min, "True Values and False Ideals".....	4
Yu. Tomilin, "Against the Threat of Nuclear War, for Peace on Earth (Results of the UN General Assembly 38th Session)".....	2
V. Davydov, "Rules of Behavior of the Nuclear Powers".....	12
V. Falin, "Front on Two Fronts".....	7
A. Vtorov, "From Helsinki to Stockholm".....	8

V. Shemyatenkov, "Cold War of Detente: Dilemma of U.S. Foreign Policy"	5
Yu. Mel'nikov, "Peaceful Coexistence and the Struggle for the Right to Life".....	11
A. Arbatov, "Military-Strategic Balance and the Policy of the Reagan Administration".....	10
N. Vasetskiy, "In Alliance With Reaction".....	7
V. Granov, "The Greens: Ideology and Reality".....	12
S. Storchak, "Exacerbation of the Developing Countries' Debt Problem--Causes and Consequences".....	10

ECONOMICS OF MONOPOLY CAPITALISM

General Problems

A. Manukovskiy, "Certain Aspects of the Structural Crises in the Economy of Capitalism".....	2
A. Mileykovskiy, "Bourgeois Political Economy and Problems of Economic Policy at the Current Stage".....	6
Ya. Pevzner, "New Features of Monopoly Enterprise".....	4
H. Okumura, "Employer Groups in Japan".....	4
S. Nikitin, "'Reaganomics' and Stagflation".....	5
D. Smyslov, "Interstate Regulation in the West--Concept and Mechanism".	7
Ye. Khesin, V. Studentsov, "Britain: From Keynesianism to Monetarism".....	6
P. Vostrikov, "The Neoconservative Economic Theory and Practice of 'Reaganomics'".....	11
I. Nerushenko, "Contradictions of Anti-Inflation Policy at the Frontier of the 1980's".....	10
V. Khablyuk, "On the Question of the Classification of Economic Crises and the Periodization of Postwar Cycles".....	12
A. Grigor'yev, "The Increased Role of Secondary Resources in the Economy of Capitalist Countries".....	1
S. Aukutsionek, "Singularities of the Overaccumulation of Capital in the United States (Economic Cycles of the 1970's-Start of the 1980's)".....	10

S. Baskakova, "The State Sector in Japan's Economy".....	9
A. Borodayevskiy, "Trends of Canada's State-Monopoly Development".....	7
L. Demidova, V. Usoskin, I. Sheyman, "The U.S. Services Sphere-- Contradictory Development Trends".....	2
O. Kazakova, "The Scandinavian 'Industrial Niche' Concept".....	6
V. Presnyakov, "France's Export Policy".....	7
R. Simonyan, "British Scholar's Realistic Contribution".....	5
S. Woolcock, "East-West Trade After Williamsburg--Problem Posed, but Not Resolved".....	5
S. Ul'yanichev, "The Japanese Government's Economic Program".....	5
V. Fedorov, "Concern for the Future".....	7
I. Tselishchev, "Administrative-Financial Reform--the Japanese Version of Neoconservatism".....	11
I. Tselishchev, "Japan's Domestic Trade".....	2
"The Capitalist Economy in 1983 (Survey of Conditions)".....	3
A. Belorусov, "Japan's Ferrous Metallurgy".....	1
K. Borisova, "Protracted Difficulties of the EEC's Auto Industry".....	1
V. Volobuyev, "The 'Laffer Curve'--Concept and Political Realities".....	11
L. Zonova, V. Chernyavina, "State Regulation of the Developed Capitalist Countries' Foreign Trade".....	12
M. Stepanov, "Singularities of the Monopolization Process in U.S. Engineering".....	10
S. Chebanov, "State-Monopoly Regulation of the Developed Capitalist Countries' Foreign Trade".....	12
Yu. Shamray, "The FRG's Energy Policy".....	2
Interimperialist Contradictions	
Yu. Stolyarov, Ye. Khesin, "The Three Power Centers in the Economy of Contemporary Capitalism".....	1
T. Kosyreva, "The Disagreements Are Growing".....	4
N. Krichigina, "West Europe in the Technology Race".....	1
Yu. Osipov, "Japanese-American Rivalry on the Markets of Science- Intensive Products".....	7

D. Smyslov, "The 'Political Show' in London.....	9
O. Shenayev, "Interimperialist Rivalry in the Banking Sphere".....	6
A. Tsimaylov, "Currency Interventions and Currency Exchange Rates".....	1
Internationalization of Capital. Currency-Finance Questions	
I. Korolev, "The World Credit Crisis".....	9
N. Petrov, "Methodology of Study of Problems of the Internationalization of Production and Capital".....	5
Yu. Yudanov, "Export of Capital From West Europe".....	2
M. Gel'vanovskiy, "World Prices Under the Conditions of the Crisis of Capitalism of the Start of the 1980's".....	3
S. Gorbunov, N. Shmelev, "New Trends in the Sphere of International Capitalist Credit".....	11
V. Acharkan, "Currency Exchange Rates--Formation Mechanism and Interimperialist Contradictions".....	9
N. Gnatovskaya, "British Overseas Capital".....	5
B. Rubtsov, "Australia's Finance Capital".....	7
G. Vlasov, "International Activity of French Banks".....	9
S. Pyatenko, "The Federal Reserve System and Regulation of the Loan Capital Market in the United States".....	11
A. Tsimaylo, "Currency Interventions and Currency Exchange Rates".....	1
Capitalist Monopolies. Expansion of the Transnational Corporations [TNC]	
S. Medvedkov, "The TNC and the Exacerbation of the Contradictions of Capitalism".....	8
A. Astapovich, "Singularities of the Current Expansion of the TNC".....	12
A. Yudanov, "International Monopolies at the Time of Crises".....	6
A. Kollontay, "Paths of the Formation of Japanese TNC".....	12
A. Bereznoy, "TNC in the Economy of the Developing World".....	4
V. Lapshin, "West German Companies Under the Blows of the Crisis".....	11

V. Sorokina, "Marketing Practice of the West European Monopolies".....	9
V. Kashin, "Banking Monopolies' Offshore Business".....	3
Contradictions of Scientific-Technical Progress Under Capitalism and the Deepening of Social Antagonisms	
I. Ivanov, "Socioeconomic Consequences of the Mass Application of Microelectronics".....	6
V. Lyubimova, "Certain Forms of the Employment of Manpower in Capitalist Countries".....	3
V. Martsinkevich, "The Process of the Scientific Saturation of Capitalist Production".....	5
Yu. Nikulichev, "Blind Alleys of the 'Information Society'".....	4
S. Peregudov, "The Bourgeoisie's Tactics Under the Conditions of the Deepening of the General Crisis of Capitalism".....	10
A. El'yanov, "Microelectronics, the Developing Countries and the International Division of Labor".....	5
Yu. Savinov, Yu. Shcherbina, "Production and the Use of Industrial Robots".....	8

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND FOREIGN POLICY

"Europe in the World Politics of the 1980's".....	2
"Role of the United Nations in the Modern World and Ways of Increasing its Effectiveness (MEMO Roundtable)".....	6
V. Zagladin, "The Current International Crisis in the Light of Lenin's Teaching".....	4
A. Yakovlev, "The Cancer of Imperial Ambitions in the Nuclear Age".....	1
O. Bykov, "Lenin's Peace Policy and its Embodiment in the Activity of the CPSU".....	3
N. Kapchenko, "Lofty Mission of Soviet Foreign Policy".....	12
V. Kortunov, "'Limited Nuclear War'--Strategy of Global Suicide".....	4
V. Petrovskiy, "System of Security Guarantees of States in the Modern World".....	7

Yu. Tomilin, "Against the Threat of Nuclear War, for Peace on Earth (Results of the UN General Assembly 38th Session)".....	2
V. Davydov, "Rules of Behavior of the Nuclear Powers".....	12
G. Vorontsov, "The United States, NATO and Euromissiles".....	11
G. Vorontsov, "Nuclear-Free Zones--Way to Peace and Disarmament".....	8
A. Vtorov, "From Helsinki to Stockholm".....	8
V. Shemyatenkov, "Cold War or Detente: Dilemma of U.S. Foreign Policy"	5
V. Razmerov, "Viable Alternative".....	9
Yu. Mel'nikov, "Peaceful Coexistence and the Struggle for the Right to Life".....	11
A. Arbatov, "Military-Strategic Balance and the Policy of the Reagan Administration".....	10
S. Stashevskiy, "Preventing the Militarization of Space".....	1
V. Dal'nev, "Tilt in a Dangerous Direction".....	8
V. Baranovskiy, "NATO and the EEC in the Policy of Imperialism".....	6
V. Davydov, "A Nuclear-Free Europe--From the Idea to the Reality".....	3
V. Makarevskiy, "The Conventional Arms Race and Problems of Limiting Them".....	5
S. Karaganov, "The Adventurism of U.S. Military Strategy".....	3
K. Zuyeva, "Soviet-French Cooperation in Time of War and Time of Peace".....	12
L. Istyagin, "A Dangerous 'Big Brother'".....	10
O. Kovtunovich, V. Nosenko, "The Near East--Power Politics of Imperialism in Action".....	4
A. Markov, "Japan and South Korea in the Plans of American Imperialism"	10
M. Isayev, "The ASEAN Countries and Problems of Peace and Stability in Southeast Asia".....	3
I. Bulychev, "The Contadora Group and the Search for Paths Toward Peace in Central America".....	2
V. Fedorov, "Following Washington's Lead".....	1

V. Avakov, I. Aleksandrov, E. Borodulin, V. Vladimirov, Ye. Volkova, K. Nikolayev, "Current Problems of World Politics (International Survey)".....	1, 4, 7, 10
---	-------------

IDEOLOGICAL CONFRONTATION IN THE MODERN WORLD. CRITIQUE OF BOURGEOIS AND PETTY BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY

A. Mileykovskiy, "Bourgeois Political Economy and Problems of Economic Policy at the Current Stage".....	6
Yu. Krasin, "Correlation of Ideology and Policy in the Revolutionary Movement".....	5
E. Kuz'min, "True Values and False Ideals".....	4
E. Arab-Ogly, "Raymond Aron in the Mirror and 'Through the Looking Glass' of His Memoirs".....	8
N. Vasetskiy, "In Alliance With Reaction".....	7
P. Vostrikov, "Neoconservative Economic Theory and the Practice of 'Reaganomics'".....	11
V. Granov, "The Greens: Ideology and Reality".....	12
A. Kaufman, "Socialist Concepts in Asian and African Emergent Countries: Basic Types and Trends of Evolution".....	12
I. Osadchaya, "Evolution of Bourgeois Political Economy. Zigzags of History".....	9
Ye. Khesin, V. Studentsov, "Britain: From Keynesianism to Monetarism".....	6
S. Peregudov, "The Bourgeoisie's Tactics Under the Conditions of Deepening of the General Crisis of Capitalism".....	10
V. Pan'kov, "Social-Reformist Concepts of the Quality of Life".....	3
V. Volobuyev, "The 'Laffer Curve'--Concept and Political Realities"....	11
K. Kozlova, "Ideological Sources and Evolution of the 'Mixed Economy' Concepts".....	2
V. Zarin, "Socioeconomic Platform of the Greens Party".....	5
Yu. Nikulichev, "Blind Alleys of the 'Information Society'".....	4
Ye. Aksenova, "Monetarism in Italy".....	3

MEMO ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

Struggle for a New International Economic Order: Results of a
Decade.....7, 8

Role of the United Nations in the Modern World and Ways To Increase
its Effectiveness..... 6

N. Dlin, "Singularities of the Socioeconomic Structure and
Development Trends of Oriental Countries"..... 1

A. Manukovskiy, "Certain Aspects of the Structural Crises in the
Economy of Capitalism"..... 2

V. Khablyuk, "The Question of the Classification of Economic Crises
and the Periodization of Postwar Cycles"..... 12

TRIBUNE OF THE ECONOMIST AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS EXPERT

Yu. Krasin, "Correlation of Ideology and Policy in the Revolutionary
Movement"..... 5

Yu. Shiryayev, "The World Economy Under the Conditions of the
Modern Technology Revolution"..... 10

Yu. Shishkov, "On the Question of the Unity of the Modern
World Economy"..... 8

B. Dobrovinskiy, "Certain Questions of the Methodology of
Determining Social Production Efficiency"..... 7

A. El'yanov, "Microelectronics, the Developing Countries and the
International Division of Labor"..... 5

N. Petrov, "Methodology of the Study of Problems of the
Internationalization of Production and Capital"..... 5

V. Gromeka, A. Dynkin, "Trends and Prospects of the Use of Modern
Technology in Developing Countries"..... 6

V. Acharkan, "Currency Exchange Rates--Formation Mechanism and
Interimperialist Contradictions"..... 9

A. Yudanov, "International Monopolies at the Time of Crises"..... 6

DOMESTIC POLITICAL LIFE ABROAD

A. Galkin, "From Pluralism to Corporativism? (Reflections on the
Crisis of Capitalism's Political System)"..... 9

V. Granov: "The Greens: Ideology and Reality"..... 12

V. Zarin, "Socioeconomic Platform of the Greens Party".....	5
A. Kudryavtsev, "France and 'European Building'".....	10
A. Kudryavtsev, "France and Certain Military-Political Issues".....	2
V. Fedorov, "Ominous Nostalgia".....	10
V. Fedorov, "Following Washington's Lead".....	1
O. Shakhnazarov, "Ireland--Disturbing Symptoms".....	11
Yu. Baturin, "Whither Will the 'European Idea' Lead?".....	9
V. Davydov, "Nuclear-Free Cities--Outposts of the Antimissile Movement".....	5

HISTORY AND THE PRESENT DAY. CURRENT AFFAIRS

L. Istyagin, "A Dangerous 'Big Brother'".....	10
V. Kelin (deceased), "The USSR-Britain: Experience of Cooperation in the Struggle Against the Common Danger".....	8
A. Knyazev, "Edifice Without a Foundation".....	2
Yu. Oleshchuk, "Will There Be a 'Recovery of Sight'?".....	9
V. Falin, "Front on Two Fronts".....	7

THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT. PROBLEMS OF ASIAN, AFRICAN AND LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

The Struggle for a New International Economic Order: Results of a Decade (MEMO Roundtable).....	7, 8
K. Brutents, "The Nonaligned Movement in the Modern World".....	5
L. Bagramov, "The Food Problem in Developing Countries".....	12
R. Andraesyan, "The Energy Aspect of Development and the Problem of Oil Prices".....	1
I. Bulychev, "Escalation of Aggression. U.S. Policy in Central America".....	9
V. Gromeka, A. Dynkin, "Trends and Prospects of the Use of Modern Technology in the Developing Countries".....	6

Ye. Denisov, "Ethiopia--Step Into the Future".....	11
N. Dlin, "Singularities of the Socioeconomic Structure and Development Trends of Oriental Countries".....	1
I. Dmitriyev, "The System of Neocolonial Exploitation".....	11
I. Zorina, V. Sheynis, "Argentina at a Historical Turning Point".....	5
V. Iordanskiy, "Internal and External Causes of the Conflict in Chad"..	3
M. Isayev, "The ASEAN Countries and Problems of Peace and Stability in Southeast Asia".....	3
A. Kaufman, "Socialist Concepts in the Asian and African Emergent Countries: Basic Types and Trends of Evolution".....	12
A. Knyazev, "Edifice Without a Foundation".....	2
O. Kovtunovich, V. Nosenko, "The Near East--Power Politics of Imperialism in Action".....	4
S. Storchak, "Exacerbation of the Development Countries' Debt Problem--Causes and Consequences".....	10
A. Urnov, "The South African Knot".....	5
A. El'yanov, "Microelectronics, the Developing Countries and the International Division of Labor".....	5
M. Bezdudnyy, "LDC's--Problems of Overcoming Backwardness".....	9
A. Berezhnoy, "The TNC in the economy of the Developing World".....	4
I. Bulychev, "The Contadora Group and the Search for Paths Toward Peace in Central America".....	2
V. Sokolinskiy, "Structural Policy of the Western States and Neocolonialism".....	2

WE ANSWER READERS' QUESTIONS

V. Davydov, "Nuclear-Free Cities--Outposts of the Antimissile Movement."	5
V. Kashin, "The Banking Monopolies' Offshore Business".....	3
I. Nikulin, "Cycles and Crises in the Common Market Countries".....	9
S. Pyatenko, "The Federal Reserve System and Regulation of the Loan Capital Market in the United States".....	11

P. Sergeyev, "West Europe's Gas Supply".....	9
A. Tsimaylo, "Currency Interventions and Currency Exchange Rates".....	1

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

Against Militarism and Revanchism (International Symposium in Prague)...	12
In the Academic Council for Problems of Peace and Disarmament.....	10
The activity of the Specialized Councils Under the Auspices of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO.....	5
N. Baykov, "The World Petroleum Congress".....	2
V. Zuyev, "State-Monopoly Regulation of the Capitalist Economy".....	2
A. Kudryavtsev, "Soviet-French Symposium".....	6
Ye. Leont'yeva, "Soviet-Japanese Symposium of Economists".....	1
V. Razmerov, "Meeting of Permanent Commission Experts".....	7

CRITICISM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY (BOOK REVIEWS)

Questions of International Relations and Foreign Policy

V. Baranovskiy, "Important Facet of International Relations" (V.P. Lukin, "'Power Centers': Concepts and Reality").....	4
D. Valentinov, "Nuclear-Free Zones and European Security" ("Nuclear Liberation in Europe").....	8
V. Gantman, "Imperialist Solidarity and Political Independence" (S.B. Vorontsova, "The United States and France. Rivalry and Partnership").....	1
S. Karpov, "Militarism and Merchant Shipping" (V.G. Parshin, A.A. Romanenko, V.K. Sokolov, "The Capitalist Countries' Maritime Transport [Development Trends and Militarization]").....	7
N. Kosolapov, "New Angle of Imperialist Policy" (I.L. Sheydina, "Nonmilitary Power Factors in U.S. Foreign Policy").....	9
I. Lebedev, "Chronicle of International Life" ("International Yearbook. Politics and Economics. 1983 Edition").....	8
B. Messiya, "Blind Alleys of Nuclear Policy" (Field Marshal Lord Carver, "A Policy for Peace").....	8

V. Romanov, "Vistas of Friendship" (Yu.S. Girenko, "Soviet-Yugoslav Relations [Pages of History]").....	3
D. Tomashevskiy, "West European Integration: New Angle" (V.G. Baranovskiy, "Political Integration in West Europe. Certain Questions of Theory and Practice").....	2
A. Yakovlev, "A Timely and Necessary Publication" ("Diplomatic Bulletin. 1982").....	2

Problems of War and Peace in the Ideological Struggle

M. Ashitkov, "Bourgeois Analysis of Economic Aspects of the Arms Race" (G. Kennedy, "Economics of Defense").....	11
V. Davydov, "Burning Question of the Nuclear Era" (A.N. Kalyadin, O.V. Bogdanov, G.A. Vorontsov, "Preventing Nuclear War. Soviet Scientists' Viewpoint").....	7
V. Karpushin, Ya. Povarkov, "Groundless Basis" (Yu.M. Mel'nikov, "Strength and Impotence: Washington's Foreign Policy. 1945-1982")..	6
A. Kovalenko, A. Podberezkin, "The Arms Race--Not the Way to Peace" ("Living With Nuclear Weapons").....	2
G. Kolosov, "Underlying Motives of NATO's 'Missile Plan'" ([P. Byuto], "Alliance Strategy, Doctrine and Policy: Modernization of Theater Nuclear Weapons in NATO").....	9
N. Kuznetsov, "Cold War Until the End of the Century?" ("Soviet Power and the West's Policy in the Negotiating Sphere, Vol I").....	6
A. Likhotal', "Strategy of Insanity or Insanity of the Strategists?" (Aleksey Arbatov, "Military-Strategic Parity and U.S. Policy").....	11
P. Cherkasov, "Advocate of Atlantism" ([F. de Rose], "Against (Kuriatsiyev) Strategy").....	10
Yu. Shvedkov, "Against the Nuclear Threat" (B. Russet, "Prisoners of the Lack of Security. Nuclear Restraint, the Arms Race and Arms Control; [D. Beresh], G. Lipton, "Stop Nuclear War! A Manual")	3
L. Istyagin, "American Missiles and the West German Catholics" (F. Alt, "Peace Is Possible. Sermon on the Mount Policy").....	1

East-West Relations. Global Problems

L. Istyagin, "'Do the Russians Want War?'" ([G. Kade], "The Russians and US").....	9
--	---

I. Kuznetsov, "Historic Example of Effective Cooperation" (A.Yu. Borisov, "The USSR and the United States: Allies in the War Years. 1941-1945").....	8
B. Maklyarskiy, "Main Condition of the Solution of Global Problems" ("State of the World. 1984").....	11
A. Medvedev, "Long-Term Form of Economic Cooperation" ("East-West Industrial Cooperation in Third Countries").....	7
S. Men'shikov, "Factor of Stability and Independence" ("Finnish Capitalism. Study of Social Development and its Contradictions in Postwar Finland").....	2
A. Parkanskiy, "Short-Sighted Policy" ("Prerequisites of East-West Economic Relations").....	8
Ye. Prokudin, "Failure of the Policy of Pressure and Discrimination" ("Common Sense in American-Soviet Trade").....	12
Ye. Yakovleva, "Cooperation Is Essential" ("The CEMA Countries" Economic Relations With the West [Strategy, Long-Term Interests, Prospects]); L.A. Rodina, "Socialist Integration and New Forms of East-West Cooperation").....	12
 Economics of Contemporary Monopoly Capitalism	
A. Anikin, "Capitalism's Credit-Monetary Sphere" ("Monetary Circulation and Credit of the Capitalist Countries").....	8
M. Belyeyev, "The TNC in the Mirror of Statistics" ("Modern TNC. Economico-Statistical Handbook").....	11
M. Vcherashnyaya, "Present-Day Japan: From Technology Imports to Exports" (M. Moritani, "Progressive Technology and Japan's Contribution").....	6
A. Demin, "Modern Monopoly Capitalism" ("The FRG").....	10
V. Zhelezova, "Modern Monopoly Capitalism" ("The United States").....	7
V. Zelenin, "Specifics of the Canadian Economy" (V.V. Popov, "Canada: Singularities of Industrial Development").....	11
I. Ivanov, "Useful Book" (L.I. Yevenko, "Organizational Structures of the Management of U.S. Industrial Corporations: Theory and Practice of Formation").....	10
A. Kravtsevich, "Modern Monopoly Capitalism" ("Japan").....	8

V. Kudrov, "Key Factor of Economic Efficiency" ("Present-Day Capitalism: Labor Productivity in the Basic Material Production Sectors").....	3
I. Levin, "Modern Monopoly Capitalism" ("Italy").....	12
R. Leshchiner, "Technology and Power Engineering Under Capitalism" (F.L. Bromberg, "Scientific-Technical Progress and the Development of the Electric Power Engineering of the Main Capitalist Countries").....	4
V. Persianov, R. Faramazyan, "Fourth Sphere of Material Production" (D.S. Nikolayev, "Transport in International Economic Relations. Problems of the Economics and Organization of Commodity Movement in World Economic Relations").....	8
A. Salmin, "Modern Monopoly Capitalism" ("France").....	11
V. Sokolov, "Zigzags of the U.S. Administration's Ecology Policy" ("Quality of the Environment--1982. Thirteenth Report of the Presidential Council on Environmental Quality").....	7
R. Solodkin, "Modern Monopoly Capitalism" ("Great Britain").....	9
I. Sysoyev, "Analysis of the TNC's Foreign Economic Strategy" ("The TNC in World Development Third Survey").....	12
A. Sharov, "The Economic 'Squaring of the Circle'" (A.A. Khandruyev, "Money in the Economy of Modern Capitalism").....	9
R. Entov, "Study of the Regularities of Modern Capitalism" (I.Ye. Rudakova, "Methodological Problems of the Theory of Imperialism").....	6
Yu. Yudanov, V. Chernyavina, "Structural Problems of the Capitalist Economy" ([F. Kneshaurek], "Swiss Companies in a Changing World. Strategy of Adaptation to the Structural Changes in the World Economy").....	10
 Exacerbation of Socioeconomic Contradictions in Capitalist Countries	
Yu. Adzhubey, "Anatomy of the Contradictions of Capitalism" ("Internationalization of Production and Capital: Development Trends"; "The Present-Day Capitalist System. Deepening of Antagonisms").....	9
Yu. Borko, "Important Direction of the Proletariat's Class Struggle" (V.A. Vinogradov, "Worker Control of Production: Theory, History and the Present Day").....	4

I. Bushmarin, "Incurable Disease of Capitalism" ("Unemployment--the Tragedy of Millions").....	6
Yu. Oleshchuk, "Pessimistic Evaluations" ("The State, Class and Recession").....	4
G. Ponedelko, I. Tsapenko, "An American Scholar on Spain's Economy" (S. Liberman, "The Present-Day Spanish Economy: Historical Perspective").....	4
R. Subayev, "Crisis of British State-Monopoly Capitalism and the 'Right' Danger" (B. Jordan, "Mass Unemployment and Britain's Future").....	3
V. Chernega, "Yet Another Social Utopia" (M. Guillaume, "Work-Sharing: A Different Industrial Civilization?").....	10
Ideological Confrontation in the Modern World. Critique of Anti-Marxist Concepts	
I. Aleshina, "Overcoming Backwardness: Two Approaches" ("From Dependence to Development. Strategy for Overcoming Underdevelopment and Inequality").....	12
N. Vasetskiy, "Ideological Sabotage of the Class Enemy" (V.S. Komarovskiy, "Lies for Export. An Analysis of the Anti-Soviet Actions of Imperialism's Foreign Policy Propaganda").....	1
V. Verzhbitskiy, A. Kormanovskiy, "'Neoclassical Synthesis': Eclecticism and Apologia" ("Samuelson and Neoclassical Economic Theory").....	1
I. Zorina, "At the Precipice of Ideological Confrontation" ("Modern Ideological Currents in Latin America").....	12
R. Kanelyushnikov, "Bourgeois Concepts and Capitalist Reality" ("Critique of Anti-Marxist Theories of the Present-Day Economic Development of Capitalism").....	2
V. Studentsov, "Crisis of Bourgeois Political Economy" (S. Brittan, "How to Put an End to the 'Monetarist' Polemic: a Journalist's Reflections on Production, Employment, Prices and Money").....	2
Yu. Shishkov, "Groundlessness of Bourgeois Concepts" (A.Yu. Yudanov, "Theories of the 'Open Economy': Doctrines and Reality").....	11
Economy and Policy of the Developing Countries	
A. Bogomolov, "Southeast Asia: ASEAN Faced With the Necessity of Choice" ("Questions of Economics, Politics and Security in Southeast Asia in the 1980's").....	1

Ye. Bragina, "Need for a Comprehensive Strategy" ("Industry and Accumulation in Africa").....	7
E. Grebenshchikov, "Behind the Facade of Official Declarations" (V.V. Samoylenko, "ASEAN. Policy and Economy"; M.A. Khaldin, "ASEAN Without Illusions").....	4
I. Yegorov, "The Developing Countries in Imperialism's Military Strategy" (E.S. Nukhovich, "The Arms Race and the Emergent Countries"; "Problems of Disarmament and the Developing Countries").....	1
M. Zagrevel'nyy, "Contradictions Are Aggravated" ("Supermonopolies in Southeast Asia").....	6
V. Kasatkin, "African States in the Modern World" (A.A. Shvedov, "Independent Africa: Foreign Economic Problems, Diplomatic Struggle").....	6
V. Lukov, "American Neocolonialism" (V.A. Kremenyuk, "United States: Struggle Against the National Liberation Movement. History and the Present Day").....	10
A. Mileykovskiy, I. Filatochev, "Useful Study Instrument" ("Interregional Intersectorial Models of the World Economy").....	12
S. Nesterov, "Man and Nature in the Emergent Countries" [O.K. Dreyer, B.V. Los', V.A. Los'], "Ecology Problems of the Developing Countries. Theoretical-Methodological and Sociopolitical Aspects").....	2
S. Solodovnikov, "Nature and Scale of the 'Debt Crisis'" ("Foreign Debt and Economic Development of Latin America").....	2
Yu. Stolyarov, "Important Direction of Washington's Expansion" (A.V. Parkanskiy, "U.S. Economic Interests in the Asia-Pacific Region").....	10
A. El'yanov, "Oil--Economics--Politics" (A.Ye. Primakov, "The Persian Gulf: Oil and the Monopolies").....	4

STATISTICS

"Foreign Trade of CEMA and the Common Market".....	11
"Capitalist Countries' Balance of Payments".....	2
"Labor Resources in the Capitalist Countries (1970-1980)".....	1
In the USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO Academic Council. In Remembrance of Academician Anushavan Agafonovich Arzumanyan.....	5

Svetlana Mikhaylovna Zagladina Obituary..... 7

Sergey Ivanovich Tyul'panov Obituary..... 4

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye
otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/9

END