

234084

JPRS-UWE-85-008

1 July 1985

USSR Report

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No. 4, April 1985

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

19991008 105

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

3
121
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.

1 July 1985

USSR REPORT

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No 4, April 1985

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 Summaries of Major Articles (pp 158-159).....	1
Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev (p 5) (not translated)	
Information Bulletin on CPSU Central Committee Plenum (pp 6-7) (not translated)	
Speech of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at CPSU Central Committee 11 March 1985 Plenum (pp 8-11) (not translated)	
CPSU, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers Address to the Communist Party and the Soviet People (pp 12-16) (not translated)	
Avoiding Nuclear War Overrides Class, National Interests (pp 17-32) (D. Tomashevskiy, V. Lukov).....	5
Velikhov, Kokoshin Examine U.S. Nuclear Concepts (pp 33-43) (Ye. Velikhov, A. Kokoshin).....	13
Soviet Defense of Polish, French Interests at Yalta Recalled (pp 44-52) (A. Roshchin).....	27
Indochina Progress Problems Since 1975 Viewed (pp 53-65) (M. Isayev).....	36

Formation of Sociological Thought in Developing Countries (pp 66-77)
(B. Starostin) (not translated)

INTERNATIONAL ROUNDUP

Survey of Major World Events 2 December 1984-1 March 1985 (pp 78-97)
(T. Panova, M. Strezhneva, Yu. Fedorov)..... 51

OUR COMMENTARY

Enlargement of the EEC (pp 98-104)
(T. Filimonova) (not translated)

INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM

Bloc Symposium on Conservative Shift in Western Economic
Policy (pp 105-116)..... 78

SURVEYS, INFORMATION

U.S.-Japanese-West European Competition in Electronics Viewed (pp 117-125)
(A. Khlystov)..... 94

Problems of the Use of Labor Resources in Developing Countries (pp 126-134)
(O. Vorkunov, deceased) (not translated)

BOOKS, AUTHORS

Tikhvinskiy Reviews Book on Scientists' Role in Peace Struggle (pp 135-139)
(S. Tikhvinskiy)..... 107

Bulgarian Book Urges Further CEMA Integration (pp 140-141)
(B. Pugachev)..... 114

Review of "Struggle for a Relaxation of International Tension and the
Socioeconomic Problems of Capitalism" (pp 141-142)
(I. Ivanov) (not translated)

Review of (Kadzyo) Ogawa's "Soren no taygat bo:eki to Nikhon"
(pp 143-145) (not translated)

Review of "Economic Choices 1984," edited by Alice M. Rivlin (pp 145-147)
(L. Maksimova) (not translated)

Review of Gordon R. Foxall's "Corporate Innovation: Marketing and
Strategy" (pp 147-149) (not translated)

STATISTICS

Certain Trends of International Commerce (pp 150-157) (not translated)

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS No 4, April 1985

Russian title : MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE
OTNOSHENIYA

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : Ya.S. Khavinson

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda"

Place of publication : Moscow

Date of publication : April, 1985

Signed to press : 18 March 1985

Copies : 27,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda".
"Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye
otnosheniya", 1985

ENGLISH SUMMARIES OF MAJOR ARTICLES

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4,
Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 158-159)

[Text] Documents of the Extraordinary Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

In the historical conditions of the last quarter of the 20th century the "interests of humanity" concept deserves close attention. Has it the right to existence in general, what is its essence in the sphere of international relations, its correlation with such traditional categories as national, state and class interests and the way these interests are reflected in foreign and political concepts and practices of various socio-political forces and world policy as a whole. D. Tomashevskiy and V. Lukov in their article "Interests of Humanity and World Policy" concentrate on the origin and introduction in international policy of one of the present-day key world political realities--the interests of humanity. The most important of them--the prevention of war and the establishment of lasting peace originated as a philosophical and ethical concept hundreds of years ago. But only in the 20th century, in the acute struggle between the forces of social progress and peace, on the one hand, and the forces of militarism and oppression on the other, this fundamental interests of humanity has become an impetus and a decisive factor of powerful social forces, states and parties as well as of state and public figures. The authors, in analyzing the trend of the collision and debates around the content and role of the interests of humanity in present-day international relations, come to the conclusion that the dividing line in this struggle doesn't usually run between classes and parties but within them. The reason for this is the growing awareness of considerable layers of the population in the West of the disastrous consequences of the nuclear conflict. The article points out that objectively the imminent process of formation, awareness and realization in world policy of human interests by no means develops automatically and straightforwardly. Its pace at large depends on a subjective factor, the struggle between social and political forces hindering it, trying to reverse this pace. This conclusion is convincingly proved by the events of the 1980's. The authors believe that the prerequisites for the elimination of the threat of nuclear catastrophe are political realism, readiness to honest negotiations and joint actions in the name of preserving humanity itself, a growing understanding of the need to place common, vital, human interests above individual ones, above the discrepancies dividing peoples.

Mankind is at a critical point of its history. The very future of human civilization depends on whether the major tasks facing the world today are resolved, first and foremost, that of removing the nuclear threat, of preventing the militarization of outer space, of using it exclusively for peaceful purposes, and of combining the efforts of the peoples to settle global economic and ecological problems. Ye. Velikhov and A. Kokoshin in the article "Nuclear Weapons and World Security Dilemma" remind one about the important conclusions drawn of late by Soviet, American and West-European scholars both in natural, and social sciences who revealed the truth about the consequences (medical, biological, genetic and climatic) of nuclear war to all mankind. Not only is an accumulation of nuclear arsenals by both sides taking place at present but such weapons are being developed which in the period up to the year 2000 may drastically change the very idea of strategic stability and possibility of effective limitation or reduction of nuclear weapons. The existing strategic balance is a form which shows the qualitative and quantitative correlation of forces of the two sides and the factors, determining the strategic situation. The dialectics of development of the strategic balance is such that the creation of new "defensive" weapons, claiming to be still more effective, would cause an ever greater disbalance than new offensive weapons. The authors point out that the world has crossed the line beyond which any further build up and perfection of these arms are not only dangerous but senseless. The article criticizes different Western concepts concerning the employment of nuclear weapons as a means for nuclear war, "limited". "protracted" etc. The scientifically substantiated stand of the USSR on the danger of such wars finds ever growing understanding among many Western scientists and political figures who are for the aversion of a nuclear holocaust. On the whole a strict scientific analysis of present and future military and political problems made out by many Soviet and responsible Western scientists convincingly proves that it is impossible to provide security at the expense of further development of nuclear technology. The Soviet Party and State leaders unlike U.S. bellicose forces stress that the nuclear age inevitably dictates new political thinking. The aversion of a nuclear war is the most burning issue for all nations.

This historic Crimea conference of the leaders of the three allied powers, which took place in Yalta in February 1945, is of special importance, says A. Roshchin in his article "The Lessons of Yalta and Our Times". Considerable attention in the decisions of the conference was attached to joint military operations against Germany and to questions of post-war settlement. The conference demonstrated the possibility of political cooperation between states with different political systems. The basic aim was to preserve and strengthen the cooperation of the three powers, to guarantee lasting peace in the interests of entire humanity, to prevent German militarism and nazism from violating world peace. Nevertheless, the ruling circles of the U.S.A., Britain and the FRG are still challenging the decisions of the Crimea and Potsdam conferences and seeking to revise them irrespective of the fact that these decisions were approved by world democratic opinion, that they have become stronger. The system of colonialism has collapsed and the positions of imperialism have weakened. Historical experience makes imperative a new approach to the establishment of relations between states with different socio-political systems. Yalta, Potsdam are milestones of cooperation. They paved the way to the historic Helsinki Act which laid down the basic principles of inviolability and territorial integrity of all European states. A revision of post-war realities is dangerous, taking into consideration the present level of armaments.

The article by M. Isayev "Countries of Indo-China: along the Road of Social Progress" confirms that Southeast Asia has witnessed very important developments favorable to the struggle of the Vietnamese, Lao and Kampuchea people for national defense and upbuilding. It tells about the tremendous events which have taken place in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Lao People's Republic of Kampuchea since their origin. These events have become milestones in the development of today's world revolutionary process and clearly speak for great successes which the national liberation forces have been able to achieve. With the vigorous and effective support of the Soviet Union, the socialist community, the non-aligned countries and friends all over the world the three countries of are steadily forging ahead. Their foreign policy is closely coordinated with that of the countries of the socialist community backing the interests of socialism on the international arena and of the national-liberation movement. The article points out that the relations of these countries with the USSR and other socialist countries are built on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. The deepening of cooperation with the socialist countries in political, economic and other fields is of exceptional importance to translate into practice the program of the construction of a new life. The experience of construction of the basis of socialism in Vietnam and the Lao Peoples Democratic Republic, the outstanding achievements recorded by the People's Republic of Kampuchea in economic and other fields confirm that each country introduces a lot of peculiar national fraternal into the process of realization of the common basic laws which finds its manifestation in time, tempo and methods. The history of the past 40 years shows that nothing can prevent the peoples of Indo-China from realizing their lofty goals namely: peace, independence, friendship and cooperation.

B. Starostin in the article "Formation of Sociological Thought in the Developing Countries" notes that for the last two decades social sciences have notable progressed in the developing countries. They have as yet not been subjected to a detailed study being affected by a range of external and internal factors. The collision of interests of different social classes, groups and political parties is reflected as in a prism in this process which involves major problems of national reconstruction, cultural revival and the struggle of the developing countries for economic independence, against scientific and information neocolonialism. The peculiarities of development of social thought in Afro-Asia and Latin American are organically connected with the sharply aggravated ideological confrontation in the world today. The author believes that the social sciences in the region are the object of a fierce ideological and active political struggle of progressive forces against those oppression and social conservatism. The author outlines socio-political and sociological trends of public thought in the developing countries in sociology, politology, and cultural anthropology. He reveals the socio-theoretical sources of ideological trends, main peculiarities and the problems of their development at the present stage. The author considers it to be significant that the progressive changes in public consciousness in the aforementioned countries serve as a reflection and manifestation of those qualitative shifts which are connected with the deepening of the world revolutionary process. He comes to the conclusion that the main trends in the development of sociological and socio-political thinking in Afro-Asia and Latin America are connected with ideological and socio-class differentiations,

reflecting the shifts in the social structure and social orientation of these states. The ideological trend, expressing the interests of the growing bourgeoisie is becoming more clear cut. It is far from being homogeneous and embraces a broad spectrum of theories both pro-imperialist reactionary and conservative as well as national-patriotic ones. The sociological ideas of national democracy are more wide, but they are fraught with complicated, dialectically-controversial process.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

CSO: 1812/223-E

AVOIDING NUCLEAR WAR OVERRIDES CLASS, NATIONAL INTERESTS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4,
Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 17-32

[Article by D. Tomashevskiy, V. Lukov: "The Interests of Mankind and World Politics"]

[Excerpts] In the actual historical situation of the final quarter of the 20th century the "interests of mankind" concept merits the most serious attention. Does it have a right to existence at all and what is its real meaning with respect to the sphere of international relations? How is it correlated with such traditional categories as national, state and class interests? How are human interests specifically reflected in the foreign policy concepts and practice of different sociopolitical forces and world politics as a whole?

The proposition concerning the possibility of the rapprochement and concurrence even of the interests of different classes in tackling certain common tasks in the sphere of international relations was embodied in the notion of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, which was formulated by V.I. Lenin and which has exerted the profoundest influence on the world politics of the post-October era. Examples are sufficiently well known: dozens of specific agreements between the USSR and individual capitalist countries in the prewar years, the experience of the anti-Hitler coalition in World War II, the Soviet Union's cooperation with other states within the UN framework and bilaterally and so forth.

Today, however, it would appear appropriate to put the question: is it possible when analyzing the content of world politics to confine ourselves to the categories of class, state and national interests? After all, it is in our time that the deep-lying trends of the internationalization of social development enriching the content of world politics are manifesting themselves particularly strongly.

The upsurge of the production forces under the conditions of the scientific-technical revolution and the profound qualitative shifts in the alignment and correlation of social forces in the world arena have engendered a number of problems of a global scale in whose solution all social strata, all peoples and mankind as a whole have an objective interest. It is these

problems which are occupying an increasingly pronounced place in interstate relations. Both in terms of significance and degree of direct interconnection with the sphere of foreign policy and international relations the problem of preventing nuclear war undoubtedly emerges at the forefront here.

It is well known that scientific-technical progress, which is opening to mankind new opportunities for penetrating the secrets of nature and the increasingly full satisfaction of people's diverse requirements, has resulted through the fault of imperialism primarily in the appearance of qualitatively new, nuclear, weapons and other types of weapon of mass annihilation. As a result there have been profound changes not only in the strategy, tactics and nature of military operations but also in the social parameters of war and its possible consequences. And this cannot fail to be reflected in the content of modern world politics.

Whereas throughout all past centuries wars were considered the most effective means of achieving this foreign policy goal or the other and an inalienable attribute of interstate relations (and which at times objectively promoted social progress), in our time a war involving the use of nuclear weapons would inevitably entail the loss of hundreds of millions of people, profound material, social and spiritual regression and the devastation on a gigantic scale of the material and spiritual values of civilization. Such a war, although its outbreak would be the result of continuation of the certain policy of a certain class, is incapable of securing the achievement of any political goals whatever. It would, furthermore, put an end to any politics and, possibly, the very existence of mankind.

We shall quote in this connection the opinion of Academician Ye.P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "Fifty thousand nuclear warheads are stockpiled in the world, which constitutes in TNT equivalent three and one-half tons of explosive per person. One warhead is capable of causing damage many times greater than the effect of the American bombing of Dresden or the Hiroshima explosion. If all 50,000 are exploded simultaneously, life on Earth will vanish, intelligent life, at least."*

As competent experts testify, the mass detonation of nuclear warheads would be accompanied by radioactive fallout; the following would be a consequence of this: the persistent contamination of vast territories and expanses of water, the clouding of the atmosphere, a general cooling of the Earth's surface (a "nuclear winter"), partial destruction of the stratosphere's ozone layer and a sharp increase in the ultraviolet irradiation of the planet's surface fatal for living beings.**

It is also appropriate to cite the conclusion concerning the influence of a large-scale nuclear conflict on the biosphere at which 40 prominent American biologists arrived in 1983: "It is obvious that merely the influences on

* IZVESTIYA, 30 October 1983.

** See J. Schell, "The Fate of the Earth," New York, 1982, p 94.

ecological systems as a result of a large-scale thermonuclear war could be sufficient for the destruction of existing civilization, in the Northern Hemisphere, at least." As if summing up the scientific investigation of the possible consequences of nuclear war, the well-known American scientist C. Sagan asserts with complete conviction: "In view of the scale of the potential losses, no political declarations and no technical guarantees will be capable of sufficiently ensuring preservation of the human race."*

Under these conditions the prevention of a thermonuclear catastrophe becomes not only a prerequisite of the preservation and normal functioning of individual states and social systems but also the primary condition of the very existence of human society.

Formulating the law of the development of human history discovered by K. Marx, F. Engels once emphasized the "simple fact that people first of all have to eat, drink and have shelter and clothing before being in a position to engage in politics, science, art, religion and so forth...."**. It may be added to this today that before eating, drinking and having shelter and clothing, people must first of all ensure the preservation of the human race. The solution of all the remaining questions--economic, social, political, ideological and so forth--ultimately depends on this. This thought was expressed distinctively by A. Einstein: "Man must first ensure his own survival; only then may he ask himself the question as to what type of existence he prefers."***

The universal interest of mankind, regardless of the class, national and other differences dividing it, in preventing nuclear war assumes in our time the significance of an objective category consideration of which is an essential condition of a realistic foreign policy. And here the interests of the socialist states, the workers movement and other revolutionary forces of the present day fully coincide with the interests of all mankind for removal of the danger of such a war is an essential prerequisite of further successes of socialism and communism and social progress as a whole. But the prevention of nuclear war cannot fail to correspond in a certain sense to the objective interests of bourgeois states also and the bourgeoisie as a class inasmuch as such a war threatens the existence of capitalism as a system and is fraught with the danger of the physical destruction not only of the working people but the exploiters also.

Thus as distinct from the past, when the peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist states was based on the temporary, partial coincidence of their interests (frequently on the part of bourgeois states, of a market-determined nature), under the new conditions it is a question of the objective, long-lasting common interest of all states and all social strata in preventing nuclear war, that is, the interests of mankind as a whole (whether these new realities and objective interests are sufficiently reflected in the consciousness and political practice of different classes and states is another matter).

* FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Winter, 1983/84 No 2, p 274.

** K. Marx, F. Engels "Works," vol 19, p 350.

*** Quoted from "Problems of War and Peace. Critique of Contemporary Bourgeois Socio-Philosophical Concepts," Moscow, 1967, p 253.

The formation of interests common to all mankind is connected not only with preventing nuclear war, although it is this task which occupies the central place under current conditions. The appearance of a number of new problems of a global scale such as providing the planet's growing population with food, the rational distribution of fuel and raw material resources, the exploration of new energy sources, space and the oceans and environmental conservation operates in this same direction. Their solution demands the joint efforts of the entire world community. The connection of the said problems with the interests of mankind as a whole is obvious. It is not fortuitous that in examining the scientific criteria of the highlighting of global problems the Soviet experts V.V. Zagladin and I.T. Frolov point primarily to the fact that such problems "essentially affect the interests of all mankind and in the long term the future of all mankind also. It may be said in this sense that global problems are of a general nature."*

The growing role of interests common to all mankind ultimately reflects the objective and natural trend of the internationalization of social life. What is new, however, is not so much the very appearance of such interests as the direct and, it may be said, dramatically serious "incursion" of this category into interstate relations, the insistent need for and practical possibilities of the realization of the interests of mankind in the sphere of world politics and their complex interaction with the categories of class, national, state and, at times, narrow-group interests traditional for this sphere.

A correct understanding of the scale and depth of the changes in the world which have already occurred and which are gathering pace increasingly and mankind's common destiny and determination of ways of removing the dangers threatening it are a categorical imperative of our day. But it is the very nature of recognition of the realities of the nuclear age and the very approach to the most urgent general task of the prevention of nuclear war (and to other global problems also) in foreign policy strategy and practice which reflects with full force the contrast of the class nature and class interests of the socialist and capitalist states and progressive and reactionary political parties and politicians.

The consistent policy of the USSR and its allies aimed at preventing nuclear war and ensuring peaceful coexistence combined with the appearance of realistic trends in the policy of the West's ruling circles began to produce tangible practical results in the sphere of world politics. The first, fundamentally important steps on the path of a quest for joint solutions of urgent international problems of a global scale were the Treaty Banning Nuclear Tests in Three Media (1963), the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (1968) and the Treaty Banning the Deployment on the Seabed and Ocean Floor and in the Interior Thereof of Nuclear Weapons and Other Types of Weapon of Mass Destruction (1971). The Treaty on Antarctica (1959), which enshrined its demilitarization and neutralization, could also serve as an example of the fruitfulness of such an approach.

* V.V.Zagladin, I.T. Frolov, "Global Problems of the Present Day. Scientific and Social Aspects," Moscow, 1981, p 6.

The forced revision by the West's ruling circles of certain tenets of the cold war together with other domestic and foreign policy factors contributed to the positive development of bilateral relations between socialist and capitalist states throughout the latter half of the 1960's-first half of the 1970's. This experience showed that neither the contrast of socioeconomic systems nor differences in ideology serve as an impediment to cooperation for the purpose of preserving and consolidating peace.

The community of states' long-term interests in the sphere of international security formed the basis of the detente process, which developed successfully at the start of the 1970's on a bilateral and also on a multilateral level besides. Graphic confirmation of this were the convening and successful completion of the historic Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, in which 33 European states and the United States and Canada participated. Referring to their wish "to cooperate in the interests of mankind," in the Final Act of the conference its participants drew up generally acceptable principles of interstate relations corresponding to the requirements of peaceful coexistence. The Final Act also reflected the spread of the problems of interstate relations to such spheres as the environment, power engineering, transport and humanitarian exchange.

The struggle against the arms race and the threat of nuclear war and for the solution of other present-day global problems is attracting the increasingly great attention of the participants in the nonaligned movement. This is distinctively refracted in particular in the developing countries' demands concerning a reorganization of international economic relations.

The interests of mankind are also being reflected to an ever increasing extent in UN activity. This is attested by, for example, such documents which it approved in the 1970's as the Declaration on Strengthening International Security, the Resolution Renouncing the Use of Force and Banning the Use of Nuclear Weapons and the Convention Banning the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological, Biological and Toxic Weapons and on Their Destruction and also the results of the UN General Assembly special disarmament sessions. Special attention is merited by the adoption as a result of many years of work of the Law of the Sea Convention, which speaks directly of the "interests and requirements of all mankind," while the area of the seabed and ocean floor and the interior thereof beyond the confines of national jurisdiction, as, equally, the resources thereof, are regarded as "the common inheritance of mankind".

As a whole the 1970's were marked by pronounced progress in the recognition and practical realization in international politics of the vital interests of mankind. Of course, such a development of events, which afforded a prospect of a limitation of the race in arms, a reduction therein, the removal of the threat of nuclear war and the peaceful coexistence of all states in the solution of global problems common to all mankind, by no means signified a change in states' class nature and their foreign policy. But whereas, as noted, the basic--class and national--interests of the socialist states do not diverge in principle from the interests of mankind as a whole and socialism's foreign policy is aimed at their practical embodiment, things

are different in respect of capitalist states. The selfish interests of monopoly capital here frequently prevail over the interests of the broad people's masses and interests common to all mankind. The socially conditioned inconsistency of the forces and figures who operate from realistic positions and the impact thereon of market-determined factors engendered by the struggle of different groupings within the ruling class are also reflected here. The attempts to make the solution of problems of limiting the arms race, which are of vital importance to mankind, dependent on the "behavior" of the USSR in this part of the world or the other (the notorious "linkage" concept) may serve as an example. Extreme reaction's avowed nonacceptance of detente and peaceful coexistence in general, bellicose anti-Sovietism and appeals, based on nuclear blackmail, for a "crusade" against socialism represent a direct threat to the interests of the peoples.

Influential circles of the monopoly bourgeoisie discern in the achievements of detente, a reorganization of international relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and the approach to problems of world politics with regard for the interests of all mankind a threat to their class privileges, political positions and hegemonist aspirations. Such was the underlying class motive of the "antidetente" operation which unfolded in the West in the latter half of the 1970's and which has continued through today. The most dangerous manifestation of the selfishness and egotism of the reactionary circles of present-day imperialism has been the U.S. Administration's policy of adding a further twist to the arms race spiral dictated by the endeavor of the biggest monopolies to obtain guaranteed high profits and hopes for the achievement of military superiority as the principal instrument of the struggle against world socialism, the peoples' national liberation movement and their own capitalist competitors also. The possibility of a reorganization of international relations in accordance with the realities of the nuclear age and the interests of mankind, connected with detente, has proven to be unrealized through the fault of American imperialism.

The historically necessary and objectively urgent process of the formation, recognition and realization in world politics of interests common to all mankind develops, as can be seen, by no means automatically and rectilinearly. Its tempo largely depends on the subjective factor, on the course and outcome of the struggle between the social and political forces which contribute to it and those which impede it and attempt to turn it back even. This was confirmed as forcefully as could be by the international-political events of the start of the 1980's.

The threat to mankind created by Washington's policy is giving rise to the growing resistance of the healthy forces of mankind. The Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries and their joint peace-loving policy are a conscious and consistent fighter against the nuclear danger, staunch defender of the vital interests of mankind and main guarantor of the preservation of peace in the world. New confirmation of this was the Soviet Union's important initiative which led to the understanding concerning the subject and goals of the Soviet-American negotiations on questions of space and nuclear arms, which will be studied and tackled in interconnection. Strict observance in the course of the impending negotiations of the accord

that has been reached in all its parts could ensure progress on the way to a halt to the arms race, removal of the threat of nuclear war and ultimately the liquidation of nuclear weapons, as the vital interests of the peoples of the world demand.

The people's masses are playing an increasingly significant part in the struggle for the salvation of mankind. This is convincingly attested by both the scale of the present antiwar movement and the breadth of the spectrum of social forces participating therein (political parties, trade unions, women's and youth organizations, scientists, the church and so forth). "The unprecedented mass and political awakening of the past 2 years," O. Palme, chairman of the Independent Disarmament and Security Commission and leader of Sweden's Social Democratic Party, observed in 1982, "has given rise to a new community concerned with problems of peace and security. People are no longer looking at nuclear war as something remote and unreal. They are feeling the burden of military spending as a result of cutbacks in health care programs, lost jobs and lost hopes of progress. They now know precisely what will happen in the event of war to the cities and suburbs where they live and what will happen to their near ones and dear ones and all whom they love. They are aware (often more clearly than many professional experts) of the entire shakiness of the premises of mutual 'deterrence'. This mass consciousness has already become a considerable political force which has succeeded in influencing the course of events."

The United States' premeditated departure from the principles of detente and arms limitation, which has been particularly pronounced since the start of the 1980's, is causing disquiet not only in the broad masses but also in the ruling circles of a number of Western states. Thus in March 1983 the British weekly THE OBSERVER considered it necessary to remind Reagan that in the nuclear age no great power can ensure its security at the expense of another. "The survival depends on ensuring universal security. This joint interest and actual need are independent of their ideological differences." In a report submitted to the FRG Bundestag the well-known SPD figure H. Ehmke emphasized with good reason: "In the era of weapons of mass annihilation both sides must come to terms with the fact that survival can be ensured only together with the other side and not in defiance of it." Finnish Foreign Minister P. Vayrynen formulates his view of the problem of international security thus: "Each country's national interests coincide increasingly with the common interests of mankind. Peace and international security are indivisible. We all live in one and the same biosphere and enjoy the same natural resources. We are essentially all passengers of a single spaceship. International interdependence grows with every passing year. No people can close their eyes to this and pursue merely their own goals contrary to the interests of other countries." Prominent figures in the United States itself who in the past held high federal office like C. Vance, R. McNamara, G. Smith and G. Kennan are also critical of the foreign policy doctrines and actions of the Reagan administration, under which the militarist-hegemonist claims of American imperialism have enjoyed the most concentrated expression.

Political realism, a readiness for honest negotiations and joint actions in the name of preservation of the human race itself and a growing understanding of the need to put mankind's common vital interests above particular interests and above the disarmaments which divide people are the prerequisite of successful struggle for removal of the threat of nuclear catastrophe. It is this that determines the consistent and scrupulous policy of the Soviet Union--one of peace and progress--which was confirmed with new force at the special CPSU Central Committee plenum in March 1985. "Never before has such a terrible threat hung over mankind as in our day," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said. "The sole reasonable way out of the situation is the countervailing forces' understanding concerning an immediate halt to the race in arms--primarily nuclear--on Earth and prevention thereof in space."*

* PRAVDA, 12 March 1985.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/13

VELIKHOV, KOKOSHIN EXAMINE U.S. NUCLEAR CONCEPTS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 33-43

[Article by Ye. Velikhov and A. Kokoshin: "Nuclear Weapons and the Dilemmas of International Security"]

I

[Text] Mankind today is experiencing what is perhaps its greatest ordeal in history. Despite the struggle to halt the nuclear arms race, which has been waged for several decades by the USSR and its allies, and also by all peace-loving forces, and despite a certain success in this sphere, the unrelenting aspiration of the most aggressive imperialist circles to military superiority and super profits from military production has led to serious exacerbation of the international situation and a threat to the existence of human civilization and even to life itself on this planet.

"...Mankind," noted K.U. Chernenko, "is living a crucial moment in its history. The future of human civilization depends on whether the most major tasks facing the world today are resolved--primarily those of eliminating the nuclear threat, preventing the militarization of outer space and using it exclusively for peaceful purposes, and uniting the efforts of the peoples in order to resolve global economic and ecological problems."¹

Very important conclusions have been reached in recent years by Soviet, American and West European doctors and scientists, who have revealed a whole range of new, possible medical-biological, genetic, and climatic consequences of a nuclear war which are a vital addition to our ideas on this phenomenon.

The specific features of the strategic situation now arising are determined to a considerable extent by the fact that it is not simply a build up of nuclear arsenals by the sides that are in questions, but also the appearance of types and forms of weapons which in the period up to the year 2000 could radically alter ideas on strategic stability and on the very possibility of effectively limiting and reducing nuclear weapons. In this respect increasing alarm is being caused by the programs implemented by the U.S. military-industrial complex which are aimed at significantly increasing the proportion of nuclear warheads with enhanced precision guidance in the armed forces, which the Soviet Union is fully justified in regarding as first-strike weapons.

French and British nuclear forces are also developing in the direction of substantially increasing the quantity of ammunition and enhancing its precision and strike power. If the programs announced by the state leadership of these countries for increasing strategic weapons are realized, by the end of the nineties their nuclear forces will fundamentally differ from everything they have had until now.

The contemporary strategic balance is a form of expression of the correlation of the qualitative and quantitative condition of the sides' forces and of the factors determining the strategic situation. Their aggregate can be represented as a complex, dynamic macrosystem, the main elements of which are nuclear, primarily strategic, offensive weapons. However, the state of the macrosystem depends not only on nuclear weapons, but also on many other of its components. There exists a close dialectical connection both between the sides' offensive weapons taken individually and between offensive and defensive weapons--both between the opposing sides and within the armed forces of each of them.

The dialectics of development of the strategic balance is such that the appearance (even the testing, let alone the deployment) of new "defensive" weapons with pretensions to effectiveness could cause no less (and possibly even greater) "upset" in the balance than the creation of new, even offensive weapons.

At the end of the sixties--beginning of the seventies, when the USSR and the United States began discussing the problem of strategic weapons, they jointly admitted that there is an indissoluble mutual connection between strategic offensive and defensive weapons. It is no accident that in 1972 the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, of unlimited duration, and the first Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement (SALT I) were concluded between the Soviet Union and the United States at the same time--we stress, at the same time.²

In order to maintain the military balance and preserve strategic parity with the United States at the aforementioned level, the Soviet Union is compelled to take adequate measures of both military and political-psychological significance. In particular, a complex of steps aimed at preventing a break in the military balance has been taken by the USSR in conjunction with its Warsaw Pact allies in response to the beginning of the deployment of Pershing II ballistic missiles and long-range cruise missiles in Western Europe. As a result, the nuclear balance has been restored, although--and this is not our fault, of course--at a higher level. Thus, in recent years the number of the sides' nuclear warheads aimed at one another's objectives has increased still further. There has been a sharp reduction in the time in which to make a responsible decision in connection with a nuclear attack or a nuclear situation arising accidentally. Trust between states has been undermined.

In this connection one can, perhaps, speak of the effect in the sphere of the strategic balance of the law of "diminishing returns," when more and more investments of resources in offensive weapons (having in mind the vast stocks of these weapons already accumulated, and also the measures,

in response available to the other side) yield less and less effect from the point of view of really significantly altering the correlation of forces, and not simply from that of increasing arsenals for destroying every living thing on earth many times over.³

Evaluating the scale of the buildup in nuclear weapons, A.A. Gromyko noted in his speech at the 39th UN General Assembly Session that "the world has crossed the point beyond which the further accumulation and perfection of these weapons is not only dangerous, but senseless."

The problem of the limitless accumulation of nuclear weapons also has another side, because the existence of weapons stockpiles in itself, as N.A. Tikhonov has noted, causes totally justified alarm and increased nervousness and the threat of a nuclear war breaking out, including on account of technical error or human error, the danger of which increases with the number of weapons.⁴

Many scientists, members of the military, and state and political figures in the West admit that for 12-15 years now the correlation of the sides' nuclear arsenals has been such that neither of them could win a nuclear war, even having begun it first. This strategic situation, as presented by American military theoreticians, is called "mutual assured destruction." Various Western figures sometimes say that it is precisely the state of a "balance of fear" and its realization and acceptance by both sides that is the main guarantor of peace and the main factor which has prevented the outbreak of a new world war until now.

There is no doubt that peace would be considerably stronger without the existence of nuclear weapons on either side (or in the hands of any other powers). Far more reliable measures for safeguarding security would be normalizing the political situation, developing and intensifying economic, scientific-technical, and cultural cooperation and extensive contacts between peoples, and resolving all problems and issues by peaceful, diplomatic means rather than maintaining a "balance of fear" (particularly at a high level of military-political tension and with a vast quantity of nuclear warheads on both opposing sides).

The policies of U.S. militarist circles have resulted in billions of people today being virtually potential hostages to imperialism's military adventures. Hence the upsurge of the antiwar, antinuclear movement in many countries, which has become one of the most important factors in world politics in recent years. Scientists play a prominent role in this movement.

The fact should also not be overlooked that the existence of vast arsenals of nuclear weapons, the accumulation of which has been caused by the policy of U.S. militarist circles, and also increasing awareness by the public of the threat of universal destruction, every day, every hour traumatizes the minds of a vast number of people. Psychiatrists, neuropathologists, and psychologists note that the number of nervous illnesses has sharply increased in the contemporary world. In this respect, as Academician H.P. Bekhterev, member of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, notes, the arms race and fear of nuclear war are the greatest neurosis-forming factor creating particularly favorable

conditions for the development of neuroses. The threat to the mind of the individual in the fact of the moral danger to mankind is increasing more and more.⁵

II

However paradoxical it may be at first glance, the situation of "mutual assured destruction" is not only criticized in the West by pacifists, but also by political figures, members of the military, and even certain scientists, who are guided by motives far from peaceableness. Arms reduction and disarmament on the basis of the principle of parity and equal security is unacceptable to them. But "mutual assured destruction" also does not suit them as it signifies recognition of the "nuclear stalemate" inherent in parity, or approximate parity, which calls in question the use of military force as an active instrument of policy and thereby logically leads to the cancelling out of the idea that it is essential to further develop military technology.

Striving to liquidate the "nuclear stalemate," certain political and industrial-financial circles in the United States stimulate the elaboration and adoption of various concepts which envisage using nuclear weapons as a means of conducting combat operations ("limited" nuclear war, "protracted" nuclear war, the carrying out of "measured-out" [dozirovanny] or "surgical" nuclear strikes'. Military technology and weapons systems are also developed accordingly (Pershing II, MX, neutron weapons, cruise missiles, and others).

First of all we will concentrate on the concept of a "limited" nuclear war, which is expected to "legitimize" the use of nuclear weapons and nuclear war as such. This concept--and this follows from analysis of American official documents and works by military theoreticians which have appeared in the last decade--is now detailed to such an extent that its very presence in the arsenal of American strategic thinking makes the possibility of a rapid slide toward nuclear conflict more real. Today it includes plans for "selective nuclear strikes" against the territory of the USSR and for a "limited" nuclear war in Europe, as well as projects for the use of nuclear weapons during operations by the "Rapid Deployment Forces" in the zone of the developing countries.

When discussing the possibility of limited strikes and control over the escalation of war, and also protracted and graduated exchanges of nuclear strikes, Western specialists frequently discuss the first use of nuclear weapons as if it were some kind of isolated, almost symbolic act, after which both sides will immediately get down to settling the conflict which, in its turn, could, quote, lead to a mutually acceptable compromise. There is nothing more dangerous than ideas such as these. The use of nuclear weapons cannot be regarded as a "demarche in a crisis situation." It would signify a "crossing of the Rubicon" and give rise to a chain of irreversible events. The use of nuclear weapons would threaten the vital interests of the other side and provoke a counterstrike calculated to cause the maximum destruction of the enemy. Nuclear war is not a "joint

enterprise," not a game with rules and limitations known well in advance: By virtue of the physical properties of nuclear weapons and the consequences of using them, such a war would be the greatest catastrophe in history.

The inhumanity of the concept of a "limited" nuclear war also lies in the fact that for certain regions it would be a total war from the very outset. A nuclear conflict that is "limited" from the viewpoint of the United States would signify the destruction of European civilization.⁶

Soviet political thinking and our military doctrine totally reject the very idea of a "limited" nuclear war. As S.F. Akhromeyev, marshal of the Soviet Union, has noted, "in contemporary conditions, given the existence of many thousands of nuclear warheads on both sides, a limited war is impossible. If nuclear war does break out it will inevitably become universal, with all the resulting consequences. The theory of a 'limited' nuclear war, however, proceeds from a false interpretation of the essence of the matter and from the desire to make the very idea of nuclear war acceptable to public opinion and to instill the idea in people that nuclear conflict can supposedly be waged in accordance with some previously developed 'rules'"⁷

The Soviet Military Encyclopaedic Dictionary clearly states that "the concept of a limited nuclear war is considered untenable in Soviet military theory, because it is virtually impossible to keep nuclear war within some earlier defined limits."⁸

Behind the statements and appraisals cited there lies a thorough understanding of the essence and nature of war in general and of nuclear war in particular. This understanding of the phenomenon in question is based on extensive experience of very serious wars in the past and on scientific understanding of the realities of the nuclear age on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory and methodology. It should not be forgotten that precisely the Soviet Union bore on its shoulders the main burden of the struggle against that most dangerous of enemies--Hitler's Germany and its Wehrmacht. This in many ways explains the realism which characterizes contemporary military-political thinking in the USSR and by virtue of which there are no artificial constructions in Soviet military-political thinking such as "limited" nuclear war, "surgically precise" nuclear strikes, and so forth. One must be fully aware of the fact that the reality of war is both more simple and more terrible than it is imagined by many armchair strategists on the other side of the ocean.

It is appropriate to recall in this connection the concept of the "friction of war" put into circulation in the middle of the last century by K. Clausewitz, whose work *On War* was highly appraised by F. Engels and V.I. Lenin. "Friction is the only concept which in general differentiates between real war and war on paper. The military machine--the army and everything connected with it--is basically extremely simple, and that is why it seems easy to control. But let us remember that not one of its component parts is made all of a piece; everything is definitely composed of separate individuals, each of whom experiences friction in all directions.... This terrible friction, which cannot be concentrated, as in mechanics, in several points, everywhere comes into contact with chance and gives rise to phenomena which it is impossible to take into account beforehand, because they are mainly chance in nature."⁹

In Clausewitz's time, the military technology with which we deal today was not in evidence even in rudimentary form. In recent decades, however, the means of waging war have grown and developed from their individual elements into a kind of technosphere. Its existence and rapid growth stimulate to a considerable extent Western theoreticians' creation of super-refined strategic concepts.

However, facts attest that the formation of a military technosphere leads not to a lessening of the "friction of war," but to an increase in this tension--on account of the multitude of extremely complex effects of interaction between the individual and technology in extreme conditions and on a mass scale. This is attested to in particular by certain American research works on the unreliability of fundamental elements of electronic computer technology in real combat conditions.

Before the beginning of the nuclear age, a state's adoption of unrealistic schemes for waging war primarily signified the danger of this state being cruelly defeated in war. To a certain extent, from a purely military point of view, this was advantageous to its enemies. Today one has to relate to this differently. A state leadership that adopts concepts which fail to take into account the real nature of war, and, in particular, concepts calculated on the "controlability" and "limited nature" of military conflicts using mass destruction weapons, condemns its country and its people to certain destruction in the event of war breaking out; it could also drag the whole of mankind after it into nonexistence.

III

The Soviet Union's scientifically substantiated and clear position regarding the danger of different concepts and plans for a "limited" and "protracted" nuclear war is finding increasing understanding among many Western scientists, social and political figures, and mass movements working to prevent a nuclear catastrophe and to limit and reduce mass destruction weapons. This fact cannot fail to be taken into account by the American leadership which, in the face of sharp criticism of its policies in the military (primarily nuclear) sphere, has undertaken various propagandist and diplomatic maneuvers. As the 1984 presidential elections drew nearer, the head of state and certain members of his administration began to promise--if reelected to a second term--to make arms limitation and reduction the prime task. In this respect, previous "revelations" by representatives of this administration regarding nuclear weapons were painted over in every way possible and sometimes even refuted. One of the subjects of Washington propaganda was the argument, as, for example, G. Keyworth, the U.S. President's science adviser, stated in an interview with the newspaper THE WASHINGTON TIMES on 21 October 1984, that "one must get away from the accent on tactical nuclear weapons" in Europe. Instead, it is proposed to count on developing new nonnuclear means of waging a war by using the latest achievements in radar and developing optical and infrared sensors, minicomputers, and new forms of munitions of enhanced power. The United States has adopted the aggressive concepts of "air-land operations" and "deep strike" (with increasing emphasis on the key role played by new nonnuclear strike weapons). These concepts are critically appraised by many figures

in the West European states, who rightly regard them as one more attempt by Washington to get out of the strategic "nuclear stalemate" by means of acquiring the ability to conduct large-scale combat operations in Europe without using nuclear weapons, while at the same time envisaging achieving the necessary result in this theater of military operations.

Consideration of all these factors in sum total makes it possible to say that the development of conventional forces and weapons systems spurred on by U.S. actions is progressing in such a way that, by the year 2000, a number of these forces and weapons systems will be comparable to certain types of mass destruction weapons in terms of their strike capacity. And even a conventional war, for example, in the center of Europe, in contemporary conditions (given the existence of vast stocks of hydrocarbons, numerous nuclear power plants, stored waste materials from chemical production, and so forth) would be a catastrophe commensurable with the results of using various types of nuclear weapons.

Another way in which the United States is now attempting to get out of the "nuclear stalemate" is its plans to build a large-scale antimissile system with space-based elements, and also a series of other strategic "defensive measures, including the accelerated development of forces and weapons for strategic antisubmarine warfare.

They are primarily relying on the creation of space-based elements of such a system using weapons based on new physical principles (including laser and particle beam weapons) and electrodynamic mass accelerators. In a speech given on 23 March 1983, President Reagan urged American scientists and the entire nation to concentrate their efforts on realizing a long-term "defensive" program as a "means capable of rendering nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete."

Under the title "High Frontier," the authors of one of the versions of an antimissile defense system, extensively publicized by militarist circles, claim that as a result of building such a system the United States would make a transition from the state of a "balance of fear" to "guaranteed survival." In this respect it is emphasized that the existence of this kind of "defense" corresponds to "the American's ideas regarding military problems." It is obvious that the advocates of building this system try, for demagogic purposes, to play on the natural human desire to find at last protection against the all-destructive might of nuclear weapons.

A working group of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat has carried out some special research of this problem.¹⁰ The potentials of antimissile defense systems using various types of lasers and neutron particle accelerators were studied. It was a question of lasers with X-ray radiation fed by nuclear explosion, and also other types of directed-energy weapons.

The research work once again confirmed the conclusion made in the "Appeal by Soviet Scientists" signed by full members of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "In reality, the attempt to build so-called 'defensive weapons' against the strategic nuclear forces of the other side... will inevitably express itself

in the appearance of another element increasing American potential for a "first strike".... 'Defensive weapons' of this kind can do almost nothing for a country suffering a sudden massive attack, because it is clearly incapable of protecting the overwhelming majority of the population. The use of anti-missile defense weapons most suits precisely the attacking side striving to reduce the strength of a counterstrike. However, it cannot completely prevent this counterstrike."¹¹

The results of the group's work accord in many ways with the conclusions drawn by scientists conducting parallel research in other countries, including in the United States. Authoritative American organizations such as the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Federation of American Scientists, the Arms Control Association, and also prominent scientists and specialists from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stanford University, the Brookings Institute, and the U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment have expressed their negative attitude toward plans for building a large-scale antimissile defense system.

One of the most important conclusions drawn by the working group of the Committee of Soviet Scientists is that space-based elements of an antimissile defense system will be highly vulnerable to various means of counteraction--both active and passive. What is more, an effective network of such means could be built much more quickly and would cost much less than the antimissile defense system itself--in relation to the cost of the latter the price of an effective system of counteraction would be a matter of a few percent. The vulnerability of the space-based elements of an antimissile defense system merely increases its destabilizing influence. The fact of the matter is that, while failing to provide effective protection against a massive first strike (carried out while simultaneously using every means of counteraction), such a system is capable of engendering the dangerous illusion of the possibility of protection against a counterstrike, in which case it would be more difficult for the already weakened enemy to take countermeasures against orbital combat stations.

As a whole, building a U.S. antimissile defense system is primarily oriented precisely toward ensuring that a first strike can be carried out with impunity. Analysis of a number of official American documents and works by theoreticians close to the administration shows that Washington regards such a system as a potential shield under the protection of which the United States could wage various kinds of wars (including nuclear wars) while concluding them on conditions advantageous to the United States.¹²

Forced to reckon with scientifically substantiated criticism of their plans to build and deploy space weapons, the supporters of this system in Washington have tried to reconstruct their arguments. While admitting now in a number of cases that space-based antimissile defense weapons will not be an "absolutely impenetrable shield," they have begun to lay emphasis on the fact that they will supposedly increase the "degree of uncertainty" for the enemy and make his military planning and building more difficult. However, even this "argument" does not stand up to any serious criticism. The objection is justly made to American apologists for space weapons that they fail to take into account the fact that increased uncertainty for one side will inevitably lead to the same thing for the other side, as well as to a reduction in strategic stability throughout the world as a whole.

Of course, uncertainty is inherent in the contemporary strategic situation now, by virtue of the very nature of nuclear weapons. But to increase this uncertainty still further would mean increasing the existing danger of war breaking out--nuclear war, beginning with the fact that, in order to lessen the degree of uncertainty created for it, the other side would, in the opinion of scientists, have to adopt measures to further develop its strategic weapons guaranteeing it the potential for carrying out counterstrike.

Of course, with its vast scientific-technical and economic potential, the USSR is capable of doing everything necessary in order to prevent a break in strategic parity and also to prevent the slightest illusion from arising on the other side regarding the possibility of acquiring the ability to carry out a first strike with impunity.

Certain American publications regard a space antimissile defense system also as an antisatellite weapons system. In this connection it should be clearly emphasized that the deployment of space-based antimissile defense weapons even on a limited scale will mean increased instability in the world situation and a serious undermining of international security, because the present military-political balance in many ways depends on the existence of control and surveillance systems using various types of artificial satellites of the earth.

Analysis of versions developed in the United States for building a space antimissile defense system leaves no doubt that such a system could be intended not only for striking the other side's satellites and strategic missiles after they have been launched, but also for striking objectives on earth, once again precisely for the purpose of carrying out a first strike.

Many prominent social and political figures in the West recognize the exceptionally important role now played by the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, of unlimited duration, signed by the USSR and the United States in Moscow on 26 May 1972. In this connection we will quote paragraph 1 of Article V of the Treaty: "Each Party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based."

Introduction of another (qualitatively new) component into the structure of strategic forces by one or both of the sides will greatly complicate the entire system of strategic balance and create additional complications for calculating the correlation of the sides' forces. It must also be noted that if the United States were to build a space antimissile defense system, this would place a barrier in the way of Soviet-American cooperation in the utilization of outer space for peaceful purposes. Meanwhile the value of such cooperation is great, including on both an economic and scientific-technical level, because in many of their parameters Soviet and U.S. space programs complement one another. Great would be the role of such cooperation on a political-psychological level--from the point of view of improving the entire atmosphere of Soviet-American relations and establishing mutual trust.

IV

The steady build up of nuclear weapons, the thoughtless utilization of any scientific-technical possibilities that open up, and, as a consequence of this, the undermining of strategic stability and the weakening of the security of the United States itself prompted a group of American experts and politicians at the beginning of the eighties in the direction of seeking to "rationalize" the arms race conducted by the United States. In particular, they have been forced to admit that about 12-15 years ago the U.S. leadership made a serious mistake by embarking on the path of increasing warheads on strategic carriers by means of equipping them with independently targeted warheads (MIRVs). The number of such carriers has been limited in accordance with the SALT I Treaty. Having rejected Soviet proposals to ban intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and sea-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) with MIRVs, American leaders hoped to retain their superiority over the USSR for the foreseeable future in terms of the number and precision of warheads. However, these hopes proved to be groundless. The Soviet Union rapidly built analogous weapons, thereby preventing the United States from gaining any advantages.¹³

Recognizing that the problem of strategic stability is of a reciprocal nature, the advocates of "rationalizing" the construction of U.S. armed forces (A. Gore, B. Scowcroft, H. Kissinger and others) put forward the idea in 1983 of "deMIRVing," that is, gradually returning to single-warhead strategic ballistic missiles. This approach, in their opinion, would increase the "survivability" of strategic forces and reduce the possibility and probability of a first strike aimed at disarming the enemy by reducing the number of warheads on both sides targeted at every carrier on the other side. It was proposed that at first only ICBMs would be switched to single-warhead missiles, and only in the more distant future--after approximately 15 years--could this also be applied to the sea-based component of strategic forces. This order of priority in the matter of making the transition to single bloc ICBMs revealed the same policy aimed at giving the American side unilateral advantages, considering the fact that land-based ICBMs comprise the basis of Soviet strategic nuclear might, while SLBMs and heavy bombers fill this role for the "United States. In this respect the issue of rejecting long-range cruise missiles on heavy bombers is completely side-stepped, although within the framework of the SALT II treaty heavy bombers equipped with cruise missiles are equated in a number of parameters with ICBMs and with MIRVED SLBMs.

The advocates of this approach to restructuring the strategic forces also deliberately ignore the factor of the growth of the numbers of warheads (as a result of extensive programs of MIRVing the strategic forces of Britain and France). There is no doubt that the policy of equipping the single-warhead intercontinental ballistic missiles with high precision warheads, which is now dominant in the United States, runs counter to the interests of maintaining the strategic balance.

In considering such a complicated and multi-level problem as strategic stability it is necessary to take into account a multitude of its component elements, that is, political, military-technical, doctrinal, and other elements.

As far as the military-technical aspects of the problem are concerned, it is necessary to note a whole series of factors which are usually concealed by many American specialists. These factors are:

Reduction of the flight time (in the case of Pershing II missiles to approximately 8 to 10 minutes, as compared with a flight time of 25 to 30 minutes for American intercontinental ballistic missiles), which does not simply make the use of detection and warning means more difficult but in fact also reduces to a minimum the time necessary for making a decision, that is, it disrupts stability to the advantage of the aggressor;

Launching on unpredictable trajectories, which primarily applies to the possible launchings of contemporary or future submarine-launched ballistic missiles and long-range cruise missiles;

Reduced possibilities for radar detection (in particular, by means of "Stealth" technology); and

Difficulties in ensuring two-way communications with command centers (this is especially important for the sea component of the strategic "triad") which increases the chance factor and the danger of unapproved use of nuclear weapons.¹⁴

All in all, strict scientific analysis of the military-political problems--both present and possible long-range ones--made by many Soviet and responsible Western scientists convincingly shows that it is impossible to reliably ensure the security of a state by means of military-technical innovations. Even the very illusion of possible achievement of such security is extraordinarily dangerous.

At the same time, the situation of "mutual assured destruction," also cannot be a guarantee of peace because in this situation the line between peace and war and between existence and nonexistence becomes thin to a certain extent.

The danger of a nuclear catastrophe only increases if we proceed from the principle that a state can protect its security at the expense of the security of others. It is necessary to strive for equal security for all.

However, U.S. militant circles approach the problem of security on the basis of former criteria and categories. They separate national security from international and universal security and strive to ensure national security with methods that have served their time, that is, along the path of the arms race and of achieving military superiority. The intention of restoring the role of military force in world political affairs at all levels and in relation to virtually all subjects of international relations is also connected with this.

A whole range of influential Western strategists in fact strives to refute the qualitatively new properties of nuclear weapons which have effected a revolution in strategy and in the very approach to war. The most reactionary representatives of American strategic thinking strive to prove that thermonuclear weapons should be accepted in general and, on the

whole, in the same way as conventional bombs and shells--except that they have a greater destructive power--and that, correspondingly, they should be used to achieve quite definite and completely real political, strategic, or operational-tactical goals. Certain American scientists-physicists who have become part of the body of the U.S. military-industrial complex speak in an analogous spirit. They try to diminish the catastrophic consequences of nuclear war by suggesting to the public the idea of its "acceptability."

The Soviet side's approach to the role of nuclear weapons in international relations and to the significance of military force in general is of an essentially different nature. As K.U. Chernenko has emphasized, "it is criminal to consider thermonuclear war as a rational and almost 'legitimate' extension of policy. Today, any responsible statesman must realize that setting hopes on force and on the use of nuclear missile weapons jeopardizes mankind's future."

The Soviet party and state leadership, the Soviet public and scientists emphasize that the main directions as regards questions of strengthening international security are arms limitation and disarmament, because the common interest of all states and peoples is in not allowing a nuclear catastrophe to be connected with them. In the contemporary situation, under conditions of the activation of reactionary and militarist forces, there also can be no other way but the way of gradually advancing to the final goal, the liquidation of nuclear weapons and the step-by-step solution of the task of limiting and reducing arms, while at any given moment equilibrium is maintained, but at a lower level.

Further evidence of the consistency, far-sightedness, and realism of the Soviet approach to the problems of arms limitation and disarmament is provided by the concept, put forward by the Soviet Union, of new negotiations between the USSR and the United States, within the framework of which problems of non-militarization of outer space, strategic nuclear weapons, and intermediate-range nuclear weapons will be examined as a complex. During a talk with Soviet political observers on 13 January 1985, A.A. Gromyko said in reply to a question on the prospects of reducing strategic weapons that "to consider the problem of banning strategic weapons in isolation from the problems of space weapons... is impossible. But if the problems of outer space are examined in the necessary direction and if agreements came to light in this sphere, then progress will also be able to be made in the problems of strategic weapons."¹⁵

An important step on the way to reaching the main goal of the Soviet-American talks--the complete exclusion of nuclear weapons from the arsenal of armaments--would be a quantitative and qualitative freeze on nuclear weapons by all states in possession of such weapons. The Soviet Union and the United States could be the first to do this on a bilateral basis as an example to other nuclear powers. Despite the frenzied attacks of open and disguised advocates of the arms race in the United States and other capitalist states, this idea has found the broadest support in the world community, including among many scientists who have carried out corresponding research. The Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, which has published the aforementioned special report on this problem,

has expressed its opinion on the stabilizing role of a freeze on nuclear weapons and on the reliability of existing means and methods of controlling and verifying a potential agreement on freezing nuclear arsenals.

The increasing might of the socialist community, the humanist orientation and scientific validity of the foreign policy of the USSR and other socialist countries, the upsurge in the mass antiwar movement, and the putting forward of constructive alternatives to the present dangerous military-political course pursued by the United States and NATO in a number of countries in the West--all this provides grounds for saying that it is completely possible to overcome the present stage of exacerbation in the international situation. This will require tireless and purposeful effort on the part of all peace-loving forces on the planet, as well as a thorough and comprehensive understanding, analysis, and timely disclosure of problems which arise on the way to constructively resolving the cardinal problems of war and peace.

FOOTNOTES

1. PRAVDA, 2 February 1985.
2. Yu.V. Andropov, Selected Speeches and Articles, Moscow, 1983, p 253.
3. A. Arbatov, The Military-Strategic Balance and the Policy of the Reagan Administration, MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 10, 1984.
4. PRAVDA, 23 September 1983.
5. VESTNIK AKADEMII NAUK SSR, No 9, 1983, p 80.
6. V. Zhurkin, No to Concepts of Nuclear War, in A New World Order and the Political Community, Moscow, 1983, p 12.
7. VESTNIK AKADEMII NAUK SSSR, No 9, 1983, p 48.
8. The Military Encyclopedic Dictionary, Moscow, 1983, p 842.
9. K. Clausewitz, On War, Vol 1, Moscow, 1937, pp 104-105.
10. The Strategic and International-Political Consequences of Building a Space-Based Antimissile Defense System Using Directed-Energy Weapons, Moscow, 1984.
11. NOVOYE VREMYA, No 16, 1983, p 10.
12. For example C. Gray, Nuclear Strategy and Strategic Planning, Philadelphia, 1984.
13. At the beginning of the eighties USSR strategic forces numbered approximately 2,500 carriers and 7,000 nuclear warheads, while the United States had approximately 2,300 carriers and 13,000 warheads. In this respect it should be taken into account that there is a considerable asymmetry in the structure of the sides' strategic forces. See "Whence Emanates the Threat to Peace," Moscow, 1982, p 8.

14. "The Problem of the Freeze of Nuclear Weapons. Report of the Committee of Soviet Scientists for Defense of Peace and Against Nuclear Threat." Moscow, 1984, p 33.
15. PRAVDA, 14 June 1985.

SOVIET DEFENSE OF POLISH, FRENCH INTERESTS AT YALTA RECALLED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4,
Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 44-52

[Article by A. Roshchin: "The Lessons of Yalta and the Present Day"]

[Excerpts] The Crimea conference of the leaders of the three allied powers--the USSR, the United States and Great Britain--which was held in February 1945 in Yalta, occupies a special place among such events. Only 3 months separate it from fascist Germany's unconditional surrender. And Japanese militarism suffered a crushing defeat 7 months later. Thus a great mission fell to the lot of the Crimea conference--charting the paths of the joint and swift conclusion of the war against Hitler Germany and militarist Japan and also solving problems of the world's postwar arrangement. By the time of the opening of the meeting--4 February--only 60 kilometers separated Soviet forces from Berlin. They had approached the River Oder, cut off the East Prussia grouping from the remainder of Hitler's Wehrmacht, had basically completed the liberation of Poland and a considerable proportion of Czechoslovakia and had almost completely taken possession of the Silesian industrial area.

It should be borne in mind that even at the start of 1945 a very difficult situation had taken shape for our allies on the Western Front. Having breached the front in the Ardennes, the Germans had gone onto the offensive. As is known, the British prime minister then urgently requested of the Soviet leadership that it step up the offensive on the Eastern Front. True to its allied duty, the Soviet High Command accelerated implementation of the outlined plans and struck a number of devastating blows at the common enemy. This made it possible not only to halt the German advance in the West but to resume the Anglo-American forces' offensive operations. By the time of the opening of the conference in Yalta the latter had surmounted the Ziegfried Line on Germany's Western border, reached the Rhine in the Strasbourg area and were 500 kilometers from Berlin. The allies themselves emphasized repeatedly that the Soviet people and their armed forces had broken the backbone of Hitler's military machine to such an extent that this had predetermined the inevitability and proximity of fascist Germany's final catastrophe.

The People's Liberation Army of Yugoslavia and armies and formations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania fought against the aggressor together with the Soviet Army. Armies and formations of France, Belgium and Holland and also Canada and other British dominions operated together with the Anglo-American forces on the Western Front.

We would also recall that by the time of the opening of the conference the Third Reich had lost all its satellites in Europe in the shape of the ruling circles of Italy, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Finland.

The Crimea conference was a landmark of paramount significance in the military-political cooperation of the three allied powers in the accomplishment of tasks connected both with the completion of the war and the elaboration of joint strategy and the principles of the postwar arrangement, primarily in Europe. At the center thereof was concern for the preservation and strengthening of the three powers' effective cooperation for the purpose of guaranteeing lasting, indestructible peace in the interests of all mankind. The most essential prerequisite of this had to be prevention of the possibility of a revival of German militarism and revanchism, in other words, the unleashing of a war from German soil and a repetition of the tragedy which had brought the peoples of Europe and the whole world so many calamities. "The most... important condition for the preservation of lasting peace," I.V. Stalin declared in his speech at the conference, "is the unity of the three powers. If such unity is preserved, the German danger is not to be feared. It is therefore necessary to ponder how best to ensure a united front among the three powers, to which France and China should be added."*

Inasmuch as by the start of the meeting the question of Germany's defeat had in fact been predetermined, the main place in its work was occupied by problems of the postwar settlement. At the center of attention was, naturally, the German question. The ink on the protocols and decisions of the Crimea conference on this problem had not dried before the machinery of subtle falsifications and complete distortion of the Soviet Union's position was activated in the West. At first the proposition was advanced to the effect that the USSR had occupied a "particularly tough" position here, while the United States and Britain had allegedly displayed the utmost "moderation". The misfortune for the creators of such falsifications is that the world community now has at its disposal documents which reveal fully and in detail the content and progress of the work of the Crimea conference and also of the meetings of the leaders of the allied powers which preceded and followed it.

To what do they testify?

Back at the Tehran conference in November 1943 the United States and Great Britain had advocated Germany's partition into several separate independent states. This question was raised by Britain in January 1944 in the European Consultative Commission, which had been set up at the Moscow conference of foreign ministers of the USSR, the United States and Great Britain in the fall of 1943 for coordinating problems of the postwar settlement in Europe. The British side proposed at that time the creation of a committee for the partition of Germany. The USSR's representative did not support the said proposal, declaring that he was not prepared to associate himself with the work on a study thereof.

* "The Soviet Union at International Conferences of the Great Patriotic War Period, 1941-1945," Vol IV, "The Crimea Conference of the Leaders of the Three Allied Powers--the USSR, the United States and Great Britain, 4-11 February 1945. Collection of Documents" (henceforward: "The Crimea Conference..."), Moscow, 1980, p 87.

Nonetheless, the United States and Britain continued to persist in their position. At the Quebec conference in September 1944 the U.S. President and the prime minister of Great Britain initialed the "Morgenthau Plan" (U.S. treasury secretary), which provided for Germany's participation into a number of independent states and their conversion, the Ruhr and Saar industrial districts included, into agrarian regions devoid of significant industry. This territory, the "Morgenthau Plan" for the Ruhr and its adjacent industrial areas said, should not only be deprived of all industry which currently exists but also weakened and administered such that it may not in the foreseeable future become an industrial region. All industrial enterprises and equipment not destroyed by military operations should either be dismantled completely, withdrawn from this region or completely liquidated.*

It is appropriate to point out that in October 1944, in the course of Soviet-British negotiations in Moscow, the British prime minister declared that he and the U.S. President supported the "tough treatment of Germany" (remember the reproach connected with the "tough" position of the USSR--the same words were used!--A.R.). In addition, W. Churchill and A. Eden, who accompanied him, set forth a plan for Germany's partition into three states: Prussia, a zone of international control consisting of the Ruhr, Westphalia and Saar districts and an Austro-Bavarian state incorporating the South German provinces. It was candidly "specified" here that international control of the industry of the three said industrial districts would enable Britain to take Germany's place in the production of commodities for the European market.

In Yalta the Western powers again raised the question of Germany's partition. The conference confined itself to the creation of a special commission consisting of the foreign minister of Great Britain and the ambassadors of the USSR and the United States in this country. The USSR representative declared at the commission session on 26 March 1945: "The Soviet Government understands the Crimea conference's decision on Germany's partition not as a binding plan for Germany's partition but as a possible prospect for pressure on Germany for the purpose of neutralizing it in the event of other means proving insufficient."**

The long-awaited day of Hitler Germany's surrender, which had been paid for with the blood of tens of millions of people, arrived. In the address to the Soviet people on 9 May I.V. Stalin proclaimed: "The Soviet Union is celebrating victory, although it does not intend either to partition or destroy Germany."***

In the context of an all-European settlement the Crimea conference could not, naturally, have failed to have dealt with the problem of Poland's borders. And, as is known, there is no shortage of speculation in the West in this connection aimed at flouting the vital interests of the Polish people and encouraging ravanchism in West Germany. In Yalta the Soviet Union proposed that Poland's western border run from Stettin along the River Oder and further

* See H. Feis, "Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin," Princeton, 1970, p 370.

** "The Crimea Conference....," pp 20-21.

*** "The Soviet Union's Foreign Policy in the Patriotic War Period," vol 3, Moscow, 1947, p 45.

along the West Neisse River. However, the leaders of the United States and Britain did not consent to this. A decision of a general nature was adopted, namely: "Poland should obtain an appreciable increase in territory in the North and the West." It was further pointed out that "the opinion of the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity will be canvassed on the question of the size of these increments at the proper time, and in the wake of this the final determination of Poland's western border will be deferred until the peace conference."* Poland's western border was in fact finally determined in the form proposed by the Soviet Union at the Potsdam conference of leaders of the three allied powers in July-August of the same year.

Nonetheless, right up until the present attempts have been made in Western countries, primarily in the United States, Britain and the FRG, to contest the legality--and the very fact even--of the establishment of Poland's western border in Potsdam, referring to the fact that it was to be finally determined by a "peace conference". Such an assertion is, alas, groundless.

We shall refer primarily to the fact that the Potsdam conference adopted a decision on the resettlement of Germans from Poland--this logically ensued from the fact of the establishment of Poland's new western border. The Germany Control Council (consisting of representatives of the USSR, the United States, Britain and France) adopted unanimously on 20 November 1945 a plan for the resettlement of Germans from the territories which had passed to Poland, which was implemented by January 1947. "It could occur to no one," V.M. Molotov declared on 9 April 1947 at a meeting of the allied powers' Council of Foreign Ministers, "that the eviction of Germans from these territories, as also the installation of Poles on these territories (of whom there were approximately 5 million there by that time), was adopted only as a transient experiment.... It is not possible to play with such things, not to mention the fact that this would be intolerable cruelty not only in respect of the Poles but also in respect of the Germans themselves." Thus the Western powers' adoption of the plan for the resettlement of the German population from the territories handed over to Poland cannot be evaluated other than as their confirmation of the conclusive establishment of the German-Polish border which exists currently.

Further, the decision of the Potsdam conference noted that the territories east of this border "should be under the control of the Polish state, and in this respect they should not be regarded as part of the Soviet occupation zone in Germany."** The territories east of the prewar German-Polish border were thereby recognized as belonging to Poland.

We would also recall that U.S. President H. Truman, speaking on radio on 9 August 1945, declared: "The territory which will be administered by the Poles will afford Poland an opportunity of better supporting the existence of its population. It will afford an opportunity for the better defense of the borders between Poland and Germany. Populated by Poles, it will lead to the

* "The Crimea Conference....," p 261.

** "Berlin Conference of Leaders of the Three Allied Powers--the USSR, United States and Great Britain," Moscow, 1980, p 483.

creation of a more homogeneous nation."

On 6 July 1950 the GDR and Poland signed a border agreement providing for the demarcation of the "inviolable border of friendship" which exists between them. In turn, the treaty between Poland and the FRG of 7 December 1970 on the principles of normalization of their relations confirmed the inviolability of existing borders and contained a commitment to unswervingly observe both states' territorial integrity.

The historic Final Act of the All-European Conference in Helsinki which was signed on 1 August 1975 by the European states and also the United States and Canada confirms the inviolability of the borders and the territorial integrity of all the states which participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The eminent American diplomat C. Bohlen, who participated in the Yalta conference, wrote: "Poland was a subject which caused the most prolonged, wearisome and futile debate with the Soviet Union in the Crimea."*

From the very outset the American and British delegations endeavored to foist on Poland the authority of the emigre "government" in London. Their purpose was obvious: to impose on the country a regime which would act to the imperialist powers' liking, restore bourgeois practices therein and once again use Poland, as had been the case in the interwar period, as an anti-Soviet cordon sanitaire.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it set the task of the restoration of a strong, democratic Poland which was friendly in respect of the USSR. The Polish Committee for National Liberation, which was converted at the end of the same year into the Provisional Government of the Polish Republic, which was recognized by the Soviet Union, had been set up on liberated territory in July 1944. "The question of Poland," I.V. Stalin declared in Yalta, "is a question of life and death for the Soviet state."**

The conference adopted the decision that the Provisional Government operating in Poland should be "reorganized on a broader democratic basis incorporating democratic figures from Poland itself and Poles from abroad."*** In the course of the subsequent consultations within the framework of the three powers' Commission for Poland, which had been set up in Yalta, the representatives of the United States and Britain attempted to achieve not the reorganization but the abolition of the Provisional Government which existed in Poland, which was emphatically rebuffed by the Soviet side. It was only in May 1945, in the course of the USSR leaders' negotiations with H. Hopkins, adviser of the U.S. President, who had come to Moscow, that the question of the Polish Government was settled.

We have already mentioned the discussion at the conference of the question of Poland's western border. As far as its eastern border was concerned, the

* C. Bohlen, "The Transformation of American Foreign Policy," London, 1969, p 39.

** "The Crimea Conference...", p 93.

*** Ibid., p 213.

Soviet Union advocated its establishment on the basis of the Curzon Line proposed by the Entente countries and the United States back in 1919 at the Versailles peace conference. Understandably, neither Roosevelt nor Churchill could raise any objections to this and they agreed that "Poland's eastern border should run along the Curzon Line with a deviation from it in certain areas of 5-8 kilometers in favor of Poland."*

This solution corresponded fully to the interests of the two neighbor states--the USSR and Poland--and the development of friendly relations between them. In August 1945 the USSR and Poland signed the state border treaty.

There is no doubt that the anti-Polish campaign developed by imperialist circles in recent years has been aimed at undermining the interests of both Poland and the Soviet Union and undermining the great friendship of the two peoples. And attacks on the Yalta decisions on questions of the Polish borders are assigned a considerable role in this campaign.

As is known, France was not a participant in the Crimea conference. But inasmuch as it discussed problems of the postwar settlement in Europe, the question of France's place and role in such a settlement could not have failed to have occupied a fitting place. Specifically it was a question of the allocation for it of an occupation zone in Germany and enlistment in the control of the defeated country, that is, according to its membership of the Germany Control Council. Serious contradictions were revealed here primarily between the United States and Britain. The British representatives supported the allocation of such a zone and France's participation in the Control Council. London hoped thereby to strengthen its positions in Europe and in the colonial world and also prevent the growth of the democratic movement in France itself. The evaluation of the British position made by F. Roosevelt is highly characteristic. In the course of a conversation with I.V. Stalin he said that the British wished to make France a strong power with a 200,000-strong army, which would have, in the event of Germany's new aggression, to take on itself the first assault and hold positions until the British had created their own army. "The British," F. Roosevelt continued, "are strange people. They wish to have their cake and eat it." Washington, on the other hand, endeavored to prevent a strengthening of the influence of the European states on the postwar settlement and also to lay its hands on their colonial possessions. Roosevelt originally objected to France's participation in the Control Council. "He believed," C. Bohlen wrote, "that the inclusion of France (in the Control Council--A.R.) would only give rise to unrest, aggravation and difficulties."** The U.S. President proposed that "all questions pertaining to France's participation in the control apparatus be deferred. If the control apparatus consists of three powers, he observed, it would be easier for it to work."***

Proceeding from the need to ensure France's restoration as a great, sovereign and independent power, the Soviet Union supported its participation in the settlement of the German problem. "France," I.V. Stalin declared, "is an ally of the USSR. A treaty has recently been concluded between France

* "The Crimea Conference...", p 214.

** C. Bohlen, Op. cit., p 42.

*** "The Crimea Conference...", p 68.

and the Soviet Union on alliance and mutual assistance (signed in Moscow on 10 December 1944--A.R.). The Soviet Union is concerned for France to have a strong army. The Soviet Government spoke of this earlier with the France of Daladier and recently with the France of de Gaulle. He, Stalin, is for a great France."*

The conference decided that "France should be granted in Germany a zone to be occupied by French forces. This zone will be formed from the British and American zones." At the same time France was invited "to membership of the Germany Control Council."**

What are the most important lessons of Yalta which have retained their vitality in our day also?

Doing everything to avert a new tragedy and to exclude war as a means of solving disputes and disagreements means fulfilling the solemn commitments assumed by the allies in the anti-Hitler coalition.

This conclusion ensues from a most important lesson of World War II: it is necessary to fight against war before it begins. And the Soviet state has proven and continues to prove by its entire foreign policy activity its readiness for equal, honest cooperation in the struggle for the accomplishment of this most noble task with all states and with all public and political movements.

Evaluating the results of the Yalta conference, President F. Roosevelt said: "...We achieved unity of thought and agreement on how we will live together henceforward." Unfortunately, postwar development--and not through our fault but by the will of the short-sighted successors of the outstanding president--took a different path. But the conclusion drawn 40 years ago retains its relevance. As observed in the course of a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation visit to the United States in March 1985, the Soviet and American peoples and the entire world community have only gained when the USSR and the United States have acted concertedly, considered one another's legitimate interests and operated in accordance with the rules of international community living.

In the war years the leading powers of the anti-Hitler coalition were able, although belonging to different social systems, to rally together and confront the common enemy, who had made an attempt against the very existence of human civilization, and were able to establish--in Yalta and Potsdam--cooperation, in the formulation of the postwar peace arrangement included. The main thing today is to give thought to how to defend peace and civilization in the face of a historically unprecedented threat--the threat of its annihilation in the conflagration of a thermonuclear catastrophe--and how to learn to live on the same planet and establish mutually enriching and fruitful cooperation.

* "The Crimea Conference...", pp 66-67.

** Ibid., p 259.

So, a most important lesson of Yalta is the conclusion concerning the possibility and necessity of unifying the efforts of peoples and states with different social systems in combating the nuclear threat and tackling the global tasks confronting mankind.

Extraordinary relevance is attached under current conditions to defense of the fundamental principles of the world's postwar arrangement formulated in Yalta, primarily observance of the principles of territorial integrity and the inviolability of borders as an indispensable guarantee of peace and international stability. Under conditions where, given the direct connivance of and instigation even of bellicose U.S. circles, in West Germany revanchism and militarism are again raising their heads, it is particularly appropriate to recall the Yalta decisions aimed at preventing a threat to peace again emanating from German soil. And is not such a threat, apart from anything else, created by the deployment of American first-strike nuclear missiles on FRG territory. It is precisely under the protection of the overseas missiles that certain circles of this country are attacking the postwar territorial-political realities in Europe. It is thus a question of actions and designs in crying contradiction with the spirit of Yalta.

Addressing an election meeting on 19 February 1985, A.A. Gromyko emphasized: "It is granted no one to infringe the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, which have for four decades now formed the basis of European and general peace. The peoples paid a stiff price for these agreements."

Immediately after the end of the war, however, the West's imperialist circles embarked on a path of a bitter campaign of attacks on the decisions of the Yalta conference and their most flagrant falsification. How can we not recall here the fact that an important step which initiated the process of the Western powers' gradual departure from observance of the Yalta accords was W. Churchill's notorious Fulton speech. It is interesting to recall that back at the start of the 1950's the inveterate obscurantist Sen J. McCarthy had characterized the Crimea conference as a "conspiracy against America." R. Nixon spoke of the "ill" repute of Yalta. The position concerning the "Yalta mistake" of the United States and Great Britain, the "betrayal" of the peoples of East Europe and their "deliverance" to the Soviet Union is now widespread in the West. It is thus that attempts are being made to present the results of the great liberating mission of the Soviet armed forces, which, incidentally, ensued directly from the three powers' Yalta commitments. Total silence is maintained here on the incontestable fact that the postwar arrangement was the result of joint decisions and mutual commitments assumed in Yalta by the allies, the United States included. Thus the Soviet Army's liberating mission, which the West attempts to portray as "expansion" and the foisting on the peoples of "Soviet domination" of the "Soviet system," corresponded fully to the international treaties and agreements in effect.

Speaking in September 1983 in Vienna, U.S. Vice President G. Bush, referring to the need for a removal of the "misunderstandings" in an interpretation of the Yalta decisions, virtually demanded a revision thereof. However, it is granted no one to "replay" history, even less to turn it back. Nor will conceited American imperialism be successful in this.

The 40th anniversary of Yalta is a new living reminder of continuity in the struggle for security and cooperation in Europe. Historical experience confirms that the peaceful coexistence of states with different sociopolitical systems is not only a prudent but the sole possible basis of relations between them in our era. The allied meetings and conferences of the World War II period with the participation of the USSR were essentially the first landmarks on the way to the historic forum in Helsinki, whose Final Act enshrined in international law the political realities which had emerged in Europe as a result of the war and postwar development and confirmed the fundamental principles of interstate relations in Europe, primarily the principles of states' territorial integrity and the inviolability of their borders. It may be asserted today with complete justification that without Yalta and Potsdam Helsinki would have been impossible.

The Soviet Union is true to the principles and decisions adopted at the Crimea conference--ideas of peace and cooperation based on reciprocity and equality. Together with its friends and allies it supports a continuation of the dialogue and negotiations with the United States and its partners in the interests of peace and security and for the sake of preventing nuclear war and a quest for mutually acceptable solutions of the questions on which the future of mankind depends.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/13

INDOCHINA PROGRESS PROBLEMS SINCE 1975 VIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 53-65

[Article by M. Isayev: "The Indochina Countries: Along the Path of Social Progress"]

[Excerpt] The arterial directions of united Vietnam's progress along the path of socialist reorganization were charted by the Fourth Vietnam Communist Party Congress in December 1976. The report of Le Duan, general secretary of the Vietnam CP Central Committee, pointed out that "since the victory in the anti-imperialist struggle and the achievement of the complete liberation of the south of the country the Vietnamese revolution has entered a new stage--that of the independence of the entire country and its unity--at which the sole strategic task--accomplishment of the socialist revolution and Vietnam's advance toward socialism--is being tackled."*

In the basic tasks of the Second Five-Year Plan of the Development of the National Economy of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in 1976-1980 determined by the congress the main emphasis was put on an upsurge of agricultural production in order to create the essential prerequisites for socialist industrialization and the population's increased living standard.

With the formation in December 1975 of the Lao People's Democratic Republic (LPDR) a policy of restoration of the economy, which had been undermined by the long war, and preparation of the conditions for a gradual transition to socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development, was adopted.

The Lao People's Revolutionary Party (LPRP) Central Committee Fourth Plenum, which was held in February 1977, concluded that the successes which had been scored by the Lao people in economic restoration following the formation of the LPDR had made it possible to shorten the time frame between the democratic and socialist stages of the revolution and that henceforward Laos was embarking on the stage of socialist revolution.

Having embarked in the mid-1970's on practical work on elaborating the strategy and tactics of the transition of united Vietnam and Laos to socialism,

* "Fourth Vietnam CP Congress," Moscow, 1977, pp 411-412.

the Vietnam CP and the LPRP were guided by the general regularities of socialist revolution, applying them creatively in accordance with the actual specific features of their countries. The tasks of the transitional period in the south of Vietnam and in Laos had to be tackled under conditions where, in Lenin's words, the majority of the people were "not workers who had graduated from the school of capitalist factories and plants but typical representatives of the working, exploited mass of peasants suffering from medieval oppression."*

United Vietnam began the advance toward socialism in a difficult socioeconomic situation. The material-technical base of industry and agriculture remained inadequate, and 80 percent of the working people were employed in manual labor. The fact that different socioeconomic structures continued to exist in the North and South also represented a considerable problem.

As far as Laos is concerned, it had no modern industry before the revolution at all, and agriculture, in which more than 85 percent of the population was employed, was essentially of a subsistence nature.

Lenin's plan of socialist building, V.I. Lenin's works on the transitional period, his approach to an evaluation of the stages of the development of socialism and the tasks corresponding to them, warnings against the danger of "overshooting" and the impermissibility at the same time of "running on the spot," Lenin's thought that the transition to socialism "must inevitably assume special forms in a country in which the numbers of the peasant population are considerable"***--all this was of fundamental significance for the theoretical and practical activity of the ruling communist parties in the Indochina countries.

The profound understanding by the communists of these states of the entire importance of the said Leninist propositions are indicated convincingly by the following pronouncement of K. Phommvihan, general secretary of the LPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Lao Council of Ministers: "It is possible in the modern era to step over developed feudalism and capitalism, but it is not possible without undermining the cause of socialism to step over the objectively necessary stages of the building of the new society. This is why the party does not accept transformations for which the prerequisites are not yet ripe. It rejects attempts, contrary to objective conditions, to socialize everything and collectivize everyone more quickly and to 'introduce socialism' by the purely administrative path. V.I. Lenin warned repeatedly that such attempts merely impede socialist building."***

In the latter half of the 1970's the economic front became the main front in the struggle for socialism in Vietnam and Laos. And considerable successes were scored in this struggle. Despite the domestic difficulties and complex foreign policy conditions (the need to repulse the Pol Pot incursions in 1975-1978 and China's aggression in the spring of 1979), in the Second Five-

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 39, p 329.

** Ibid., vol 37, pp 207-208.

*** "The National Liberation Movement on the Threshold of the 1980's. With Whom Is It?" Prague, 1982, p 228.

Year Plan (1976-1980) Vietnam succeeded in solving a large set of urgent problems of socioeconomic development: many grim consequences of the long war were overcome, the material-technical base of the national economy was strengthened and the positions of the state and cooperative sectors of the economy were consolidated. At the end of the 1980's they were producing approximately 60 percent of the gross social product. Industrial production in 1980 had increased 17.3 percent compared with 1975. Certain positive changes occurred in agriculture, and science, culture, health care and public education were developed.

Particular efforts on the part of the party and the people were required for the realization of socialist transformations in the south of Vietnam. The creation and strengthening of a state sector in industry and commerce initially proceeded along the path of nationalization of the enterprises which had belonged to the comprador bourgeoisie, traitors to the motherland, and the haute bourgeoisie, which had fled abroad. Subsequently increasingly great significance was attached to the creation of mixed state-capitalist enterprises. Of the 3,500 industrial and crafts enterprises of the private sector, 34 percent were nationalized and 14.5 percent became mixed throughout 1976-1980. Together with this private enterprise (under state control) was preserved in a number of sectors.

A priority task, considering the important role of the agrarian sector in Vietnam's economy was the transformation of agriculture in the south of Vietnam. The first steps were not easy. Manifestations of haste in the forming of cooperatives, particularly violations of the principles of a voluntary and gradual approach, which were permitted in certain areas performed a negative role. Nonetheless, the process of enlistment of the peasant masses in collective forms of labor gathered pace.

Considerable attention was paid to the lower forms of collective farming--production solidarity and labor mutual assistance groups and the joint use of agricultural equipment; and the creation of production brigades--a transitional stage on the way to the formation of agricultural cooperatives. Simultaneously surplus land was confiscated from the rich peasant stratum and redistributed among the landless and land-hungry peasants. As a result the lower forms of collective farming extended to more than one-third of peasant homesteads by 1980.

The considerable changes which had occurred in Vietnamese society were enshrined legislatively by the country's constitution adopted in December 1980. Article 2 thereof proclaims that Vietnam is a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the basis of which is the alliance of the working class and peasantry, given the leading role of the proletariat.

In Laos the LPRP Central Committee Fifth Plenum in February 1978 adopted a policy of implementation of a broad range of socioeconomic transformations aimed at laying the foundations of the material-technical base of socialism. In the 3-year plan of the development of the national economy in 1978-1980 paramount significance was attached to an upsurge of agriculture, in which approximately 80 percent of the country's gross social product is created, and to solution of the food problem.

A tremendous amount of work was done in the 3-year plan on reorganization of the entire tenor of life in Laos on a socialist basis. The old civil service was broken up. The power of the working people was established. Public and urban land, natural resources and the property of the comprador bourgeoisie, big feudal lords and other reactionaries was nationalized. The foundation of a state sector of the economy encompassing over 500 enterprises was laid. An effective system of state control of the activity of private entrepreneurs was created.

Although as a result of the huge efforts of the parties and peoples of the two countries they had scored considerable successes in their socioeconomic development, on the eve and at the outset of the 1980's the situation in the national economy of Vietnam and Laos nonetheless remained quite strained. It had not been possible to appreciably reduce the disproportions in the economy of both countries. Population growth exceeded the production growth rate. A shortage of food, cloth and other broad consumer commodities was observed.

The process of implementation of socioeconomic transformations in the south of Vietnam encountered considerable difficulties. One of them was caused by its former dependence on the world capitalist economy. Others arose in the process of reorganization of the countryside, particularly in the rice-growing provinces of the Mekong River delta, where the rich peasants held quite strong positions by the time of liberation.

Throughout their existence practically the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and LPDR have been forced to constantly repulse the incessant encroachments of imperialism and the expansionist forces forming a bloc with them on the revolutionary gains of their peoples. Even now they still have to divert considerable resources (material and human) for the purpose of strengthening defense capability.

In the process of preparations for the Fifth Vietnam CP Congress and the Third LPRP Congress individual shortcomings and miscalculations which had been permitted in the course of realization of the plan quotas of Vietnam's Second Five-Year Plan and the 3-year plan of the development of the LPDR's economy were subjected to critical analysis. The Vietnamese communists, in particular, noted that in the course of realization of the strategic line of the Fourth Vietnam CP Congress aimed at building the new society on a countryside scale the objective laws of socioeconomic development in the period transitional to socialism had sometimes been ignored and elements of voluntarism and "overshooting" had been permitted. Comrade Le Duan emphasized that in the latter half of the 1970's "subjectivism and haste" had been manifested in the course of the accomplishment of national economic tasks and that plans had been compiled with overstated indicators exceeding actual possibilities in terms of scale.*

The decisions of the Vietnam CP Central Committee Sixth (1979) and subsequent plenums provided for a certain adjustment and specification on the party's course. The main one among them was renunciation of the practice of excessive

* See "Fifth Vietnam CP Congress," Moscow, 1983, p 21.

administrative interference in control of the national economy, which had become rooted since the wartime period, introduction of methods of material stimulation of the working people and a broadening of economic initiative and independence locally.

The LPRP Central Committee Seventh Plenum (1979) also pointed to the need for a rectification of the mistakes which had been made connected both with attempts to "overshoot" and with the endeavor of individual leaders to subordinate party strategy to the spontaneous course of events. The plenum advocated socialist reorganization being undertaken in Laos by stages, in scientifically substantiated manner and with regard for the objective requirements of the country's development.

The dialectics of the revolutionary process in countries where national liberation revolutions are under way are such that serious regressive phenomena sometimes emerge against the general background of its progressive movement. In Cambodia, following the victory in the anti-imperialist struggle (April 1975), the decisive contribution to which was made by the country's genuinely revolutionary forces, power was usurped by the Pol Pot extremist, terrorist group. A real threat of the Cambodian people's loss of their revolutionary gains emerged.

The criminal "experiments" and bloody genocide of the Pol Pot adventurists threw the country back decades in the socioeconomic respect. In the atmosphere of the intensified crisis of the regime on the eve and at the outset of 1979 the conditions for its ouster took shape. Under the banner of the Kampuchean United Front of National Salvation (now the Kampuchean United Front for National Construction and Defense) the masses rose up to the struggle. A national-democratic revolution was victorious in the country in January 1979 and the People's Republic of Kampuchea (PRK) was formed.

Most complex tasks confronted the Cambodian people and their vanguard--the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party (KPRP). It was a question of overcoming the catastrophe consequences of Pol Pot rule not only in the socioeconomic but also in the cultural-ideological sphere.

The years 1979-1981 were a period of vigorous restoration work, which began virtually from scratch. In parallel with the process of the establishment of genuine democracy in the country a large and complex set of tasks for the gradual stabilization of the socioeconomic situation, primarily for combating the threat of starvation--the consequences of the complete undermining of the production forces and the disintegration of agriculture by the Pol Pot grouping--was tackled urgently. An inestimable part in the accomplishment of these tasks was played by the assistance of the USSR, Vietnam and other socialist countries and also the assistance of certain international organizations.

The efforts of the KPRP to revive the Cambodian economy produced palpable results. Paramount attention was paid to the dissemination of collective forms of labor in the countryside. In 1980 even the country had more than 50,000 labor mutual assistance groups. A rice harvest was gathered from an

area of 1.5 million hectares in 1980--this contributed to removal of the threat of starvation. Over 80 percent of the industrial enterprises and crafts workshops which had existed earlier resumed operations, which made possible the solution of the problem of employment in the cities. The medical service and the public education system were essentially created anew, and cultural life was revived.

General elections to the local organs of power and to the country's National Assembly were held in May 1981. The historic transformations which had occurred in the PRK were reflected in the constitution adopted at the first session of the National Assembly (June 1981), which legislatively enshrined the orientation of the country's development along the path of independence and socialism.

The first half of the 1980's has been a period of progressive movement of the peoples of the Indochina countries in the building of a new society. Tremendous significance was attached to the decisions of the Fifth Vietnam CP Congress and the Third LPRP Congress in 1982.

The Fifth Vietnam CP Congress mobilized the communists and the people of Vietnam for the accomplishment of two strategic tasks--building the material-technical base of socialism and strengthening the country's defense capability for the purpose of defense of the Vietnamese working people's revolutionary gains. The congress determined the basic directions of the development of the national economy in the Third Five-Year Plan (1981-1985) and the 1980's as a whole.

From the viewpoint of implementation of socioeconomic strategy at the current stage the period 1981-1985, Comrade Le Duan observed at the fifth congress, will be a further step along the path of the development and transformation of the structure of the national economy and the acceleration of its socialist reorganization. These processes are closely interconnected and geared to stabilization of the economic situation, the solution of the most urgent problems in the life of the population, an easing of the serious disproportions in the national economy, the surmounting of difficulties in the sphere of circulation and the creation of the prerequisites for subsequent growth.*

With regard for the experience of the Second Five-Year Plan the congress specified the party's economic strategy, according to which the material-technical base of socialism in Vietnam will be built in several stages. The main purpose of the first stage (up to 1990) is creation of the essential prerequisites for subsequent socialist industrialization. Its basic tasks are the accelerated development of agriculture, the growth of the production of commodities in broad demand for satisfaction of the population's priority requirements (primarily the solution of such an acute problem as the food problem), completion of the socialist transformations in the southern provinces and the improvement of the new production relations within the framework of the entire country.

* See "Fifth Vietnam CP Congress," p 61.

The policy of building the foundation of socialism in the LPDR and defense of the working people's revolutionary gains was determined by the Third LPRP Congress. The congress confirmed the basic directions and tasks of the First Five-Year Plan of Laos' Economic and Social Development in 1981-1985 and through the end of the 1980's. The priority goals of the First Five-Year Plan are to strengthen the state and collective sectors of the economy, accelerate scientific-technical progress and consolidate the defense capability of the republic. The growth of production in agriculture and forestry here is regarded as the basis by relying on which it is possible to achieve the rapid satisfaction of the people's urgent requirements and ensure the creation of the initial accumulation fund for socialist industrialization.

An analysis of the decisions of the Fifth Vietnam CP Congress and the Third LPRP Congress shows that these parties' socioeconomic policy at the present stage is that of the transitional period on the way to socialism. The Vietnamese and Laotian comrades emphasize that Lenin's ideas concerning the rapid upsurge of the economy based on the use of the progressive possibilities of all socioeconomic structures, on condition of securing for the people's power the commanding heights in the economy, preserve their viability for Vietnam and Laos. Thus the Fifth Vietnam CP Congress recognized the expediency of the preservation for a certain time in Vietnam of a multistrukture economy. In the northern part of the country there are now three structures: state, cooperative and small-scale commodity, state-private and private-capitalist. Five economic structures coexist in Laos: state, cooperative, mixed private-state, private-capitalist and small-scale commodity, in which elements of patriarchal relations are still very strong.

The upsurge of the production forces and the strengthening of the economy have at the current stage become the main direction of the struggle for consolidation of the positions of socialism in Vietnam and Laos. The leaders of the Vietnam CP and the LPRP emphasize that under the conditions of a multistrukture economy in these countries an acute struggle had unfolded at the start of the 1980's between the socialist and private-capitalist sectors of the economy (this applies to the south of Vietnam particularly). They believe that a solution of the question "who will win" in favor of the forces of the revolution is only possible on the paths of the all-around strengthening of the socialist sector of the national economy.

Particular attention is being paid to a strengthening of the role of the communist parties in leadership of the economy. Much has been done in the 5-year plan (1981-1985) in Vietnam to overcome the negative consequences of administrative methods of management. At the start of the 1980's even a set of measures had been implemented to stabilize commodity-money relations, improve the activity of the sphere of distribution and circulation, reorganize the system of wages and expand the sphere of the application of material incentives, strengthen the district level of control of the economy and develop the enterprises' independence and initiative.

Considerable efforts have been aimed primarily at increasing production efficiency in the agrarian sector, whose role is, as before, extraordinarily great. Currently the consumption fund in Vietnam is, as a minimum, formed to the extent of two-thirds in in kind-material form thanks to food (more than 70 percent of the country's able-bodied population is employed in the cultivation of food crops).*

* "The Socialist Republic of Vietnam. Socioeconomic Problems," Moscow, 1982, p 80.

In the Third Five-Year Plan steps have been taken to strengthen the socialist sector in the North Vietnam countryside and improve the operation of the economic mechanism in the country's agriculture as a whole. Great significance has been attached to finding ways of increasing the peasants' interest in an increase in production and labor productivity growth. Thus a new form of labor organization in agriculture combining the brigade method and the contract--"pay in terms of end results" or "the family contract"--has become widespread. According to this system, a peasant family or group of families is for several years assigned a plot of land used by the cooperative and a plan quota for the production and surrender to the state of this agricultural product or the other is established. The entire or a large part of the agricultural product produced over and above the planned quota ("contract") remains at the disposal of the peasants, who have a right to sell it at upgraded prices to the state or on the market.

Other important measures have been implemented following the introduction of the "family contract": an increase in state purchase prices for the basic types of agricultural product, the enactment of an agricultural tax law and steps for the more efficient use of labor resources, land and so forth.

The improvement in the mechanism of the control of agriculture did not take long to be reflected in a growth of production in the agrarian sector. In 1982, following the introduction of the new system, labor productivity increased 30 percent compared with 1981.* By the end of 1983 the "family contract" had been introduced at 90 percent of cooperatives and in production brigades. The total harvest of agricultural crops (in rice equivalent) increased from 15.1 million tons in 1981 to over 17 million tons in 1984.

The Vietnam CP Central Committee Fifth Plenum, which was held at the end of 1983, noted the significant changes in the development of agriculture, which had made it possible to solve the problem of self-sufficiency in food and end imports thereof. At the same time it was pointed out that accounting of the entire product produced in the country is as yet organized insufficiently precisely in the country and that control of the commodity circulation and distribution sphere is being exercised unsatisfactorily.

This formulation of the question was conditioned by the existence of certain negative phenomena in economic life, primarily the increased role in the economy of the "market factor". As the Vietnam CP Central Committee Fifth Plenum observed, an unhealthy trend of "following the free market" had manifested itself, and this had weakened the basis of the plan, strengthened the development of the private sector and led to the irrational redistribution of national income in favor of individual categories of the population.

In the light of the decisions of the Vietnam CP Central Committee Fifth Plenum energetic work is continuing in the country on an improvement in the forms of control in agriculture and on overcoming the shortcomings which have been revealed.

* NHAN DAN, 13 August 1983.

An important event in Vietnam's socioeconomic and political life was the Vietnam CP Central Committee Sixth Plenum, which was held in July 1984 and which was devoted basically to problems of an improvement in control of the national economy.

Considerable attention is being paid to socialist transformations in the southern provinces. The main emphasis is being put here on the accomplishment of such tasks as the completion of work on land redistribution in favor of the landless and land-hungry peasantry, the further transition of the peasants to the path of collective farming, mainly in the form of production brigades and an expansion of the network of supply-sales and consumer cooperatives. A special decree of the Vietnam CP Central Committee adopted in May 1983 points out that when enlisting the peasants in cooperatives it is essential to strictly observe the voluntary principle. It is emphasized that transformation in the countryside should be closely tied in with the transformations in the sphere of industry and trade.

By the end of 1984 there were in the south approximately 300 cooperatives and more than 20,000 production brigades, in which 52 percent of the total number of peasant homesteads had been enlisted. They work 47 percent of all the sown areas in the South Vietnamese provinces.*

However, as Vietnamese economists note, the problem of strengthening the socialist transformations in the south remains urgent inasmuch as the commercial bourgeoisie, in a compact with the rural bourgeoisie, is continuing attempts to disorganize the market and introduce chaos in the sphere of distribution and circulation not only in the South Vietnamese provinces but also in the north of the country. This is why the transformations in the south are an important and vital demand of the moment and a command of life, and "there is no room for hesitation here".**

Largely thanks to the measures to improve economic management and also the growth of the production forces in Vietnam's agriculture, it was possible in the Second Five-Year Plan to achieve an appreciable increase in the rate of the country's economic development. Thus in the period 1981-1983 the average annual rate of increase of Vietnam's national income constituted 7.8 percent compared with 1 percent in 1976-1980.

Vietnam's industry is developing rapidly in the current 5-year plan. The average annual rate of increase of the industrial product in 1981-1983 constituted 11.8 percent compared with 0.6 percent in 1976-1980. A major step forward was taken by power engineering, coal industry, construction materials industry and others. Exports of finished products to the foreign market increased. In 1983 the proportion of exports' coverage of imports increased to 51 percent compared with 35 percent in 1980.

Impressive results in fulfillment of the plan quotas of the First Five-Year Plan have also been achieved in Laos in the time that has elapsed since the

* NHAN DAN, 30 September 1984.

** Ibid., 30 December 1982.

Third LPRP Congress. By mid-1983 even the volume of the gross social product in the country had increased 25 percent compared with 1980. Manufacture of the industrial product in this same period increased 31.4 percent.

The stability of agricultural production is indicated by the fact that in the period 1981-1984 rice production was at a level of over 1 million tons compared with 700,000 tons in 1976, while the amount of rice obtained by the state in the form of agricultural tax and via the system of state purchases was twice as much as in 1978. The LPDR Council of Ministers decree of 1 November 1982 on the level of purchase prices for agricultural products was a good stimulus to the development of agricultural production.

It has been possible at the current stage to achieve a qualitative change in the approach of the country's peasant masses to the question of cooperation. "Rural workers," the Laotian press has pointed out, "have begun to understand the advantages of collective farming."* The LPRP Central Committee Third Plenum, which was held in March 1983, declared with all certainty the need to continue the struggle to increase the productiveness of agriculture and implement socialist transformations. By the end of 1983 the LPDR had 2,100 agricultural cooperatives, which united over 30,000 peasant families. Cooperatives have been created in all provinces, 80 percent of the districts and 65 percent of the communities.**

An in-depth analysis of the socioeconomic problems confronting Laos was made at the LPRP Central Committee Sixth Plenum, which was held in August 1984 and which approved measures for an improvement in control of the national economy. The plenum stressed that the guarantee of the successful fulfillment of the tasks set by the third party congress is the creative and organized labor of the entire people and a strengthening of all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries.

The facts adduced above testify convincingly that, despite the continuing serious economic difficulties, a tremendous amount of work has been done in the past decade in Vietnam and the LPDR on the formation of the foundation of socialism and the establishment of new production relations. The social structure of society is changing step by step and the role of the working class is growing, which is connected not only with its quantitative growth but also its increased ideological-political maturity, education and professional level. The alliance of the working class and peasantry is strengthening unswervingly.

The basic directions of the development of People's Kampuchea at the new stage were determined by the Fourth KPRP Congress in May 1981, which demonstrated that the party is the vanguard of the country's working class and the leading and organizing force of the entire Cambodian people. The KPRP has set in all its magnitude the task of strengthening the country's independence and accelerating the process of its recovery and gradual transition to socialism.

* PASASON, 20 December 1982.

** (TAP TI KONG SHAN) No 12, 1983, p 65.

Formulating the country's tasks in the socioeconomic sphere, Heng Samrin, general secretary of the KPRP Central Committee and chairman of the PRK State Council, pointed to the need to develop production, primarily agricultural production, in every possible way and fundamentally change the situation in the national economy. It is essential, the congress noted, to tackle the task of stabilization of the economy and a rise in the people's living standard in close combination with ideological work aimed at raising the new man.

The years 1981-1984 were, as a whole, successful for the PRK national economy, primarily agriculture. An effective factor which contributed to the achievement of fundamental changes in the agrarian sector of the economy were the active measures of the party and the state to attract the peasants to the path of collectivization. In 1983 the number of labor mutual assistance groups was already over 100,000. More than 3.3 million persons (90 percent of all peasants) work in them in the country as a whole. Cambodian communists regard these groups as the initial form of cooperation. For transition to the next stage of the development of collective farming it is essential not only to strengthen the material-technical base of agriculture but also conclusively overcome among the peasants the kind of psychological barrier caused by the fact that under the Pol Pot regime the essence of collectivization was completely distorted and is connected in many people's minds with the harshest forces labor and semistarvation existence.

Great significance for the development of positive trends in the Cambodian countryside was attached to the decisions of the KPRP Central Committee Seventh Plenum (1984). It emphasized with all certainty that the state's further rendering the labor mutual assistance groups the necessary material and financial support would contribute to the expansion of the cooperative movement in the country.

The fact that in 1981 the rice harvest constituted 1.6 million tons, but in 1983 was in excess of 2 million tons may serve as evidence of the effectiveness of the people's power's agrarian policy. The numbers of cattle have increased considerably. The areas sown to industrial crops, particularly rubber-yielding plants, have increased. The volume of state purchases of food and other agricultural products increased 50 percent in 1983 compared with 1982.

Appreciable changes are under way in PRK industry also. By the start of 1985 industrial production had increased almost 20-fold compared with 1979. A most important direction of the party's efforts is the strengthening of the positions of the state sector in industry, the basis of which are now over 60 large-scale and medium enterprises.

The successes of people's power in the solution of urgent social problems, primarily in the development of education and health care, are tangible. Cambodia, whose people just some 6 years ago were threatened with extinction, now has one of the highest birthrates in the world.

The PRK is currently at the concluding stage of the popular-democratic revolution. The KPRP is putting forward the task of a gradual transition to the socialist stage of the revolution. Of importance here is the fact that a socialist sector represented by state and cooperative structures has already taken shape and new production relations have sprung up and are becoming firmly established in the country.

The Cambodian people's peaceful building continues under difficult foreign policy conditions. Imperialist and hegemonist forces are unceasing in their attempts to frustrate the process of the creation of a new society in the country, taking advantage for subversive actions of the remnants of the Pol Pot bans which have dug in on Thai territory. It is obvious, however, that these intrigues are doomed to fail. The processes occurring in the PRK are of an irreversible nature.

The KPRP is tackling the task of preparation for the transitional period on the way to socialism by relying on the disinterested assistance of the USSR, Vietnam and other socialist community countries. The experience of People's Kampuchea shows as convincingly as can be the exceptional importance of the international support factor for countries which have opted for a socialist development path.

Guided by the decisions of their congresses, the Vietnam CP, LPRP and KPRP are pursuing an unswerving policy of the further consolidation of fraternal relations between the Indochina countries, the foundation of which was laid back at the time of the joint anti-imperialist, liberation struggle of their peoples. Solidarity and mutual assistance are the powerful lever which is enabling these countries to find effective ways of tackling the tasks confronting them of building a new life and defending the revolutionary gains. The pivotal factor of the cohesion of the three Indochina states is the strengthening unity and comradely cooperation of their Marxist-Leninist parties. The Friendship and Cooperation Treaty between Vietnam and the LPDR was concluded in 1977 and the Peace, Friendship and Cooperation Treaty Between Vietnam and the PRK in 1979. The fundamental principles on which the fraternal relations between the Indochina states are built were approved unanimously at the meeting of the highest leaders of Vietnam, the LPDR and the PRK in 1983.

By virtue of the specifics of historical development and geographical, climatic and other factors, the three countries' economic conditions are largely similar. For this reason it is perfectly natural that when tackling urgent tasks of economic development they coordinate their efforts closely and study one another's experience. A committee for economic, scientific-technical and cultural cooperation with other Indochina states has been formed in each country. At their regular sessions these committees formulate specific steps to improve the mechanism of mutual assistance. Periodic meetings of the leaders of the three countries' leading ministries and departments perform an appreciable role here.

The spheres of cooperation between them for the coming period have been determined also: food production, cultivation and processing of industrial crops, processing of timber and sea products, power engineering, construction, machine building and others. A foundation is thereby being laid for closer economic integration, which will undoubtedly contribute to the effective solution of the socioeconomic problems confronting each country.

The foreign policy of the three Indochina states is one of peace, friendship and cooperation between peoples. Vietnam, the LPDR and the PRK coordinate their foreign policy actions closely, act from uniform positions with the socialist community countries and actively support in the international arena the forces fighting for peace, democracy and social progress.

The priority place among the foreign policy tasks of Vietnam, the LPDR and PRK belongs to questions of the all-around strengthening of relations of friendship and cooperation with the USSR and the other fraternal socialist countries.

Soviet-Vietnamese relations are developing successfully in full accordance with the Friendship and Cooperation Treaty Between the USSR and Vietnam of 3 November 1978, which embodied the aspiration of the CPSU and the Vietnam CP and the Soviet and Vietnamese peoples to a further intensification and expansion of bilateral relations in all spheres.

Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation encompasses the majority of key sectors of Vietnam's national economy. At the end of the Second Five-Year Plan (1976-1980) the Soviet Union had rendered Vietnam technical assistance in the restoration, modernization and construction of 269 national economic facilities. In the current 5-year plan the USSR will assist Vietnam in the installation and design of approximately 100 facilities. These include such major ones as the Hoa Binh hydropower system on the Black River, the ("Falay") Thermal Electric Power Plant, the (Kaoshon) strip mine and a cement plant in (Bimshon). Great significance is attached to the work of the joint Soviet-Vietnamese enterprise for the exploration for and exploitation of oil and gas on Vietnam's continental shelf. A strong foundation of the country's socialist industrialization is thereby being laid. Realization of the long-term program of the development of the economic and scientific-technical cooperation of the USSR and Vietnam, which was adopted by the governments of the two countries in October 1983, is to play an important part.

In 1978 Vietnam became a member of CEMA. A Vietnamese delegation headed by Le Duan took part in the top-level CEMA economic conference in Moscow in 1984. The decision of the CEMA 39th Session in Havana that capacity for the mining and treatment of bauxites would be installed in Vietnam by the joint efforts of the CEMA countries had great repercussions in Vietnam.

Soviet-Laotian cooperation has risen to a qualitatively new level in the present 5-year plan. Industrial and agricultural enterprises, hospitals and educational institutions are being built in the LPDR by joint efforts. Major work is planned in the sphere of transportation and in expanding Laos' export potential. Commodity turnover between the two countries in 1981-1985 will increase by a factor of 3.5 compared with the preceding 5-year period.

Soviet assistance is contributing effectively to the development of the PRK's production forces. The industrial, power engineering, transport and agricultural facilities being installed in this country with the USSR's participation will make an appreciable contribution to the creation of the modern material base of its economy.

The strengthening of the cooperation of Vietnam, the LPDR and the PRK with the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries and the fraternal countries' support of and assistance to the three Indochina states are a factor ensuring their successful advance along the path of socialist creation.

They are at the same time a dependable guarantee of the defense of the sovereignty, freedom and independence of the Vietnamese, Laotian and Cambodian peoples against any encroachments from outside. In close interaction with the USSR and the other fraternal countries Vietnam, the LPDR and the PRK are conducting a stubborn struggle for peace and the relaxation of international tension and against the aggressive policy of imperialism and reaction.

An important direction of the foreign policy efforts of Vietnam, the LPDR and the PRK is close coordination of their actions for the purpose of a normalization of the situation in Southeast Asia, the conversion of this region into a zone of peace, stability and cooperation, the establishment of genuinely good-neighborly, friendly relations with all neighbors and the broadening of the dialogue between the Indochina countries and ASEAN. New constructive proposals and initiatives on this score are constantly being put forward at the Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia foreign minister conferences, which have been convened regularly twice a year (as of January 1980).

At the 10th conference, which was held in January 1985, the Indochina countries again confirmed their ardent aspiration to the speediest establishment of peace and stability in the region and readiness to begin negotiations with the parties concerned to achieve the speediest settlement providing for: the withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteer forces from Cambodia together with the expulsion of the Pol Pot clique; respect for the Cambodian people's right to self-determination, primarily and mainly the right to life, free of the threat of genocide; the Cambodian people's holding of free general elections in the presence of foreign observers; conversion of Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and stability, where states with different social systems would live under conditions of peaceful coexistence, not permitting their territory to be used to the detriment of other countries; all other states' respect for the national rights of the Southeast Asian countries; international guarantees and observation of the practical implementation of these agreements.

Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia advocate the ASEAN countries' confrontation with the Indochina states, which is being imposed by forces beyond the confines of the Southeast Asia region, being replaced by constructive dialogue, in the course of which all contentious problems would be settled by political means.

While condemning China's unfriendly policy in respect of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia and the PRC's destabilizing policy in Southeast Asia, the Indochina countries invariably confirm their readiness for the restoration of normal relations with the PRC based on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The peoples of the three Indochina countries, who for many years fought courageously for their national liberation, are reliable allies of the national liberation movement and stand firmly on the side of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples in their struggle against imperialism, neocolonialism and racial discrimination and for peace, national independence, democracy and social progress.

As participants in the nonaligned movement, Vietnam and Laos are contributing to the strengthening of its anti-imperialist, antiwar thrust and struggling for the establishment of a new international economic order. People's Kampuchea also adheres firmly to a policy of nonalignment.

The Indochina states advocate the maintenance and development of normal relations with the capitalist countries on an equal, mutually profitable basis and condemn the policy of "sanctions" and "blockades" in international economic relations implanted by imperialism.

Building their foreign policy on the basis of the Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism and the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and operating in close unity with the socialist community countries and in interaction with progressive nonaligned states, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are playing an increasingly important part in the world community. Vietnam and Laos are full members of the socialist community, active participants in the nonaligned movement and members of the United Nations. The international authority of the PRK is growing.

The international solidarity of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries with the three Indochina states reflects their resolve to conduct a joint struggle against imperialism and for peace, security and social progress. Relying on the support of the socialist community and strengthening their cohesion, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are a dependable outpost of peace and socialism in Southeast Asia.

The entire process of the building of a new life in the Indochina countries is further testimony that there is not nor can there be a road to socialism in circumvention of the general regularities discovered by Marxism-Leninism and corroborated by the historical experience of the USSR and the other countries of real socialism and by international practice.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/13

SURVEY OF MAJOR WORLD EVENTS 2 DECEMBER 1984-1 MARCH 1985

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 78-97

[T. Panova, M. Strezhneva, Yu. Fedorov: international roundup: "Current Problems of World Politics"]

[Excerpts] Graphic confirmation of the peoples' aspiration to peace and their resolve to halt the slide toward the abyss of catastrophe were the results of the UN General Assembly 39th Session, which ended in December 1984. This international forum adopted many constructive documents aimed at moral-political condemnation and the prevention of nuclear war, a curbing of the arms race and the prevention of its spread to new spheres, primarily space.

Even the most aggressive and avowedly militarist representatives of imperialist forces cannot in our time fail to take stock of the peoples' will to peace. The unprecedented upsurge of antiwar sentiments in the West, including the United States itself, pressure on Washington on the part of its NATO allies supporting negotiations with the USSR and a departure from the confrontation being imposed on the socialist countries, the emphatic protests of nonaligned states against the arms race and the nuclear danger and, finally, the economic and social consequences of the policy of an unchecked arms buildup, which are being perceived increasingly by the United States--these are the entirely objective factors to ignore or deny which is becoming increasingly costly in both the direct and indirect senses of the word.

It was precisely under their impact that the U.S. Administration, albeit very reluctantly, responded to the USSR's initiative concerning new Soviet-American negotiations on the entire set of questions concerning space-based and nuclear arms--strategic and intermediate-range--in their interconnection. The corresponding agreement was reached at the start of 1985.

Through the stormcloud of tension which had built up in the world shone a bright ray of hope. And the fact that it cut through the gloom of confrontation at the start of the year imparts to these hopes special meaning and significance.

1. In the Key Area

A meeting was held 7-8 January 1985 in Geneva between A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR foreign minister, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz. After 2 days of very complex, intensive, but at the same time frank conversation agreement was reached on the holding of new Soviet-American negotiations, the suggestion concerning which had emanated from the Soviet Union. The joint statement says that the subject thereof will be the set of questions concerning space-based and nuclear arms--strategic and intermediate-range--and they will all be examined and tackled in interconnection, what is more. The purpose of the negotiations, the document emphasizes, will be the formulation of effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in space and a halt thereto on Earth, nuclear arms limitation and reduction and the strengthening of strategic stability. Ultimately the negotiations, like efforts in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction in general, are to lead to the liquidation of nuclear weapons entirely and everywhere.

The path to the negotiations was not easy. Many difficulties created by Washington had to be overcome. The main one, which has not been removed completely even now, are the U.S. Administration's attempts to impose an absolutely unacceptable format and structure of the negotiations which fail to correspond to the realities of the current strategic situation. The White House sought in every way possible to circumvent the problem of space and to prevent discussion of questions of averting its militarization. In other words, the U.S. leadership endeavored to confine itself merely to the types of arms on which negotiations, broken up in the past by the actions of Washington itself, have already been conducted. But these attempts failed. Ultimately in the course of the conversations on 7-8 January in Geneva the American side was forced to consent to recognition of the fundamental fact that questions of space-based and nuclear arms are indivisible and should be discussed and tackled in a package. It is this package approach which constitutes the fundamental novelty of the present negotiations compared with preceding negotiations.

The USSR's approach to the Geneva negotiations is well known. "...We do not aspire to the achievement of one-sided advantages over the United States and the NATO countries and to military superiority over them," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasized. The Soviet Union desires a halt to and not a continuation of the arms race. It desires a real reduction in stockpiles of arms and the destruction, for a start, of a considerable proportion thereof and not the creation of increasingly new weapons systems, whether in space or on Earth. It was these aspirations which dictated our country's formulation of such questions as a freeze of nuclear arsenals and a halt to further missile deployment. In short, it is a question of the implementation of a number of initial steps capable of facilitating in practice the holding of the negotiations and bringing nearer the achievement at them of positive results. Our ultimate goal here is the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons everywhere in the world and the complete elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

The Soviet Union and its leadership have emphasized repeatedly that our country comes to the negotiations with serious and honest intentions. It expects such an approach from its partner also. Any attempts to impose on the USSR an agreement which would tie its hands in questions of strengthening its defense and simultaneously open wide the doors for the realization of Washington's military programs of unprecedented scale are futile. They can only undermine the possibility of agreement being reached. And military-strategic parity will be preserved by the collective efforts of the socialist community. So it was before, so it will continue to be.

However, the reports being received from Washington testify that the supporters of a militarist policy in the U.S. Administration and outside it have by no means laid down their arms. Many statements have been made in the American capital on the threshold of the start of the negotiations giving rise to doubts concerning the United States' readiness to abide by the letter and spirit of the understanding reached in Geneva. In addition, manifestly at odds with it, militarist circles are stepping up the preparations for "star wars". Thus Gen J. Abrahamson, who heads the organization of work on realization of the notorious SDI, declared that the first test of antimissile technology in near-Earth space will take place in 1987--2 years earlier than the scheduled time. He reported that two such tests would be conducted annually.

The draft military budget for the 1986 fiscal year, which was submitted to Congress by the R. Reagan administration at the start of February 1985, contains plans for the deployment of strategic offensive arms which, if realized, would mean the United States going far beyond the ceilings of the limitations on MIRV's ballistic missiles established by the SALT II Treaty. The United States has deferred to this June the latest test of the ASAT antisatellite system originally planned for March, but is not abandoning either this test or, even less, the development of space arms as a whole. None of this by any means fits in with the goals and tasks of the Geneva negotiations but corresponds entirely to the aggressive plans of the U.S. Administration.

Disclosing the true intentions of militarist circles, an antiwar organization uniting representatives of U.S. academic circles issued a statement which, inter alia, sets forth the possible scenario of the use of space-based combat systems. "Killer satellites," the document says, "will put out of action the enemy's early warning system. Then hydrogen bombs will be exploded over its cities, which will put communications systems out of action. Fifteen minutes later Trident missiles will destroy the launch silos. Thirty minutes later MX missiles will wipe out everything else. Then ABM systems with space-based components will shoot down any missiles which might have survived the first strike."

Of course, our country has sufficient means for frustrating the realization of this insane scenario. However, the deployment of space arms will have extremely dangerous consequences for the whole world. The start of an arms race in space will reduce to nothing all that it has been possible to do on Earth in the sphere of nuclear arms limitation. There could be no question of any reduction, not to mention liquidation, thereof. Besides, the militarization of space would spur the arms race in all its dimensions,

shake the strategic stability and undermine international security. The Soviet leadership has plainly warned the U.S. Administration of this.

The hopes which the world community links with the new Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva explain the very close attention with which the most varied political forces and movements throughout the world followed the slightest nuances in the speeches of responsible statesmen and also the mass media on the threshold of 12 March--the day of the opening of the negotiations. And certain singularities of the tone and content of pronouncements and publications which appeared throughout January and February in the United States did not escape here the gaze of observers adhering to far from identical political positions.

The negotiations had still to begin, but the United States was emphasizing every conceivable difficulty, problem and obstacle in their way. Of course, it would be wrong to deny the complexity of the negotiations. But the constant emphasis of these difficulties has assumed a special meaning in the light of certain other facts. It was accompanied primarily by the American side's avowed attempts even prior to the start of the negotiations to impose a categorical style of attitude both toward the negotiations themselves and toward the partner--the Soviet Union. Thus addressing members of the House Appropriations Committee in the U.S. Congress, President Reagan declared that he had instructed the members of the U.S. delegation in Geneva "to get up from the table and return home" if they are unable to conclude a "good agreement" with the USSR. Precedents of what the true meaning of such rhetoric could consist are sufficiently well known.

Nor could we fail to be alerted by the fact that on the threshold of the negotiations the American side made persistent efforts, which were particularly unscrupulous in terms of the methods and means employed, whose purpose was to sow doubts as to the USSR's fidelity to commitments adopted earlier and to unswerving observance of agreements and accords which had been arrived at. A new twist to this slanderous campaign was begun in the United States around the administration's regular "report" to Congress concerning the Soviet Union's alleged "violations" of its international commitments.

The unsubstantiated and groundless nature of such accusations have been stressed by the Soviet side repeatedly and emphatically, particularly in a memorandum issued on 30 January and in a TASS statement of 21 October 1984. They were also emphatically rejected in a submission of the USSR Embassy in Washington to the U.S. Department of State, which was carried in the Soviet press on 28 February 1985. The American side, the document says, has no moral or formal right whatever to represent itself as the custodian of agreements, a scornful attitude toward which has in recent years been an integral part of the policy and practical actions of the United States.

The policy of undermining the indefinite 1972 Treaty Limiting ABM Systems; refusal to ratify the SALT II Treaty and the 1974 Treaty Limiting Underground Nuclear Tests; the concentrated use of American chemical weapons, which have claimed many tens of thousands of lives in various parts of the world; the brazen flouting of commitments in respect of the Final Act of the

All-European Conference--such is the "service record" of the United States, which cannot fail to elicit the question--on the large, fundamental plane--of the conscientiousness of Washington's attitude toward adopted international commitments. No propaganda exertions can change or "cancel" these indisputable facts. What we have is the manifest hope of the U.S. Administration of poisoning the atmosphere surrounding the negotiations in Geneva from the very outset and complicating the practical, constructive examination of the problems to be solved at them.

Meanwhile the peoples are expecting from the negotiations real results. The protests of peace-loving forces are being stepped up even more and numerous meetings and demonstrations and collections of signatures to appeals for an end to the nuclear recklessness are being conducted in many countries. The plans to transfer the arms race to space are causing particular anxiety throughout the world.

Many foreign, including American, press organs are criticizing the insane "star wars" ideas. "The present administration's plans to extend the arms race to space are capable of bringing mankind to the brink of self-annihilation," THE WASHINGTON POST, for example, wrote. "President Reagan's so-called 'star wars' proposals, which provide for the creation of superweapons and their deployment in space, give rise to the possibility of unforeseen, but catastrophic consequences."

The international community has emphatically condemned the militarization of space. On the initiative of the Soviet Union the UN General Assembly 39th Session examined as important and urgent the question "The Use of Space Solely for Peaceful Purposes, for the Good of Mankind". On 12 December 1984 some 150 UN members approved a resolution which contained an appeal for the "adoption of immediate measures to prevent an arms race in space in the interests of maintaining international peace and security."

The Delhi declaration, which was adopted by the heads of state and government of six nonnuclear countries representing different parts of the world: India, Argentina, Mexico, Tanzania, Greece and Sweden, had extensive international repercussions. It attaches particular significance to the task of preventing the militarization of space, which, the document notes, should be used for the general good of mankind and not as a future battlefield. "For this reason," the authors of the document declare, "we call for a ban on the development, testing, production, deployment and use of all types of space weapon. An arms race in space is connected with tremendous expenditure and is fraught with the danger of serious destabilizing consequences. It also jeopardizes a number of arms limitation and disarmament agreements." In other words, the declaration, which is signed by most authoritative political leaders, unequivocally condemns the R. Reagan administration's attempts to acquire the space potential of blackmail and pressure and the "star" instrument for the achievement of world hegemony.

The problems of space-based and nuclear arms--despite all their undoubted significance--do not exhaust the manifold questions of the struggle for a lessening of the military danger. January saw the completion of a year since the start of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures,

Security and Disarmament in Europe. At the start of December 1984 the conference adopted a proposal of neutral and nonaligned countries concerning the creation of two work groups. They are to specifically examine measures of confidence building and security in Europe both in the political and military spheres on an equal basis. This decision corresponds to the fundamental idea put forward by the USSR concerning the fact that a combination of political and military confidence measures is essential for the success of the conference.

The opening of the latest round of the Stockholm forum was marked by an important new initiative of socialist diplomacy. At the very first plenary session the Soviet Union submitted for the conference's examination the document "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on the Mutual Nonuse of Military Force and the Maintenance of Relations of Peace". The USSR's proposals provide primarily for the assumption by all participating countries of a commitment not to be the first to use against another either nuclear or conventional arms and, consequently, not to employ military force against another at all.

Such a commitment assumed by subscribers to the treaty would mean that, first, they would renounce any use of military force, which is incompatible with the goals and principles of the UN Charter, against another subscriber-state, particularly invasion or an attack on its territory; second, they would not threaten the security of international sea, air and space communications traversing expanses to which no one's international jurisdiction extends. The commitment not to be the first to use military force would also extend to third countries.

This initiative was underpinned by other proposals of socialist states aimed at reinforcing the atmosphere of trust and security in Europe. Delegations of Bulgaria, the GDR and the USSR submitted for examination by the conference a working document on the question of limiting the scale of military exercises. Its essence is that the conferees not conduct--independently or in conjunction with other states--military exercises in a total strength of over 40,000 men in Europe and in the adjacent sea (ocean) area and airspace. The socialist countries' proposal proceeds from the fact that it is difficult to distinguish large-scale military exercises from the preparatory stage of the deployment of armed forces for combat operations, even more under conditions where in the exercises conducted by NATO hundreds of thousands of servicemen are involved. The establishment of limits on the numbers of troops participating therein would undoubtedly limit the scale of military activity in Europe and thereby contribute to a strengthening of security on the continent.

Thus from the very start of the latest session of the Stockholm conference the socialist countries presented specific and precisely formulated proposals both in the political and the military spheres. Their realization would make it possible to appreciably improve the atmosphere in the European region, where the armed forces of two military-political alliances are directly contiguous.

What is the West's response to the socialist states' initiatives? The NATO countries are continuing to defend the so-called "transparency" concept which they put forward at the start of the conference. They submitted a document on an exchange of preliminary plans of states' military activity in Europe. This proposal does not, however, lead to a reduction in the level of military confrontation on the continent and represents nothing other than the latest attempt to legalize the collection of intelligence information on the military potential of the USSR and its allies.

The 35th round of the Vienna talks on limiting armed forces and armaments in Central Europe began at the end of January. At these talks, which have been under way since the fall of 1973, the socialist countries have consistently advocated a lowering of the level of military confrontation at the heart of the European continent. The Western participants, however, are occupying an unconstructive and unrealistic position and declining practical steps which would make it possible to reduce the armed forces and armaments here.

Endeavoring to move the talks from standstill, the GDR, Poland, the USSR and the CSSR submitted on 14 February for discussion by their participants the draft "Basic Provisions of an Agreement on the Initial Reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of Ground Forces and Armaments in Central Europe and the Subsequent Nonaugmentation of the Levels of the Sides' Armed Forces and Armaments in this Area".

The purpose of the socialist states' proposal is in 1 year from the time of the agreement taking effect the ground forces of the USSR and the United States being cut back by 20,000 and 13,000 men respectively in combat troop units together with their authorized arms and combat equipment, and up to 10 percent of such reductions being effected in terms of individual servicemen, furthermore. The draft agreement stipulates that upon completion of the reduction all states party to the agreement would undertake on a collective and national basis not to increase the level of their armed forces and armaments in Central Europe during the life of the agreement.

The document contains specific proposals with respect to monitoring compliance with the agreement. Together with national technical means of supervision it proposes an exchange of lists of the units being cut back and withdrawn, notification of the start and completion of practical measures with respect to the cutback and the creation by each side for the period of the withdrawal of the forces being cut back of three-four observation posts via which such supervision would be exercised.

The document proceeds from the fact that following the signing of such an agreement the talks would continue, having as their subject further, larger-scale reductions of armed forces and armaments for the purpose of achieving equal collective levels of the sides' armed forces in Central Europe up to 900,000 men, including up to 700,000 ground forces. This initiative of the socialist community countries takes account of a number of elements of the Western participants' position. Its implementation would make it possible to achieve the first tangible result at the long-standing talks in the Austrian capital.

Soberly evaluating the degree of dangerous tension in the world, socialist diplomacy is at the same time tireless in seeking out and showing to the international community any possibilities of lowering this tension and of a change toward a constructive solution of urgent problems of world politics. "What is needed for this," the participants in the latest session of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee in Berlin observed, "is a transition to a policy of realism and practical interaction in tackling the tasks confronting the peoples of Europe and other continents. Serious and equal dialogue between states with different social systems and negotiations whereat the sides recognize their high responsibility and aspire to positive results are essential."

2. Along an Aligned Course

The results of fulfillment of the 1984 national economic plans carried in the press show that the socialist countries are tackling the tasks confronting them successfully.

Implementing the general line of economic and social development formulated by the party, our country's working people achieved an appreciable advance in the past year. The fixed production capital of the USSR's national economy amounted to R1.5 trillion. New areas were assimilated successfully, the development of large-scale territorial-production complexes continued, the scale and efficiency of social production increased and its qualitative indicators improved.

The campaign for elections to the union and autonomous republic supreme soviets and the local soviets of people's deputies, which were held on 24 February 1985, was conducted with great enthusiasm and efficiently. Many interesting thoughts and proposals and instructions from the electorate on how to continue to improve the work of the organs of people's power and economic management were expressed in the course thereof. The election campaign was conducted in an atmosphere of the high political and labor enthusiasm of the masses guided by the struggle for a fitting greeting of the 27th CPSU Congress, the 40th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War and the successful fulfillment of the plans and socialist pledges of 1985 and the 5-year plan as a whole. The elections again demonstrated the monolithic unity and cohesion of our country's working people and all Soviet people around the Communist Party and the complete approval of the domestic and foreign policies of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

The working people of other socialist community countries achieved a marked advance in socioeconomic development in the past year. Statistical data published at the start of 1985 testify to this.

The fundamental strategic directions in the area of the continued development of the fraternal states' socialist integration were determined by the top-level CEMA economic conference in the summer of 1984 in Moscow. Practical realization of the decisions adopted thereat began in the period that has just elapsed. The first results of implementation of the jointly formulated economic strategy were summed up by the CEMA 39th Session, which for the first time in the history of CEMA's existence was held in the Cuban capital--Havana--at the end of last year.

The collective efforts of the socialist community countries are concentrated primarily on the solution of key problems of the intensification of social production. The CEMA Executive Committee 113th Session was held 14-16 January in Moscow. Its participants approved the idea of the long-term development of electric power engineering for the period up to the year 2000. A further improvement in the structure of the generation of electric and thermal energy is envisaged based on the preferential development of nuclear power engineering and the fuller use by each country of its own resources, including low-calorie fuel, new nontraditional energy sources and a reduction in the consumption of liquid fuel at power stations. The CEMA Executive Committee also deemed it expedient to draw up a general agreement on cooperation in the creation of flexible automated production systems for machine building. The state of cooperation in transport was examined and certain other topical questions of the fraternal countries cooperation were discussed.

The socialist community states are also acting harmoniously in the foreign policy sphere. They are united by unity of world outlook, goals and ideals. The socialist countries frustrated in unison imperialism's hopes of their economic exhaustion. They have not only advanced even further in their socioeconomic development but also become less vulnerable to influence thereon from outside. The socialist countries jointly prevented the NATO countries disturbing military-strategic parity in favor of this bloc.

The military-political alliance of the socialist states--the Warsaw Pact--has been operating successfully for just under 30 years now as an effective instrument of ensuring its participants' security and a dependable mechanism of the joint development and implementation of a peace-loving collective policy in international affairs. This alliance is monolithic and indestructible. All participants in the Warsaw Pact have already advocated its extension.

Meetings of party and state figures of the socialist countries invariably confirm the community members' fidelity to the Leninist principles of foreign policy. No exception in this respect were the visits which took place in the period in question. Thus talks were held at the end of January-start of February between A.A. Gromyko and B. Chnoupek, member of the Czechoslovak CP Central Committee and CSSR foreign minister, who was in Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Government. Bilateral relations and topical international problems were discussed in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding. I. Malmierca, member of the Cuban CP Central Committee and Republic of Cuba foreign minister, paid an official visit to the Soviet Union in February. The talks in Moscow made it possible to conduct a broad exchange of opinions on topical present-day problems which confirmed the complete unity of views of the USSR and Cuba.

Importance, particularly in the current situation, is also attached to the continuation of the East-West political dialogue and the broadening of the range of issues discussed here. Much was done in this sphere also in the period that has elapsed.

A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by M.S. Gorbachev paid an official visit to Great Britain in December 1984. The delegation had meetings with leaders, members of parliament and prominent political and public figures of the country and with representatives of trade and industry circles. The exchange of opinions was of a businesslike and frank nature. Both sides expressed concern at the increased tension in the world. Despite the differences in the evaluation of the reasons for this phenomenon, the sides advocated the establishment of fruitful East-West dialogue and also the development of bilateral contacts and relations.

At the invitation of the Soviet Government D. Mintoff, then prime minister of Malta, paid an official friendly visit to our country 17-20 December. The considerable increase in recent years in the volume of Soviet-Maltese trade-economic cooperation based on realization of the 5-year trade agreement of 8 October 1981 and the protocol on commodity turnover for 1984-1986 was noted at the negotiations. The sides confirmed that the expansion of trade-economic cooperation reflects the Soviet Union's support for Malta's status as a neutral and nonaligned state and is contributing to the creation of the necessary economic conditions reinforcing this status.

The documents signed during the official visit to Turkey by N.A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers--a long-term program of the development of economic, commercial and scientific-technical cooperation between the USSR and the Turkish Republic and an agreement on commodity turnover for 1986-1990--are intended to impart new impetus to the Soviet Union's economic and commercial relations with Turkey.

An official visit was paid to our country 11-14 February 1985 by A. Papandreou, prime minister of the Greek Republic. In the course of the negotiations the sides expressed satisfaction at the state of their economic mutual relations, which were further developed as a result of the visit. The trend toward the realization of large-scale and long-term projects is being consolidated.

The end of February-start of March was marked by two important visits by A.A. Gromyko--to Italy and Spain--and negotiations with the leaders of these states. There was positive assessment here, as in other countries, of the fact of the Soviet-American agreement having been reached on new negotiations in Geneva and also of the fact that the subject of these negotiations was the set of questions concerning space-based and nuclear arms--strategic and intermediate-range--examined in their interconnection.

The lessons of history teach us that it is necessary to fight against war before it begins and that countries and peoples living under conditions of different socioeconomic systems should and can jointly determine the goals and necessary actions against danger when it is a threat to all. The approaching anniversary of the Great Victory compels us to reflect on this again and again. An extensive response among the world community was encountered by the idea expressed by our country concerning the fact that in the year of the 40th anniversary of the end of the most terrible and

bloody war the leaders of the USSR and the United States could jointly confirm in a form suitable to both sides the essence and spirit of the main commitments assumed by the two powers both at the end of the war and in the 1970's.

Reports coming from the PRC testify that the leadership of this country intends to continue and develop the so-called "open doors" policy. Its purpose is to attract investments in the Chinese economy from abroad. As Zhao Ziyang, premier of the PRC State Council, observed, "the volume of foreign capital currently used by China has reached \$14.6 billion, which constitutes 15 percent of the total investments in capital construction envisaged by the Sixth Five-Year Plan (1981-1985)." Recently Beijing announced plans to extend to the country's entire coastline the special port status which was earlier accorded 14 seaports for the purpose of facilitating the influx of foreign capital.

The Chinese press reports the rapid growth of the scale of private enterprise in the country. In the past 6 years the numbers of those employed in the private sector have increased 80-fold and at the end of 1984 constituted 11 million persons in trade and industry. The PRC mass media emphasize that "private initiative" is playing a key part in the sphere of trade and services. The nonstate production mode in the agrarian sector, where a reform of the management system has been under way since the end of the 1970's, has enjoyed even greater development. There are currently in private ownership 2.8 million tractors (68 percent of all machinery) and 120,000 trucks (half of them). The cancellation of supplies of products to the state obligatory for the peasants was announced at the end of last year.

As is clear from Chinese press reports, the switch to the tracks of a commodity economy is being accompanied by serious socioeconomic consequences. It is a question, inter alia, of disproportions in the development of agricultural production, a slowing of the rate of overcoming the backwardness of certain areas of the country and exacerbation of the poverty problem. According to official data, the PRC now has 14 million poor peasant homesteads with a population of up to 70 million persons or approximately 8 percent of the country's rural population. It is reported that a decision on rendering the "economically backward and poor areas" special assistance measures has been adopted.

Recent months have been rich in events for the PRC in the foreign policy plane also. The PRC was visited at the end of December at the invitation of the Chinese Government by I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Agreements were signed during the visit on economic and technical cooperation, scientific-technical cooperation and the creation of a Soviet-Chinese commission for economic, commercial and scientific-technical cooperation. An understanding was also reached concerning the signing in the first half of this year of a long-term agreement on commodity turnover and payments for 1986-1990.

While emphasizing a desire to normalize relations with the Soviet Union and permitting the development--albeit within certain limits--of bilateral economic and scientific-technical relations and cooperation in the cultural sphere Beijing is at the same time attempting, as before, to link the process

of the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations with the solution of questions which go beyond the framework thereof and affect the interests and sovereignty of third countries. A whole number of prior conditions is being put forward. In a number of important spheres of international politics China is essentially opposed to the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and is engaging in actions harming the interests of world socialism and sometimes creating a threat to the security of the socialist states. Chinese troops' armed provocations on the border with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, which are assuming in an increasingly dangerous nature, particularly in the light of Beijing's more frequent threats to "teach Vietnam a second lesson," are unceasing.

The Soviet Union, for its part, consistently pursues in relations with the PRC the high-minded policy formulated by the 26th CPSU Congress. Our country invariably aspires to an improvement in relations with the PRC and is always ready for constructive negotiations with it. At the same time the USSR has opposed and will continue to oppose manifestations in Chinese policy which are unfriendly toward it and other fraternal countries. The Soviet Union supports a continuation of the dialogue with the PRC and a genuine normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations, which cannot take place at the expense of our country's friends and allies and must correspond to the interests of all socialist states.

There has also been a continuation of the PRC's intensive contacts with the imperialist powers, in the political sphere included. A visit was paid to China last December by M. Thatcher, prime minister of Great Britain, in the course of which a joint declaration on (Syangan) (Hong Kong) was signed. In accordance with this document, PRC sovereignty over (Syangan) will be restored on 1 July 1997. However, for 50 years after this (Syangan's) present social system will remain unchanged. The Chinese approach to this problem was formulated in the form of the "one-state--two social systems" concept.

The attention of political observers in various countries was attracted by the January visit to the PRC of Gen J. Vessey, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee. He conducted negotiations with Yang Dezhi, chief of the Chinese People's Liberation Army General Staff, and was received by State Council Premier Zhao Ziyang, Defense Minister Zhang Aiping and other Chinese leaders. As Vessey declared, during the negotiations "the sides emphasized the importance of a combination of the contacts between the two countries along military lines with cooperation in the sphere of military technology." Commenting on the visit, the NEW YORK TIMES wrote that it "concealed political and military considerations of paramount significance for both sides. The most impressive of these considerations, which went virtually unmentioned in the public statements, was the joint endeavor to confront Soviet military power with the maximum possible counterweight." Truly, Washington has long nurtured the idea of "closing from the East" the chain of military encirclement of the USSR.

At the end of February Beijing was visited by P. Wolfowitz, assistant U.S. secretary of state for East Asia and the Pacific, who was received by PRC Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian and officials of the PRC Foreign Ministry. The purpose of the trip, according to the American representative, was to discuss

"bilateral relations". The press of a number of countries noted that the latest trip to the Chinese capital by a high official of the U.S. foreign policy department coincided with increased tension on the Chinese-Vietnamese border.

3. The Capitalist World: In Labyrinth of Contradictions

As is known, the alignment of forces in the interimperialist rivalry is ultimately determined by economic indicators. Under the conditions of the cyclical recovery which the economy of world capitalism experienced in 1984, in the wake of the most profound and prolonged economic recession since the Great Depression, the United States and Japan managed to achieve relatively high economic growth rates, whereas in the EEC countries the increase in production proved far more modest. In 1984 GNP and industrial production increased thus: 6.8 and 10.7 percent respectively in the United States; 5.3 and 11 percent in Japan and 2.3 (gross domestic product) and 2.8 percent in the EEC countries.

In extricating itself from the crisis the United States put the emphasis on attracting foreign capital investments. But the measures securing for Washington an influx of money from abroad also caused as a collateral consequence an unprecedented increase in imports. In the past year the excess of imports over exports reached the record level of \$125 billion.

Ever increasing concern is being caused in the country by the chronic budget deficit. According to estimates, in the present fiscal year it will exceed \$210 billion. At the start of February President Reagan sent Congress a draft U.S. federal budget for the 1986 fiscal year beginning 1 October which plans a deficit of no less than \$180 billion. As Reagan's presentation at the joint session of Congress of the traditional annual State of the Union address confirmed, the Republican administration intends to continue to adhere to the previous policy of increasing military spending, which is incompatible with the proclaimed aim of a "radical solution" in the immediate future of the problem of the huge budget deficit. The problem of employment remains unsolved also. According to official data, by the start of 1985 the number of unemployed was in excess of 8.5 million. Some 35 million American live below the official poverty line. "America," the CHICAGO TRIBUNE writes, "continues to be a country where alongside luxury stores live millions of people who cannot even afford to eat normally.... In the last 3 years alone the Reagan administration has deprived 4.6 million persons of food stamps." Yet, as is clear from the draft federal budget for the 1986 fiscal year, a further cutback in social programs, given a simultaneous increase in military spending, is planned. Thus appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Transport (sic) are reduced 47 percent and for the Department of Education 3 percent and programs for retraining the unemployed are cut 28 percent. It is proposed "saving" almost \$40 billion altogether thanks to reductions in social spending.

For the purpose of easing the deficit burden the administration is getting deeper and deeper into debt. As a result in its term in office the U.S. federal debt has increased by practically the same amount as in the country's entire preceding history, and the United States' debt to foreign states is over \$800 billion. It is not surprising that even in U.S. business circles and the Congress government policy on the budget issue is evoking increasingly sharp criticism.

Such are merely some facts testifying that the limited economic upturn of 1983-1984 has not solved the problems of the American economy, which threaten new exacerbation in the immediate future.

Japan accounts for approximately \$37 billion of the total American foreign trade deficit. In the course of the visit to the United States at the start of January by Japanese Prime Minister Y. Nakasone R. Reagan demanded as a counterweight to Japan's commercial expansion on the American market American goods' facilitated access to the Japanese market. Nakasone referred to the overstated dollar exchange rate and other economic factors as causes of the imbalance in trade between the two countries. However, endeavoring to please the extraordinarily profitable trade partner, the prime minister promised by this March to have adopted certain measures to liberalize his country's market.

Particular attention during the visit was paid to the plans to create a so-called "Pacific community". Tokyo sees in the realization of this idea a possibility of the use of Japan's economic might for enhancing the country's political influence in the Pacific region. The United States, on the other hand, views the "Pacific community" concept in the context of its global strategic aspirations, counting on the possibility of converting it in the future into a military bloc subordinate to Washington.

Incidentally, the sides' different aspirations are not preventing at this stage a deepening of the American-Japanese "rapprochement". In the course of the negotiations Nakasone declared his "understanding" of the SDI advanced by Reagan. This declaration, like the support for the plans to deploy new American nuclear missiles in West Europe which the Japanese prime minister expressed earlier, confirms Tokyo's readiness to subordinate its policy to Washington's global strategy.

This policy is encountering strong opposition within the country. A real explosion of anger greeted, for example, Nakasone's forced admission that there exists on Japanese territory a system of American strategic communications stations virtually enabling the Pentagon to regard Japan as a forward position for waging nuclear war in the Western Pacific and the Indian Ocean.

Japanese ruling circles' attempts to circumvent the existing constitutional limitations on the growth of military spending are being treated with manifest satisfaction in Washington. Speaking in parliament on 28 January, Nakasone left open the question of whether the defense budget for 1985 would exceed the existing limit of 1 percent of GNP. Officially the bill on defense spending for 1985 confirmed by the government in December constitutes 0.997 percent of the planned GNP. However, government officials declare that it will exceed the 1-percent limit if the resources for an increase in servicemen's pay are included.

The strengthening of the American-Japanese partnership is being followed with alarm on the other side of the Atlantic. Business and political circles of West Europe are highly disturbed by the prospects of the development of cooperation between the United States and Japan in the sphere of science and technology, where the West European monopolies are inferior to their main rivals.

The latest specific event to "poison," according to the West German DIE WELT, "the entire atmosphere of American-European relations" was the embargo imposed on 29 November last year by the U.S. Government on the Common Market countries' supply of steel pipes to the United States. This decision had been preceded by lengthy negotiations between Washington and Brussels on the question of limiting West European competition on the American market. Employing arm-twisting tactics, the United States foisted on the community countries an agreement providing for a reduction in the Common Market's pipe supply quota.

An endeavor to undermine its partners' trade positions can also be traced in Washington's use of COCOM--the so-called Coordinating Committee for control of exports to socialist countries--which is made up of NATO members. At the last COCOM session, which was held in February in Paris, the review procedure of the restricted lists was changed under U.S. pressure in order "to renew them in good time with regard for the development of technology."

The offensive of American and Japanese monopolies against the positions of their West European competitors is being facilitated by the existence of acute contradictions rending the Common Market. The top-level EEC meeting at the start of December in Dublin confirmed once again that disagreements, intensified by economic squabbling, are, as before, preventing the participants from finding a solution which would make it possible to extricate the "Europe of the 10" from the financial and agricultural crises.

Agreement was reached in Dublin, it is true, on the date of Spain and Portugal's planned membership of the EEC. It is set for January 1986. But leading community circles do not conceal the fact that long and exhausting negotiations concerning the terms of membership still lie ahead.*

Evaluating the prospects of "European building," the weekly NOUVELLES ECONOMISTES writes: "By no means leading to the formation of a common culture and not contributing to the rapprochement of the peoples, this Eurocratic folklore has merely engendered in the population of the old continent a perception that it is living in an atmosphere of a wholesale grocery or a bazar." Entirely preoccupied with the struggle for power within the community and concerned primarily for its increased competitiveness in the face of foreign imperialist rivals, EEC ruling circles are getting away with bald declarations where it is a question of urgent problems of the population of the participants.

The most painful problem in West Europe remains unemployment. At the start of 1985 it amounted to approximately 2.3 million persons in the FRG and 3.2 million in Britain. Altogether the number merely of the officially registered unemployed in the EEC countries reached 12.4 million in 1984, remaining practically at the 1983 level. In fact, however, more than 18 million of these countries' able-bodied citizens were without work or were making ends meet with casual earnings. No one in the West here is venturing to forecast a reduction in the said indicators in the foreseeable future. The combination of the highest unemployment and inflation with the lowest growth

* For more detail see T. Filimonov, "Enlargement of the EEC" (MEMO No 4, 1985).

rate of the gross domestic product and industrial production among the developed capitalist countries is putting West Europe in a most difficult position compared with the two other leading power centers of imperialism--the United States and Japan.

The situation is made worse by Washington's actions essentially aimed at undermining the financial possibilities of the West European subregion and the consolidation of its subordinate strategic and military-political position in relation to the United States. In the first case the emphasis is being put, as already mentioned, on drawing off investment capital from West Europe and its transfer to the United States. In the second on the open imposition on the allies of American nuclear and other concepts and the development and use of a broad set of levers of pressure on the NATO allies and their subordination to American goals and interests.

It has to be acknowledged that in 1984, when both the U.S. economy and its currency--the dollar--were on the crest of a cyclical upturn, the United States was able on the whole to trample beneath it both the world capitalist economy and, in particular, the economy of West Europe. This fact explains to a considerable extent the apparent ease with which Washington has up to now been able to compel the other NATO members to abide in military-political questions also by a policy so manifestly contrary to their own, fundamental interests. However, this situation cannot be considered irreversible. Actions of the United States which do not take into account the interests of West Europe or even, as is the case on some issues, are prepared to sacrifice both these interests and West Europe itself increase the potential for discontent on this side of the Atlantic--both in the broad people's masses and in a certain part of the ruling circles. This is confirmed by a number of circumstances.

Thus the United States is endeavoring to obtain from West Europe and also Canada and Japan a promise to cover from 20 to 25 percent of the cost of the program to create the Columbus permanent orbital space station, whose launch is planned for 1992. Considering the cost of the project--a key element of the Reagan administration's space plans--there is undoubtedly a practical point to such calculations. Incidentally, the mere fact of these calculations testifies that the United States is beginning to feel an increasing need for the allies and their support for realization of the planned programs of militarist preparations. It is not a question of this, however. We have to agree with the opinion of R. Walther, chairman of the FRG Bundestag's Budget Commission, that the Americans are interested not so much in the allies' financial participation as in determining the directions of the West European countries' scientific research. In other words, in determining the limits of their future economic possibilities. And also, we would add, political possibilities. All this has to be understood by politicians of capitalist countries.

U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger made a trip in February to a number of West European states to indoctrinate the allies disturbed by Washington's plans and practical actions. Commenting on the goals of the tour, the French weekly (PUEN) wrote: "The Americans are endeavoring to strengthen relations

with the allies prior to the resumption (opening of new--Author) of negotiations with the Soviet Union in order to appear to the leaders of the Kremlin as undisputed leaders in the West." If the visit indeed pursued such a goal, the U.S. secretary clearly failed to achieve it.

As far as Washington's SDI--the "star wars" plans--is concerned, the United States has been able here to win "understanding" on the part only of a few NATO partners. The hurried readiness to do the United States a good turn on this issue displayed by FRG Chancellor H. Kohl is explained both by Bonn's claims to the role of the United States' most loyal ally and the hopes of West Germany military-industrial concerns to at least some extent warm their hand in participation in realization of the American plans and gains access to the corresponding technology. Similar considerations also evidently dictated the British Government's position on this question.

On the other hand, the U.S. Administration is having to encounter instances of direct and open resistance to its aggressive policy on the part of states allied to the United States in accordance with this treaty or the other.

Thus at the end of January the Greek Government declared that it would not consent to any modernization of the U.S. nuclear arsenal on Greek territory and would refrain from taking part in NATO maneuvers in the Mediterranean. In mid-February A. Drosos, alternate Greek minister of national defense, reported, addressing journalists, that his country had demanded that NATO conduct no more military maneuvers in the Aegean area.

A scrupulous position has been occupied by New Zealand's Labor government, which has banned calls at the country's ports by U.S. warships carrying nuclear weapons or nuclear-powered ships. Despite the concentrated pressure on the Wellington government on the part of the United States, the former's position on this question remains invariable, which has already led, inter alia, to cancellation of the Sea Eagle-85 maneuvers, which were planned within the framework of the ANZUS bloc for March 1985. Western observers have evaluated this fact as the biggest row in the bloc's 34-year history, threatening its very further existence. It has to be mentioned in this connection that there has been a marked growth in this bloc recently of antinuclear sentiments, about which our roundups have already written. It is not surprising that Washington is displaying every sign of a readiness to go as far as it wishes in putting pressure on the New Zealand Government. THE NEW YORK TIMES quotes an unnamed high-ranking representative of the U.S. Administration: "If we (Washington--Author) do not succeed in bringing the allies under control on the question of ships' visits and the deployment of nuclear weapons, they will start running one after the other."

4. Peoples of the Developing Countries Against the Policy of State Terrorism

The end of 1984--start of 1985 was exceptionally rich in important events for the peoples of India--a big and influential Asian power and leader of the nonaligned movement. In January the country commemorated the 35th anniversary of proclamation of the republic. In this time the Indian people have scored significant successes in various walks of life. The policy of nonalignment which the country pursues enjoys high authority in the international arena.

India consistently advocates an easing of international tension, a reorganization of the existing trade-economic relations between the capitalist and developing countries and a halt to the arms race. As the leaders of the republic have emphasized repeatedly, an important part in strengthening the country's economic and political independence has been played by cooperation with the Soviet Union. It was initiated 30 years ago by the signing of an intergovernmental agreement on the rendering to India of assistance in the construction of the foundry in Bhilai. The message of Indian President Z. Singh to K.U. Chernenko on this date notes: "The signing of the intergovernmental agreement of 2 February 1955 was a significant event in the development of our friendly relations and represents an important contribution to our efforts to create a strong industrial base. It marked the start of fruitful cooperation, which is of mutual benefit and which is expanding from year to year."

Currently Soviet-Indian cooperation encompasses practically all aspects of the life of the two states. A major landmark on the path of development of bilateral relations was the signing in 1979 of the long-term program of economic, commercial and scientific-technical cooperation between the two countries for the next 10-15 years.

The elections to the lower house of parliament at the end of 1984 were an important political event in the life of the country. They were held in a difficult situation. Internal forces, with active outside support, are unceasing in their subversive activity aimed at destabilizing the situation in the country. A particularly tense situation took shape in the states of Punjab and Assam, in connection with which the government had to postpone the elections in these states until a later date.

The ruling Indian National Congress Party (I) appeared at the elections under slogans of preservation of the country's national unity and integrity and put forward a program of wide-ranging socioeconomic transformations. These slogans proved consonant with the cherished aspirations of millions of Indians. The Indian National Congress Party (I) won a big victory. Its candidates won in 400 of the 507 electoral districts, which secured for the party more than two-thirds of the seats in the lower house of parliament. This was the Indian National Congress Party (I's) biggest victory in the history of the country's independent existence. The results of the elections reflected the Indian people's aspiration to the preservation of the country's national unity and territorial unity and the strengthening of the state's democratic and constitutional foundations.

In his speeches following the elections Prime Minister R. Gandhi declared the new government's intention of maintaining continuity of the country's policy and following the course bequeathed by J. Nehru and I. Gandhi. The prime minister emphasized India's adherence to the principles of nonalignment and a new international economic order based on justice, equality and mutually profitable cooperation. The government intends here to pay particular attention to the development of friendlier relations with neighboring states directly bordering India.

As is known, in certain areas these relations are characterized by considerable tension. Imperialism is pursuing against India a policy of creating a hostile encirclement around the perimeter of its borders, provoking anti-Indian sentiments in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Nepal and rearming Pakistan at an accelerated pace. The latter circumstance is a subject of the Indian Government's particular concern. The concentrated supplies to the Zia-ul-Haq regime of the latest arms are justifiably regarded in New Delhi as a threat to the country's security, which its leaders have declared repeatedly. The increase in Pakistan's military might combined with the growing militarization of the Pacific being carried out by the United States is leading to an undermining of stability not only on the South Asian subcontinent but also throughout Asia.

The facts testify that Pakistan is being assigned an increasingly important role in subversive activity against states whose policy is not to Washington's liking. The territory of this country serves as the main springboard of the undeclared war which imperialism headed by the United States is waging in respect of democratic Afghanistan. Dozens of organizations of Afghan counterrevolution and more than 100 camps, where bands of cutthroats sent deep into Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA) territory to carry out acts of diversion and sabotage are trained, have found refuge on Pakistan soil.

Not confining itself to the training and instruction of the bandits in the use of the most modern weapons, including missiles, the military regime has recently sharply expanded the scale of the undeclared war and has been perpetrating acts of direct aggression against Afghanistan. Pakistani artillery's shelling of Afghan localities, Pakistani Army subunits' penetration of DRA territory and other violations of this country's sovereignty have become a customary phenomenon.

Such is Islamabad's payment for the military assistance being rendered it by Washington. Pakistan has become the biggest recipient in Asia, after Israel, of American weapons with the framework of military aid programs. It is proposed allocating \$325 million for this purpose in 1986.

The flow of dollars spent directly on maintaining and arming the Afghan counterrevolution is also increasing in parallel. According to data of the WASHINGTON POST, in the present year the insurgents will receive approximately \$250 million. Furthermore, Saudi Arabia, Israel and China plan to make a further \$200 million available. The participation of the latter in the expanding interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs, a DRA Foreign Ministry statement says, is being expressed in supplies to the counterrevolutionaries of weapons and ammunition, including missiles, the training of the bandits of Pakistani and Chinese territory and hostile propaganda.

However, as the development of events show, the attempts to stifle the Afghan revolution and halt the process of progressive transformations are doomed to failure. Despite the serious difficulties created by the operations of the enemies of the Afghan people and the tremendous material damage being inflicted on the country as a result of the undeclared war against it (as of the present the direct damage alone is in excess of 35 million fghanis or approximately

\$800 million), the building of the new life continues. The authority and strength of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA), which in January celebrated its 20th anniversary, are growing, and increasingly broad strata of the working people are satisfying themselves that the PDPA's policy corresponds to their fundamental aspirations.

The DRA Government has repeatedly appealed insistently to its neighbors for a settlement of relations and a solution of contentious issues at the negotiating table. However, Iran has not taken up this proposal, while Pakistan, although it consented to negotiations in Geneva with the participation of the UN secretary general's personal representative, has not displayed an interest in reaching an agreement. The latest round of such negotiations was postponed through its fault. Furthermore, as the scheduled date of their resumption approaches, the Pakistani authorities have stepped up subversive activity against the DRA.

In the opinion of observers, in spurring tension in relations between the two countries and developing a hostile anti-Afghan campaign the Zia-ul-Haq regime is not only diligently "working off" the generous assistance granted it by the United States and other countries but also pursuing perfectly definite domestic policy goals: diverting the attention of the country's population from the arbitrariness and lawlessness currently reigning in Pakistan. It was these considerations by which the dictatorial regime was guided in holding a so-called "referendum" on the question of support for the policy of "Islamization". With the aid of this political farce, as many press organs evaluated the "referendum," the authorities hoped to acquire at least a semblance of "popular support" for their policy.

However, the dodge manifestly failed to justify the hopes that had been placed in it. The overwhelming majority of the population (90 percent, according to opposition data) boycotted the "referendum". Despite the repression which the regime brought down on its opponents and the arrests of many leaders of opposition parties, since the end of last year there has been no abatement in Pakistan of the wave of antigovernment protests, meetings and demonstrations organized by the Movement for the Restoration of Democracy. It unites the leading parties opposed to the dictatorship. In this situation Zia-ul-Haq decided to undertake the latest farce--hold elections to the National Assembly (the lower house of parliament) and provincial legislatures at the end of February. Preparing for them, the dictator-general did everything to prevent even a semblance of the people's free will. According to the evaluation of the WASHINGTON POST, this was "the strangest election campaign which has ever been conducted." "Political parties," the paper writes, "were prohibited from taking part in the election campaign, and meetings and street demonstrations were banned." As the elections approached, the military regime stepped up the repression in respect of its opponents. On the eve of the ballot alone the authorities arrested more than 650 persons in 4 days. In the country as a whole not only the leaders but also activists of opposition parties found themselves in jail or under house arrest.

The 10th conference of foreign ministers of Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam, which confirmed the three countries' readiness to begin negotiations with all interested parties for the purpose of achieving a political settlement of the

situation that has taken shape around Cambodia, was held in January 1985 in Ho Chi Minh City. Such a settlement, the conferees believe, must include removal of the criminal Pol Pot grouping in the political and military planes and the withdrawal of the Vietnamese volunteers from Cambodia, given observance of the Cambodian people's right to self-determination.

However, Washington and Beijing are continuing the futile attempts to prevent the total rout of their agents in this part of the region, prevent the "closing" of the artificially exaggerated "Cambodian question" and to maintain tension in Southeast Asia as a pretext for their own interference there. ASEAN, which adopted at its February foreign ministers' conference in Bangkok a declaration on the so-called "Cambodian question," which is essentially a declaration of the "Six's" intention of continuing the further maintaining tension in the region, is again being drawn into these plans.

The resuscitation of the provocative row surrounding the so-called "Cambodia question" has a perfectly specific cause. The point being that at the start of this year subunits of the Cambodian People's Revolutionary Army with the assistance of Vietnamese volunteers liquidated practically all Pol Pot's strong points in the northwest of the republic, thereby completely expelling the Pol Pot bands from the territory of the long-suffering country.

Commenting on the attempts of outside forces to reanimate the misanthropic Pol Pot regime, the Djakarta newspaper MERDEKA wrote: "Having proclaimed the need for the creation in Southeast Asia of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, ASEAN is in reality pursuing a policy of confrontation and the spurring of tension and instability.... It would seem that ASEAN has become China's instrument for 'inciting a second revolution in Indochina' and Washington's lever for pursuing a policy aimed against Vietnam."

In contrast to this policy Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia confirm their endeavor to achieve the conversion of the region into a genuine zone of peace, good-neighborliness and cooperation in which the mutual relations of all its states would be built on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. They also welcome Malaysia's proposal concerning the creation in Southeast Asia of a nuclear-free zone. The three countries believe that both these tasks could be accomplished without waiting for a "Cambodian settlement".

Events in the Near East in recent months have again shown that reliance on force and brigandage is sooner or later doomed to fail. In mid-January the Israeli Government announced its decision to begin the gradual withdrawal of its forces from Lebanon. The majority of observers evaluated this step as virtual recognition of the bankruptcy of the Israeli adventure in Lebanon.

The forced nature of Tel Aviv's decision concerning withdrawal from the neighboring country is obvious to all. The longer the occupation of South Lebanon continued, the more dearly it was costing the aggressor, who had come up against a mass resistance movement. Even according to official Israeli data, the occupiers' losses since the start of the invasion of Lebanon in June 1982 through mid-February of the present year constituted over 600 killed and 3,500 wounded, and expenditure was over \$3 billion. And this given the catastrophic situation of the country's economy. Finally, the war in Lebanon had brought about the unprecedented domestic and foreign policy isolation of the Zionist regime.

In the opinion of observers, the decision to withdraw from Lebanon announced by Israel should also be viewed in the broader context of Near East politics. It is designed to facilitate the realization of separate deals a la Camp David imposed on the Arabs by the "strategic partners". American-Israeli diplomacy has recently markedly stepped up its efforts in this direction. Political observers are drawing attention to the agreement between King Hussein of Jordan and Y. Arafat concerning a "framework of joint actions" signed in Amman. The document records the parties' consent to seek a settlement of the Near East problem together. The question of the Palestinian people's self-determination here is to be tackled, according to the understanding that has been reached, within the framework of "an Arab confederative alliance which it is proposed creating from the Jordanian and Palestinian states." The agreement also provides for PLO participation in peace negotiations "as part of a joint delegation".

The understanding between King Hussein and Y. Arafat has brought about an acute polemic in the PLO and the Arab world. Egypt, Morocco and Saudi Arabia have declared their support for the Amman agreement. Syria, Democratic Yemen and certain other Arab countries emphatically condemn it. The agreement is also opposed by the leaders of the majority of Palestinian organizations within the Palestine Resistance Movement. There is no unity on this question even in the ranks of the Fatah organization, a leader of which is Y. Arafat.

In the opinion of opponents of the agreement, it will lead to a further intensification of the disagreements within the Palestine Resistance Movement and an undermining of the authority and role of the PLO as the Palestinian people's sole legitimate representative and will weaken the PLO's ties to the forces fighting for liberation and progress. The understanding between King Hussein and Y. Arafat, a joint statement of representatives of communist and workers parties of the Arab East says, is a consequence of the pressure on the PLO leadership for the purpose of imposing on it a capitulationist course. The signing of the agreement, it goes on to note, took place at a time when American imperialism is making feverish efforts to establish its undivided sway in the Near East and attempting to turn the region into a springboard of struggle against the national liberation movement.

Washington's official reaction to the Amman agreement confirms this assessment. President Reagan termed it a "positive step," emphasizing here that he regards the agreement between King Hussein and Y. Arafat as "the first instance of progress being discerned" since the 1982 "Reagan Plan" was put forward.

As is known, this plan completely ignores the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and the role of the PLO and it evades all questions concerning the return to the Arabs of East Jerusalem and Syria's Golan Heights, annexed by Israel, and also liquidation of the Israeli settlements in the occupied territories. The Arab peoples, primarily the Palestinians, rejected the "Reagan Peace Plan" in the past. Now, however, to judge by everything, persistent attempts are being made to resuscitate it.

The situation in the south of Africa remains complex and explosive. South Africa, which is being shaken by Africans' mass protests, is seething. The struggle against the apartheid regime is growing and is being joined by increasingly broad strata of the country's population. On the side of South Africa's patriots are all the world's democratic forces. The racist regime is managing to hold on to power only thanks to support on the part of the United States (which increased considerably with Reagan's occupancy of the White House) and some of its closest allies. The policy of so-called "constructive engagement" being pursued by the U.S. Administration is a challenge to the overwhelming majority of UN members. As is known, a number of resolutions adopted by the UN General Assembly categorically rejects all forms of cooperation with Pretoria. Broad public strata in the United States itself are also demanding an end to the support of the racist regime.

Ignoring these demands, Washington is continuing to strengthen its ties to South Africa, which is assigned the role of gendarme of imperialism in the struggle against the progressive states and national liberation movements in the south of the continent.

The United States attempts to justify the policy of "constructive engagement" with South Africa by the fact that it is allegedly contributing to "positive change" in Pretoria's domestic and foreign policy. However, the facts attest the reverse. Relying on Washington's support, the racist regime is stepping up repression against the indigenous population of South Africa itself and also provocations in respect of neighboring states. As before, South African troops occupy southern areas of the Angolan People's Republic, although in accordance with an accord between South Africa and Angola their withdrawal was to have been completed a year ago--by March 1984. The racists' extensive assistance to the UNITA counterrevolutionary grouping is unceasing.

Subversive activity against Mozambique also continues. Pretoria is taking advantage here of the terrorists from the so-called "Mozambique National Resistance" (MNR). And this despite South Africa's undertaking (within the framework of the "Nkomati Treaty") to end all support for MNR bands, which are carrying out attacks from bases on South African territory and taking cover there after having perpetrated sabotage. Manifestly with Washington's unspoken approval the South African authorities are impudently ignoring UN Security Council Resolution 435 on Namibia, which demands the granting of independence to this territory, which is illegally occupied by the racist regime. Attempting to preserve its domination here, Pretoria is waging a real war against the Namibian people, who are fighting for the right to build their own life independently. South Africa maintains more than 100,000 regular army soldiers and special terrorist formations in Namibia.

However, Namibia's patriotic forces, headed by SWAPO, are striking increasingly telling blows at the South African troops. Under these conditions the racist regime is resorting to various maneuvers, attempting to "neutralize" SWAPO. A gamble is being made on strengthening the influence of the so-called "Multiparty Conference," which the racists have cobbled together from puppet "internal parties". However, SWAPO refuses to participate, insisting on fulfillment of UN Security Council Resolution 435 and the holding of elections in Namibia under the aegis of the United Nations.

Endeavoring to confuse the international public, Pretoria is creating the appearance of democratic transformations in South Africa itself. The first session of the tricameral South African parliament--an ugly creation of the apartheid regime--was held in February in Capetown. It is formed in accordance with the principle of racial segregation and incorporates representatives of the "Colored" and Indian communities. Almost three-fourths (73 percent) of the African population--the country's indigenous inhabitants--are not represented in it at all. As the British newspaper THE OBSERVER notes, "it is believed in some circles that he (President P. Botha--Author) is beginning to do away with the system of apartheid. He is doing nothing of the sort. He is merely changing the appearance of the system and making it more contemporary. The basic purpose--guaranteeing preservation of the white minority regime in perpetuity...--remains unchanged."

Tension is not abating in Central America either. The start of the Reagan administration's second term was marked by a sharp exacerbation of the situation in this part of the world. Emboldened by the success of the "Grenada action," Washington has gotten right down to the elaboration of plans for a "repetition of Grenada" in other countries of Central America and the Caribbean. The main target of the aggressive actions is Nicaragua.

Throughout the winter the U.S. Administration has attempted to undermine the revolutionary regime with the aid of crude military pressure and provocations. Washington's actions against Nicaragua are a graphic example of the policy of state terrorism. Bandit formations of Contras cobbled together by the CIA are engaged in killings and sabotage, thereby counting on sowing fear among the population, bringing about chaos in the economy and preparing the ground for the invasion of American interventionists for the purpose of ousting the Sandinista government. The American mercenaries undertook approximately 1,500 terrorist and sabotage actions against Nicaragua in 1984 altogether. They are being carried out mainly from the territory of Honduras and Costa Rica. Some 7,600 Nicaraguan citizens have been casualties thereof in the past 4 years.

Not confining itself to subversive activity, the United States is also engaged in direct military pressure on Nicaragua. The republic's Defense Ministry has reported the constant plying off the country's shores of U.S. warships, from which American combat helicopters carry out provocative overflights of Nicaraguan territory. More than 1,300 airspace violations were recorded in 1984, 480 of them by American spy planes.

In the plans for an expansion of the undeclared war against Nicaragua an important role is assigned Honduras, whose territory is being used as a trampoline for the aggression which is being prepared. Washington is encouraging the reactionary circles of the Honduran military in every possible way and attempting to neutralize the forces which are opposed to the spurring of tension around Nicaragua and in Central America as a whole. According to reports of the Argentine newspaper LA VOZ, total military assistance to Honduras was over \$77 million last year. This country's armed forces have more than 30,000 men. According to a statement of Nicaraguan Defense Minister H. Ortega, more than 2,000 American servicemen, who are in

charge of combat helicopter assembly, modernizing airfields, building ammunition stores and servicing the radar and other equipment at the United States' numerous military bases, are currently stationed in Honduras.

The American-Honduran Big Pine-3 joint maneuvers with the participation of subunits of the U.S. Army, Air Force and Navy began on Honduran territory on 11 February. This action was aimed at intimidating Nicaragua and reinforcing the base for the intervention which is being prepared.

Continuing to gamble on a military solution of Central American problems, the Reagan administration took the decision to suspend the Nicaraguan-American negotiations in the Mexican city of Manzanillo and to boycott the International Court in the Hague's investigation of the Nicaraguan Government's complaint of aggressive actions on the part of the United States. Washington hereby closed off practically all diplomatic negotiating channels for a normalization of the situation in Central America. Formally the dialogue was suspended on the pretext that it could impede the multilateral consultations which are being held by the Contadora Group (it includes Mexico, Colombia, Panama and Venezuela).

It was planned in mid-February holding a meeting of Central American countries to examine the "Document of Peace," which is designed to settle the conflict situation politically. However, the United States is blocking its adoption. Under pressure from Washington El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica submitted to the Contadora Group their counterdraft containing amendments to the "Document of Peace". They are aimed at undermining the most important provisions of the document and reserving for Washington the right to continue large-scale maneuvers in Central America and create there bases for direct armed intervention.

To judge by everything, it is to this that Washington is leading matters. Observers draw attention to President Reagan's words at a press conference on 14 February to the effect that his purpose is to do away with the "present structure" of the Nicaraguan Government. A few days later U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, speaking in San Francisco demanded of Nicaragua no more, no less than "fundamental changes in its conduct" and the nature of its domestic and foreign policy. It is "immaterial" to the United States here, Shultz declared, whether the changes to its liking occur as a result of "evolution... or the collapse of the Sandinista regime."

Commenting on U.S. policy in respect of Nicaragua in the light of these statements, the NEW YORK TIMES writes: "It should no longer be doubted that Nicaragua is a thorn in Reagan's side and that he intends fighting against this country's government." "It is to be expected," the paper continued, "that his pronouncements on this matter will contain even more exaggerations, disinformation and demagoguery. All this reduces to nothing the assertions that in aiding the Contras the Reagan administration has only been attempting to halt the flow of arms from Nicaragua to the leftwing guerrillas in El Salvador--assertions which have never been proved."

Considering the seriousness of the situation which has taken shape in the region through the fault of the Reagan administration, at the end of February the revolutionary government of Nicaragua put forward new peace

initiatives aimed at easing tension in relations between Nicaragua and neighboring states. As a first step toward achievement of the goals of the Contador Group it proposed the withdrawal of all military advisers from Central America. It declared here that it would renounce the assistance of 100 military instructors of Cuban nationality, the first half of whom would leave the country this May. In addition, in the context of the "Contadora process" Nicaragua would impose indefinitely a moratorium on the acquisition of new types of weapons, including interceptor aircraft. For the purpose of frustrating the attempts to block the Contadora Group's initiative the country's government intends taking practical steps to remove the secondary impediments which have been created in the way of this group's activity.

For a better understanding by the U.S. Congress, public opinion and the government of the far-fetched nature of the arguments concerning the so-called "militarization" of Nicaragua its leaders adopted the decision to send the leaders of the U.S. Congress an invitation to visit the country and see for themselves the defense nature of the Nicaraguan armed forces and means of defense.

5. A Reliable Barrier Against Historical Oblivion

As the 40th anniversary of the Great Victory comes closer and closer, the divide between the two lines in world politics can be seen more clearly and distinctly. One, which is shared not only by the socialist community states but also by the all sober-minded people generally, is aimed at preventing a repetition, even more, a multiplication of the horrors and devastation of the last war. And for this it is necessary to do everything for the sake of strengthening international security and developing cooperation between states and peoples on the basis of the principles which are the foundation of the postwar settlement in Europe and in the world as a whole. That is, on the basis of the principles of Yalta and Potsdam, which were further enshrined and developed in the Final Act of Helsinki.

The other line, on the other hand, is revealing increasingly manifestly a dangerous thrust toward a revision of the results of World War II and postwar development. A forcible and military revision, it stands to reason, since the peoples are not about to give up and will not give up gains and liberty acquired at such a high price, and the present-day Marlboroughs cannot fail to understand this. Both the voices of the West German and Japanese revanchists and the even more dangerous and adventurist appeals of the transatlantic militarists are joined in a single ominous choir here.

The start of 1985 was marked by a number of speeches of leading West German politicians, including Federal Chancellor H. Kohl. Naturally, it is hard to expect from the present West German Government expressions of delight in connection with the smashing of Hitler's Reich. But the stubborn reluctance of this country's ruling circles to recognize the territorial-political realities which have taken shape in Europe as a result of World War II--a war the lion's share of responsibility for the unleashing of which lies with German imperialism--appears strange, at the least.

In particular, presenting the government statement "The Nation's Position in a Divided Germany" in the Bundestag at the end of February, H. Kohl mentioned repeatedly some "East-West dividing line". Certain passages of his speech also permit the conclusion that Bonn continues to refuse to consider the GDR an independent, sovereign state and to recognize the existence of such an objective reality as GDR citizenship. The statement contains arguments concerning some possibility in the future of a "new peace settlement for Germany," within the framework, what is more, of some structure crowned with a "European roof".

In the FRG itself, however, prominent figures of the social democratic opposition are rightly evaluating such mouthings as provocative and irresponsible. Thus H. Apel, deputy chairman of the SPD parliamentary faction, observed that CDU figures are increasingly often "calling in question our eastern treaties, primarily Poland's western borders, while the chancellor is resorting to maneuvers instead of occupying a clear position." We can only specify: in this case and on this question such maneuvers are a position, and a quite definite and clear one, moreover.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/13

BLOC SYMPOSIUM ON CONSERVATIVE SHIFT IN WESTERN ECONOMIC POLICY

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 105-116

[M. Belyayev, R. Kapelyushnikov report: "The crisis of State-Monopoly Regulation and its Reflection in Bourgeois Political Economy"; the editorial office offers for readers' attention an abridged account of the speeches of the participants in the symposium*]

[Excerpts] A paper analyzing the causes of the revival of conservatism was delivered by Academician A. Mileykovskiy (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economy and International Relations [IMEMO]). In the era which preceded the great October capitalism solved its contradictions by way of crisis in economics and wars in politics. They were the engines of capitalist development. Now capitalism is not in a position to solve its contradictions thus. First, the transition from capitalism to socialism, which is being accomplished on a worldwide scale, the indisputable successes of real socialism and the strengthening economically and politically of young national states have become the content of our era. Second, a most important result of the competition of the two systems is the liquidation of the U.S. monopoly of strategic preponderance in the sphere of arms, nuclear weapons in particular.

The question of the prospects of the development of capitalism, which has not yet exhausted the possibilities for expanded reproduction of bourgeois production relations, should, the speaker noted, be a most important sphere of scientific research for the purpose of debunking bourgeois political economy.

A. Mileykovskiy dwelt in more detail on questions of the strategy and tactics of the class struggle under the new conditions. It is necessary upon an analysis of the different manifestations of conservatism, he believes, to pay more attention to the unevenness of the development of the political structures of state-monopoly capitalism within the framework of bourgeois democracy. It is communists' task to speak and write about the pseudodemocracy which exists therein.

* For the start see MEMO No 2, 1985.

The singularities of the class structure of this country or the other and, in particular, the class of the bourgeoisie itself are not always taken into consideration, unfortunately, in the polemic with bourgeois political economy. It is sometimes forgotten that together with the large-scale corporations there exists in each country a mass of small enterprises and together with the basic classes a many-sided stratum of declassé elements forming the "bottom of society". Their role as the social base of the reactionary wing of modern conservatism has grown.

The speaker emphasized that it is essential that our critical thought react to the changes in specific-historical conditions. However, he believes, we do not always display due promptitude here. This applies, in particular, to world market relations. Internationally interwoven capital in the shape of transnational corporations and banks and also the IMF and World Bank are now most important subjects of the world economy and policy of imperialism. They pursue the general strategy of imperialism in respect of the developing world.

Due attention is not always paid upon an analysis of the modern forms of ideological struggle to the increased role of religious organizations and institutions enlisted in imperialism's anticommunist strategy. This is particularly important upon a study of the economic and political strategy of modern imperialism in the developing world. In particular, a correct evaluation of the historical genealogy of tribalism, which has not disappeared in many young national states, is essential.

In conclusion the speaker dwelt on the tasks of the workers movement in connection with the structural crises of capitalist industry. In his opinion, it is here (and this is confirmed by the present miners' strike in Britain) that an active offensive against the trade unions is being conducted. The proletariat is responding by the cohesion of its ranks and increased worker solidarity. The working people's masses are uniting under the slogan of struggle against militarism. The antiwar movement against the deployment of American nuclear missiles on their territory has assumed unprecedented proportions in West European countries.

G. Meisner, member of the GDR Academy of Sciences, emphasized the need for the close connection between economic aspects and political, social and international aspects upon an analysis of modern imperialism.

Neoconservative economic theory is not without historical precedents. In the FRG, for example, its theoretical and economico-political instruments were prepared by representatives of the "social market economy" concept. The contemporary neoconservative concept, "justifying" a general offensive against the working people's vital rights, appears in a quite different form. Economic theory and economic policy officially and avowedly defend the interests of the propertied strata of the population.

Prof V. Shenayev, doctor of economic sciences (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO), emphasized that the entire postwar period has show graphically the existence of the two functions of bourgeois political economy: ideological and practical. The parties which are victorious at elections form governments which adopt in economic policy the doctrine which corresponds to the economic platform of the ruling party.

The predominantly neoclassical model of the so-called "social market economy" containing elements of monetarism and supply-side theory was practiced throughout 20 postwar years in the FRG. It proved its groundlessness in practice, being unable to prevent the 1966-1976 cyclical economic crisis. As a result the CDU was forced to share power with the SPD in 1966.

The model of an "enlightened market economy" came to be employed in the practice of the grand coalition (1966-1969). It represented a neoclassical synthesis with a large set of the implements and resources of Keynesian doctrine in a spirit of "global regulation". However, in reality a departure from the SPD's economic program, which was based on Keynesianism, was revealed, and a curbing of socioeconomic reforms on the pretext of preventing a federal budget deficit began, freely fluctuating currency exchange rates were proclaimed and so forth. As a result conflict arose within the SPD.

From 1969 through the fall of 1982 the SPD was in power in coalition with the FDP bourgeois party, which was given the office of minister of economics. In practical activity the policy of a departure from Keynesian methods in the direction of the "social market economy" model continued.

The position changed appreciably in the mid-1970's under the influence of the collapse of the Bretton Woods currency system, structural crises, the exacerbation of ecological problems and others. Keynesianism found itself unprepared for these conditions, primarily for unchecked inflation. The 1974-1975 world economic crisis showed the ineffectiveness of market-determined programs, and they were no longer employed in the West German practice of state regulation.

As of the mid-1970's criticism of the SPD's economic program, which was based on Keynesianism, came from right and left. The SPD leadership made concession after concession and moved to the right, losing its character and its authority.

The Christian democrats, who together with the FDP adopted a neoconservative course based on supply-side theory, again assumed office in the fall of 1982. In the press the new coalition is linked with a renaissance of the market economy.

Both Keynesianism and monetarism were again subjected to sharp criticism as of the start of the 1980's. Economic prospects are seen in a long-term policy ensuing from supply-side theory.

Changes in the theoretical doctrines of the ruling parties with their economic platforms have been and remain a characteristic phenomenon of the capitalist countries. Nor is neoconservatism in its monetarism and supply-side varieties avoiding this. V. Shenayev believes that what is new in these theories should not be exaggerated since they are frequently merely the forgotten old.

A detailed exposition of the theoretical concepts of economic neoconservatism was presented by Prof R. Entov (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO), doctor of economic sciences.

A gap between "pure theory" and practice, the speaker observed, has always been typical of the neoclassical school of bourgeois political economy. It became particularly perceptible in the 1970's-start of the 1980's, in the atmosphere of growing economic difficulties and the acute crisis of state-monopoly regulation, when a quest began in Western literature for new methods of "cheering up" the capitalist economy. In this situation economic theory oriented toward supply (henceforward, for brevity, "supply-side economics") took shape from the very outset as a very narrow sphere of theoretical analysis.

The theoretical superficiality of "supply-side economics" prompted the majority of representatives of academic science "not to notice" the constructions of supporters of this theory or to plainly dissociate themselves from them. Nonetheless, its supporters are publicizing the popularity of the said concept among representatives of the Reagan administration. Such a paradox can hardly be considered accidental: the strengthening of reactionary-conservative trends in sociopolitical life is accompanied, as a rule, by a growth of anti-intellectual trends and an increasing gap between the liberal-bourgeois constructions of many representatives of university science and the "practical philosophy" of the conservative forces which have assumed office.

A different place in modern bourgeois political economy is occupied by the theory of rational expectations. In the most prevalent theoretical outlines of rational expectations use is usually made of the supposition concerning the existence of a "natural norm of unemployment". But no intrinsic connection between these "building blocks," which the representatives of the neoclassical school at present usually use when elaborating macroeconomic models, exists. The supposition concerning the rationality of expectations may also figure, for example, in outlines with an insufficiently mobile monetary wage.

The possibilities of the extensive use of the hypothesis of rational expectations for apologetic purposes have been manifested graphically in the majority of theoretical outlines, which practically exclude the possibility of discrepancies between supply and demand, in other words, the possibilities of any lengthy overproduction vanish. Prices in these outlines are stable and provide for the complete "clearing" of the markets. Yet it was precisely in the 1970's-start of the 1980's that the capitalist economy encountered a sharp increase in instability and particularly intensive fluctuations of both "actual" and value indicators.

Unexpected changes in the money supply are a most important factor of the cyclical fluctuations in the theory of the economic cycle developed by R. Lucas and certain other supporters of the rational expectations concept. In other words, the source of instability proves here to be beyond the limits of the private-capitalist economy. These constructions, the speaker said in conclusion, reflect, albeit in distorted form, the deepening crisis of state-monopoly regulation.

A central issue of the debate, Prof A. Matyas (Hungary), doctor of economic sciences, believes, is the "argument" concerning capitalism's capacity for automatically coping with the problems confronting it.

J. Keynes answered this question in the negative. Contemporary bourgeois theorists see the basic source of the ailments in the economic policy of the state, which allegedly prevents the stable regulation of actual economic processes. The modern neoclassical schools are returning theoretically to the price theory framework.

They put forward the "clearing" of the market paradigm as a working hypothesis. A change in relative prices, in their theories, clears the commodity market, and a change in real wages the labor market.

Responsibility here for the existence of an army of unemployed is put on the "superfluous people" themselves, who are allegedly insufficiently assertive in the search for information concerning work or are immobile. The conclusion concerning the "voluntary" nature of modern unemployment is drawn on this shaky basis.

There are increased attacks here on the state, which by its economic policy is allegedly impeding the action of the "clearing" mechanism of prices and thereby making the situation worse.

Together with the "clearing" of the market paradigm the representatives of "new classical macroeconomics" put forward the rational expectations hypothesis. According to this concept, the managing subjects make the optimum use of all information. Furthermore, its compass is quite extensive--from purely economic parameters through an assumption concerning the government's reactions to this event or the other.

State intervention under these conditions is knowingly doomed to fail. In their opinion, the economy may deviate from an equiponderant path only as a result of the unsystematic mistakes of the managing subjects. Consequently, cycles are not something intrinsically inherent in the capitalist production mode. In their constructions it is only unsystematic events not susceptible to "foresight" which drive the economy from the equilibrium allegedly inherent in it.

The actual Western economy, which is rent by antagonistic class contradictions, cannot be stable, and it is all the more absurd to talk about the fact that it is possible with the aid of the price mechanism to stabilize the capitalist economy, which is in the profoundest crisis.

A paper on the place of the "new classical macroeconomics" in the system of bourgeois political economy and modern state-monopoly regulation was presented by Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Leonidov (Bulgaria).

A fundamental place in the "new classical macroeconomics" system is occupied by the rational expectations concept or hypothesis formulated by (Dzh. Mut).

Prof K. Mueller (GDR), doctor of economic sciences, concentrated attention on the new phenomena in bourgeois reproduction theory. It is in this sphere that special efforts are being made for the purpose of counteracting the serious crisis state of bourgeois economic theory and economic policy.

The new trends in the development of bourgeois reproduction theory demand a detailed analysis not only to expose the economico-theoretical substantiation of existing state-monopoly regulation mechanisms. In the economic competition of the two world systems it is important to assess the impact and limits of the possibilities of individual instruments and measures of state-monopoly regulation and on this basis to forecast the development of the capitalist world.

Candidate of Economic Sciences M. Rumler (CSSR) observed that the ineffectiveness of Keynesian prescriptions, bourgeois theorists believe, is explained not even by the excessive nature of state-monopoly regulation but by the fact that it allegedly led to a redistribution of the national income to the detriment of the employers. In time this began to exert a destimulating influence on the supply of economic resources. The high taxation of profits and the low interest rate reduced incentives to save. In the sphere of labor resources the same negative role was performed by the allegedly high real wages.

Despite the impotence of the prescriptions proper, supply-side theory as a whole has contributed to dispelling the reformist illusions concerning the possibilities of state-monopoly regulation.

A considerable place in the arguments of modern conservatives is assigned evidence of the need for a renunciation of state intervention in the economy. In actual fact, the opposite process is to be observed in all developed capitalist countries.

The conservative concept is presented as a theory of the combination of the "free market mechanism" and a "strong state" (by no means in the economic plane, however). But we need to judge not by what it is being attempted to present this phenomenon as, Doctor of Economic Sciences N. Bekhar (Bulgaria) observed, but by the actual state thereof.

The proposition concerning a "mixed economy without Keynes" is now being proposed in the search for a rational economic policy. This slogan is being advanced by certain representatives of the conservative school. A combination of elements of the free market mechanism and elements of state intervention is considered the optimum type of economic system in conservative concepts of bourgeois "comparativistics" (comparative analysis of economic systems). In other words, elements of state intervention are preserved, but with a change in the "dosage" depending on priorities and emphases.

The rightwing-conservative shift in the capitalist world, which was a result of the profound crisis of the Keynesian model of state-monopoly regulation, Doctor of Economic Sciences D. Smyslov (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO) observed in his speech, has also been reflected in bourgeois concepts of a reorganization of the international economic mechanism. This fact may be traced primarily in three basic spheres.

West Europe the conflicts among them are becoming increasingly explosive and assuming the nature of trade-economic wars. In the wake of the widely celebrated "textile" and "automobile" wars caused by the influx into the United States of cheap Japanese goods, a new skirmish is developing--on the front of technically intricate electronic products.

It is not fortuitous that electronics has become the arena of the latest trade-economic conflict. It is expected that in the present decade the new "technically intensive" processes will to a considerable extent oust from the main capitalist countries' exports such labor-intensive sectors as metallurgy, shipbuilding and auto assembly and others. Therefore in the structural reorganization of the economy which is currently under way in these countries a leading role is assigned electronics.

The Japanese monopolies' tactics are quite adroitly adapted to the modern conditions of the international capitalist market of high-technology commodities manufactured by a comparatively narrow circle of competing suppliers. Abiding by these tactics, they are concentrating resources on the development of certain new production directions and are endeavoring, engaged in concentrated exports, to capture monopoly positions on the world market of a specific type of finished product, thereby preventing the process of the inception and formation of analogous works and even entire sectors of industry in other countries. The Japanese monopolies have managed in this way to achieve success on the video tape recorder, IC copier, facsimile duplicating machinery, personal computer and a number of other electronics product markets. Furthermore, they are beginning to squeeze out the American and West European competitors in the production of wire-matrix impact printers, interchangeable central processors, terminals, reprogrammable and self-adjusting robots and means of automation of managerial work.

First, the antistatist conceptual principles of bourgeois economists belonging to the rightwing-conservative school have now been officially confirmed in declarations of conferences of the heads of state and government of the seven leading capitalist states.

Extensive use is now made at the summit meetings of the main Western countries of the entire standard set of postulates aimed at a narrowing of the sphere of state maneuvering put forward by the supporters of a monetarist approach and the "supply-side economics" concept. These include a shift of resources from the sphere of government consumption to the private sector; a limitation of state nonmilitary spending and a reduction in budget deficits and also the national debt; implementation of a restrictive monetary-credit policy.

Second, the trends toward a limitation of state intervention are being manifested in the modifications of international economic relations which are occurring. These include the adoption as a result of the negotiations of the GATT participants (the "Tokyo Round") in the period 1973-1979 of certain measures to liberalize international trade; expansion of the role of the Eurocurrency and Eurobond markets; abolition of the official gold price; legalization of the system of "floating" currency exchange rates which had been operating since 1973; and others. The speaker noted here that the enumerated changes do not signify the capitalist states' renunciation of regulation of the world-economy sphere.

Third, sentiments are being displayed in the West in support of a limitation of centralized regulation of the world economy by interstate institutions and, correspondingly, a shift in the center of gravity toward independent, autonomous "adaptive" reactions of national state authorities.

The trend toward a reduction in the degree of the directive approach of interstate economic regulation in the West is evoking a varied reaction there. Bourgeois economists who previously adhered to a Keynesian orientation condemn this trend and insist on the need for an intensification of multilateral regulation of the world economy.

Western theorists who to this extent or the other have been touched by the wave of neoconservatism see the centralized regulation of the world-economy sphere as an unacceptable "collectivist" principle. D. Smyslov drew attention to a certain contradiction in U.S. ruling circles' attitude toward the practice of interstate regulation. On the one hand Washington endeavors to use it to enhance its hegemonist role in the capitalist world. On the other, a hostile attitude toward it is widespread among the rightwing-conservative figures belonging to the President's entourage. In practice Washington is attempting to emasculate as much as possible and reduce to empty rhetoric the economic aspects of the coordination of actions with its partners. It is putting the main emphasis on the military-political aspect of "cooperation" and stressing in every possible way its thrust against the socialist community and the developing countries.

In the opinion of Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Kollontay (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO), the greater the role in a country's economy performed by the world market and the more foreign economic relations permeate all components of reproduction, the less the effect which may be produced by measures of regulating demand within a national framework. The internationalization of economic life is undermining the bases of the former state-monopoly regulation.

The growing interimperialist rivalry, the exacerbation of all forms of competitive struggle and the persistent maneuvering for the purpose of shifting the burden of the crisis onto the competitor--all these phenomena inherent in imperialism are acquiring particular significance under the conditions of the level of internationalization of economic life which has now been achieved. Whereas previously what was decisive in state-monopoly regulation was its anticrisis thrust and attempts to maintain a certain growth rate, now increasingly great significance is attached to the struggle to secure more favorable world-economic positions and the country's increased competitiveness.

Under capitalist conditions increased competitiveness is inseparably attended by an offensive against the vital rights of the broad working people's masses. Neoconservatism is the ideology of such an offensive both at the level of individual enterprises and on the scale of all society. On the one hand neoconservatism is aimed at undermining the foundations of the worker and trade union movement. On the other, it is modifying the entire system of state-monopoly capitalism, removing everything which does not correspond to the criteria of profitability and competitiveness.

Neoconservatism is the avowed manifesto of the class interests of the moneybags and the ideology and practice of unbridled capitalist rationalization and predatory competitive struggle. However, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that the internationalization of economic life on a

capitalist basis is now an appreciable factor strengthening the neoconservative trends in Western countries. It would be wrong not to take this into consideration when determining the prospects of neoconservatism.

With the development of world-economic relations there has been increased interest in the "open economy" theories, on an analysis of which I. Filatochev (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO) dwelt.

Theorists of the neoclassical school counterpose to Keynesian regulation the idea of the "self-tuning" market mechanism, whose action leads of its own accord to the optimum use of resources and the establishment of economic equilibrium. The capitalist economy, they believe, possesses intrinsic forces providing for its steady and stable development.

Neoclassical economists are opponents of various protectionist policies (import quotas, customs tariffs and so forth) disrupting the "free" progress of world trade. The unimpeded movement of commodities between individual countries in their constructions creates the basis of the equilibrium of the capitalist economic system. The assertion concerning the complete ineffectiveness of intervention on the part of the state in the currency market is put forward in addition to this. For example, intervention by the central bank of any country aimed at stabilizing its currency's exchange rate does not lead to the desired result but merely causes a serious upheaval in the currency-finance sector of the capitalist economy.

Thus only totally unrestricted commodity and money transfers between "open economies" are, bourgeois theorists believe, the prerequisite for the capitalist countries' crisis-free development.

Obviously, the neoclassical "open economy" concepts represent a theoretical current reflecting the interests of the modern "supermonopoly" bourgeoisie.

Certain new currents also may be distinguished in the mainstream of neoconservative trends. Candidate of Economic Sciences S. Aukutsionek (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO) dwelt on a critique of bourgeois theories of scientific-technical progress.

The conceptual nucleus of the new direction may be described schematically in roughly the following way. Each major technological change opens new spheres of the investment of capital. Accelerated accumulation in the new sectors promotes a long-lasting economic upturn. However, the growth of production of the new product is determined not so much by the absolute potential of the volume of the market as the speed with which it is saturated. Therefore when it has been achieved and there is a sharp decline in the demand for the new commodities, the amount of capital "fitted" in the (now already former) new sectors proves surplus. A long depression ensues, which it is only possible to overcome as a result of the next technological "spurt".

At the microlevel the effect of this mechanism is usually connected in one way or another with a depression. But some economists believe that a depression impedes the introduction of new equipment for the risk in this period is the maximum. Others, on the other hand, believe that a depression

stimulates technical development and explain this by the fact that the relative risk of innovations (that is, the risk compared with other investment alternatives) is in this period the minimum.

At the macrolevel the task being set is that of explaining the formation of a cluster, that is, a sharp simultaneous increase in the concentration of innovations representing an integral system of new technologies.

In terms of many important issues this theory occupies a position not so much the opposite of the orthodox position as intermediate. Hitherto practically all more or less general theories have concerned, as a rule, individual economic agents or the entire economy as a whole. In this case at least a further two levels are actively incorporated in the sphere of analysis: the sector and the individual technological innovation, which is regarded as a particular structural unit of the economic system. Study of the economic situation either statically or dynamically has also been traditional. Here, however, we again have a mixed instance. The analysis is dynamic, but only within the limits of one "life cycle" of technology.

Criticizing both Keynesians and monetarists, representatives of the school in question believe that a depression may only be overcome with the aid of the mass introduction of new, base technologies. But the spectrum of the proposed measures is very broad: from the artificial stimulation of innovations (H. Freeman) through the passive awaiting of the "natural" end of the depression (G. Mensch). Within the framework of the new school, called "neo-Schumpeterism," certain really important and actual problems are touched on. Essentially for the first time in bourgeois political economy the question of the lack of correspondence between the capitalist system of economic planning and the potential of scientific-technical progress is raised (although, of course, from apologetic standpoints). Of course, its future will largely depend on the extent to which the new school corresponds to the interests of the prevailing monopoly groupings. But one thing is clear even now: "neo-Schumpeterism" is being born before our very eyes, and its critical study from Marxist standpoints is becoming an urgent task.

Prof T. Trendafilov (Bulgaria), doctor of economic sciences, noted that the conflict between the traditional material-technical base of production and the possibilities connected with new equipment and technology is inevitably becoming the subject of acute theoretical and practical debate.

This partly explains the interest in the problems of re-industrialization in the United States. Among the multitude of interpretations of this phenomenon, T. Trendafilov believes, mention should be made primarily of its most prevalent interpretation as a process of the replacement of fixed capital, which is leading to a recovery of the old industrial sectors and the rapid growth of new, promising sectors of industry based on the extensive use of the latest technologies.

Candidate of Economic Sciences Yu. Kochevrin (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO) dwelt on the concept of managerism within the framework of contemporary bourgeois economic science.

Basic theoretical approaches may be distinguished here, the speaker said. The oldest is the institutional branch of managerism connected primarily with the proposition concerning the separation of responsibility from supervision in a major corporation ([A. Berli, G. Minz]). Its new representatives ([R. Lerner, Ye. Kherman]), without abandoning the proposition concerning the separation of responsibility from supervision, pay increasingly great attention to factors of the institutional defense of capitalist ownership. As a result they, far from departing from the managerial revolution theory, have fallen into another extreme--a new market automatism theory, which regards managerial hierarchies as a kind of collective entrepreneur-capitalist obedient to the signals of the market.

Another branch of managerism has developed on the basis of traditional bourgeois microeconomics and the theory of the firm, after the "behavioral" and "managerial" approaches, which attached great significance to intrafirm organization, had developed within the theory of the firm framework.

Historical research into the growth of the major corporations, which has paid special attention to distinguishing the stages of this growth and the forms of managerial hierarchies, has assumed significant proportions in the last decade.

The managerism concept, which is designed to throw light on the reasons for the expansion of the transnational corporations, has come to be developed in recent years. These attempts have been embodied most fully in "internalization" theory, which deduces the expansion of the transnational corporations from the laws of a capitalist firm's internal growth, presenting it as a manifestation of the advantages of the "organized" solution over the "market" solution in the process of the international division of labor. It originates in certain complex theoretical constructions fostering the managerism concept and such varieties of the theory of the firm as the "organizational," "information" and "transaction costs" varieties.

The basic propositions of "internalization" theory demand the closest attention of Marxist criticism. As a counterweight to the orthodox approach, the managerism concept in its latest ramifications puts at the center of an analysis of the modern capitalist economy the "internal organization--market" system of interaction. An attempt is made by this method to overcome the "state--economy" contrast characteristic of the currently competing basic schools of bourgeois political economy--Keynesianism and monetarism.

Speaking of the acute apologetic thrust of the modern wave of neoconservatism, Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Khudokormov (Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov) emphasized that the present crisis of bourgeois political economy is inseparably connected with the ideological struggle at the current stage of the general crisis of capitalism. In the speaker's opinion, attention should also be drawn in this connection to such a form of crisis of bourgeois political economy as its loss of a certain theoretical "balance," when the neo-Keynesian center was balanced, as it were, by a neoclassical "counterweight" to the right and an institutional-sociological "counterweight" to the left.

This internal structure afforded a possibility of reacting swiftly and relatively painlessly to changes in economic and political conditions.

The crisis of state-monopoly regulation which began in the 1970's destroyed the illusion of class peace. The Keynesian center which had been prevalent previously found itself undermined and eroded, and the fundamental positions were occupied by the conflict dualism of reactionary rightwing-conservative ideology.

A number of bourgeois ideologists are attempting in their constructions to lead the proletariat away from the class struggle and to substitute for it battles on the "ecology fronts" and to persuade the workers that the protest against exploitation can no longer serve as a "lever of transformations".

The speaker dwelt on the problem of the correlation of general democratic ("alternative") movements and the struggle for the ouster of exploiter relations and for socialism. A policy of reconciliation of the antagonistic classes has always been the political platform of opportunism. In the present form it is presented as a program of social compromise "on the broadest basis". There is no doubt that the real significance and prospects of the "alternative" movements, "ecological," in particular, which are automatically ascribed an antibourgeois nature, are being distorted here.

Prof J. Isa (CSSR), doctor of economic sciences, noted that supply-side theory, which played an important part in the theoretical substantiation and propaganda of R. Reagan's economic program, may be characterized as the political economy of big capital since it entirely openly expresses directly the economic interests and ideas of the most reactionary groupings of finance capital. It expresses them here such that it retains--at least temporarily--its attractiveness for the petty bourgeoisie, middle strata and even a certain part of the working class.

However, supply-side theory is doomed to fail since it is built only on "logical postulates" unrelated to reality.

Since the eve and outset of the 1980's, Candidate of Economic Sciences S. Jug (GDR) emphasized, the reactionary social thrust of the assault of the "political economy" of neoconservatism has been supplemented by the reactionary-aggressive doctrine of totalitarianism in its anticommunist, antisocialist manifestation.

In the opinion of Candidate of Economic Sciences R. Kapelyushnikov (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO), considerable significance is attached to a critical study of the kind of ideological arsenal pertaining to questions of employment which is activated by non-Marxist political economy. Superficially bourgeois theory on this issue appears as an incoherent set of the most contradictory approaches, views and recommendations. However, in practice certain theoretical stereotypes predominate here. Showing the exposing them is an urgent task of Marxist criticism.

The Walras outline of overall equilibrium, which does not allow of the possibility of the existence of unemployment, may be taken as the reference point. At the same time no bourgeois economist would venture to deny the fact that a reserve army of labor is an eternal companion precisely of the capitalist mode of production. The differences between the "competing" theoretical explanations of the phenomenon of unemployment essentially amount to what deviations from the idealized Walras model their supporters reveal.

The arguments are conducted basically around the question of which of the components of the price mechanism prove "jammed," causing economic disorders. In the Keynesian model the stumbling block was the wage, and unemployment was evaluated as a long-lasting and inevitable phenomenon.

Monetarism and the rational expectations school interpret unemployment as a "voluntary" occurrence and as a phenomenon of misdirected labor supply. In fact it is a question of the notorious rigidity of monetary pay. It is claimed that unemployment can grow as a consequence of workers' resistance to a reduction in the nominal wage, which they "mistakenly" interpret as an attempt to reduce their real income. This resistance is specifically expressed in the fact that they reduce the supply of their services in the market.

A special line in the defense of unemployment is represented by the so-called "contract theory," which studies contractual relations in the labor market.

In its first "version" secret contractual relations develop from firms' interest in retaining experienced personnel, in the second, from their endeavor to "protect" workers against excessive fluctuations in the level of pay. Unemployment in their constructions proved to be a byproduct of the choice of the optimum form of labor contract, in other words, entirely voluntary. The preaching of class peace, which presents exploitation as relations of mutually beneficial "partnership," is heard most openly, perhaps, in "contract theory".

Increasingly great popularity has been gained recently by the "classical unemployment" concept, which is engendering ideas in the polemic against which Keynesianism took shape in the 1930's. The past decade taught the capitalist countries an important lesson, showing that not only sudden changes in nominal demand have a "shock" impact. In the 1970's the entire nonsocialist world encountered a series of actual supply "shocks" (the increased cost of base resources, the fall in the productivity growth rate, the exacerbation of competition on the world market and others). The "classical unemployment" concept shows that when the economy has experienced some real "shock," a reorganization of the entire system of relative (actual) prices is needed to restore the initial position. If, however, just one component of the price mechanism remains immobile (and this role is assigned, as a rule, real wages), there is a rise in the level of costs. And this jeopardizes the capitalists' profits with all the disastrous consequences for the capitalist production mode. Thus in the "classical unemployment" concept the impediment proves to be the real wage, which bourgeois ideologists link either with the policy of the unions or the national singularities of the labor markets.

Having noted that conservative interpretations of the concept of unemployment have been exposed repeatedly, R. Kapelyushnikov dwelt in more detail on the

general methodological baselessness of the bourgeois theory of employment as a whole. The speaker emphasized that it proceeds from an individualist and not a class perspective, not reckoning with the fact that each employer is further personified social capital, and each worker personified wage labor.

For this reason the interpretations of unemployment as the natural result of the optimizing behavior of individuals (monetarism, "contract theory") or as a "regrettable violation" of such behavior (Keynesianism, the "classical unemployment" concept) are apologetic. They disguise the class nature of relative overpopulation, a phenomenon which serves as an instrument of the exploiters' offensive against the rights of the exploited.

The speech of V. Studentsov (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO) touched on the question of unemployment and the methods of combating it in the economic strategy of the bourgeoisie in the 1980's. For a large part of the postwar period state-monopoly regulation was oriented toward the achievement of "full employment". But this concept concealed not so much a struggle against unemployment as the securing of favorable conditions for the functioning of capital. In the social plane the "full employment" slogan was designed to prevent the radicalization of the social sentiments of the masses, strengthen the political domination of capital and ensure the preservation of the institutions of bourgeois democracy.

In connection with the sharp increase in crisis processes as of the latter half of the 1970's the mere formulation of the question of the achievement of "full employment" has been inconceivable. Opposition to the "full employment" of the Keynesian model also grew in the past decade in connection with the bourgeoisie's recognition that low unemployment under certain conditions limits the bourgeoisie's freedom of action in "disciplining" the working people. Finally, the demagogic proposition that higher levels of unemployment are permissible at the present time since social assistance is more extensively developed has become widespread.

The policy of macroeconomic stabilization pursued by governments of capitalist countries in the 1980's is objectively contributing to spurring unemployment. Meanwhile, V. Studentsov observed, government circles of developed capitalist countries are attempting to conceal this actual abandonment of the "full employment" principle. Understanding the social danger of mass unemployment, the bourgeois state is taking certain steps to ease it. However, the programs for combating it are now assuming "offensive" forms for the purpose of "disciplining" the working people and lowering their capacity to resist increased exploitation.

The antipopular essence of the capitalist state was sharply criticized by Docent M. Santo (Hungary) on the basis of the example of the "state of universal prosperity" theory.

Candidate of Economic Sciences S. Janackow (CSSR) linked his speech with the reasons for the prevalence of neoconservative ideas in the United States. Outwardly they appeared acceptable to broad strata of American society. However, in practice neoconservatism is incapable of solving a single problem

inasmuch as it explains the reasons for the crisis by the mistakes of official economic policy, leaving out of consideration the intrinsic contradictions of the capital accumulation process. Conservatives claim that the main cause of the crises was the excessive stimulation of effective demand and insufficient scope for natural forces and stimuli of the growth of supply and the growth of productivity.

Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Volobuyev (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO) emphasized once again that today it is a question not simply of a technical change of instruments of traditional policy and not only of the replacement of obsolete instruments by newer, more effective ones but of the promotion of a fundamentally new sociopolitical and economic orientation. A process of the gradual crystallization of the new version and modified model of state-monopoly capitalism is under way in which both the role and mechanism of state regulation of the economy and the form of its "junction" with the monopolized market appear differently than in the past. This process has been summoned into being by the complex set of objective, domestic and foreign economic and also subjective factors which in the 1970's brought about the crisis of the entire postwar system of state-monopoly capitalism. Traditional strategy within its framework has proven incapable of providing for an in any way serious approach to the socioeconomic goals whose realization, the ruling class believes, has served and is to serve as a guarantee of capitalism's adaptation to the changing world.

In the structural, political economy sense its pivotal feature uniting all the individual fragments of policy is the proclamation of a limitation of intervention in reproduction--the process. In actual reality it is a question of a reorganization of this regulation and modification of its forms. However, this is a modification whereby the emphasis in the "state--monopolized market" correlation is moving toward the latter and in the interests of the latter.

Examining the conservative program for the "recovery" of the FRG economy, Candidate of Economic Sciences K. Opawski observed that the FDP's economic policy (the so-called Cologne Theses) has been based entirely on neoliberal economic principles--recognition of the role of the market and competition with a simultaneous limitation of the economic functions of the state. Monetarism has become the theoretical basis of the new program.

In reality, at the center of attention of conservatism's economic policy is creation of the most favorable conditions for the functioning of capital. Maintaining the investment activity of private businessmen and creating favorable conditions for this are the state's paramount economic task. All the other problems, including unemployment, will allegedly be solved of their own accord.

The economic intentions of the Kohl-Genscher government are as clear as can be from both the theoretical and ideological viewpoints. The antiworker nature of the economic policy being pursued by the FRG Government is unambiguous also.

Certain aspects of alternative economic theory and policy in France were illustrated by Candidate of Economic Sciences D. Schadow (GDR).

The concerted reform program of the forces of the left following victory at the parliamentary and presidential elections (1981) undoubtedly differed from previous economic policy. In principle the socialists aspired to an increase in state intervention in economic activity for the purpose of easing the social consequences of the crisis. And in fact prior to the wage and price freeze (1982) certain measures which improved the position of the population were implemented.

Understandably, such a policy encountered and continues to encounter the resistance of both internal and international forces of the right.

The problems of France's economic development reflect the general difficulties encountered by the realization of alternative economic concepts in the developed capitalist countries. First, undoubtedly the basic problem confronting each government in a developed capitalist state is whether the progressive forces will succeed in using the existing potential of the production forces in the interests of the working people in combating internal and external reaction. For this reason the strengthening and expansion of the anticapitalist movement should be based on an enhancement of the leading role of the working class in the struggle against capital, the more assertive implementation of democratic transformations and an emphatic reorientation of relations toward the socialist community countries.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850
CSO: 1816/13

U.S.-JAPANESE-WEST EUROPEAN COMPETITION IN ELECTRONICS VIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4, Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 117-125

[Article by A. Khlystov: "The United States-Japan-West Europe: On New Fronts of the 'Electronic War'"]

[Text] The first half of the 1980's has been characterized by a further increase in the rivalry of the three centers of imperialism--the United States, Japan and West Europe. Their conflicts are manifested particularly acutely in the sphere of scientific-technical progress. The Western press is commenting increasingly often on the accelerating scientific-technical development of Japan and the West European countries and presenting assessments of the possibility of the United States' loss of leadership in the sphere of the latest technology, which could ultimately lead to a fall in its international prestige and a weakening of its economic might. Indeed, in the past 10-15 years the correlation of forces among the centers of present-day imperialism has changed appreciably, and the aggregate scientific-technical potential of Japan and West Europe has roughly matched that of America, furthermore, and in certain, most important and promising areas they have succeeded not only in reducing the gap but overtaking the United States even.

The foreign economic expansion of Japan, which pretends to scientific-technical leadership, is particularly noticeable against the background of these changes. Many Japanese commodities have firmly captured the world market and are successfully resisting competition on the part of the producers of analogous products in the United States and West Europe.

Under the conditions of Japan's offensive against the markets of the United States and (word processors, graphic devices and so forth).

American electronics industry monopolies still retain the dominant positions in the capitalist world, but after many years of defense against the onslaught of powerful competitors Japanese corporations are switching to the offensive in individual sectors of the new front, carrying the struggle to U.S. territory.

Semiconductor Production: Japan's Challenge to the United States

Just a few years ago the United States' leadership in the manufacture of IC's was not in doubt. This country has the world's biggest production of computers ensuring for the most intricate of them a capacious home market. However, in the mid-1970's, when under the conditions of economic crisis American semiconductor industry cut back sharply on investments in fixed capital, the Japanese monopolies, primarily Nihon (denki), Hitachi (seisakuse) and Toshiba, continued to invest large resources in the expansion of capacity. As a result, when the demand for IC's in the United States exceeded the production possibilities of American suppliers, Japanese firms edged their way into the "breach" that had taken shape. By the end of 1979 even they accounted for 40 percent of the market, and the quality of the Japanese 16K IC's, furthermore, as such a well-known firm as Hewlett-Packard claimed, was higher than the American counterparts. Its statement that upon testing more than 300,000 16K IC's of three American and three Japanese companies the waste and intensity of rejects of the American product were higher was, some specialists believe, the signal for the start of a so-called American-Japanese quality and reliability war.

Japan's assault on the American and West European memory markets continued, and, when at the start of the 1980's the 16K IC came to be replaced by the 64K model (the first generation of super-large IC's), the share of sales on the world market of Hitachi alone constituted 40 percent, and together with Fujitsu and Nihon (denki) 66 percent. The American Motorola and Texas Instruments companies accounted for 27 percent.*

The nature of the trade in IC's between the United States and Japan changed sharply also. Whereas in 1977 exports thereof from the United States to Japan were approximately 3.5 times greater than exports from Japan to the United States, in 1982, given a considerable increase in the trade volume, supplies of Japanese IC's (\$532 million) were more than 3.3 times greater than purchases thereof from American firms (\$159 million). Japan's trade in IC's with West Europe has in general assumed a one-sided nature: while exporting them to the tune of \$170 million they purchase practically none of these products in West European countries.**

Such dynamism is explained to a considerable extent by the Japanese electronics industry's concentration of efforts on the achievement of high product quality, the precision of assembly operations and the development of more accomplished production and control equipment. According to the data of a group of scientists of Stanford University, who made a comparative analysis of the state of the semiconductor instruments industry in the United States and Japan, at a most important stage of the production process of the manufacture of semiconductors--automated assembly--the leading Japanese firms now use the latest equipment, which in terms of productivity is no less than 1.5 times higher than American equipment. In accordance with the conventional classification, it may be ascribed to the fourth-fifth generation, whereas a number of American enterprises are still operating on first-second-generation equipment.

* FORTUNE, 14 December 1981, p 55.

** See ELECTRONICS, 19 May 1982, p 138; BUSINESS WEEK, 23 May 1983, pp 59, 53.

The change in the correlation of forces between the United States and Japan in the sphere of semiconductor industry is also attested by the significant decline in the United States' share of the Japanese domestic market: whereas in 1980 imports from the United States satisfied 18 percent of Japan's semiconductor requirements, in 1981 the figure was approximately 15 percent and, later, only 10 percent.* In order not to cause the even greater irritation of their American partners, who are worried by the growth in the reciprocal trade deficit, Japanese semiconductor companies intend employing new tactics--freezing the export shipments of products from domestic enterprises at a level corresponding to their 30-percent share of the world market and simultaneously increasing the sales of enterprises built by the Nihon (denki), Hitachi and Fujitsu corporations in the United States itself.

The conditions of competition on the electronics market are forcing producers to constantly modify and replace their products, which demands increasingly new capital investments. Currently the construction and fitting out of a plant for the production of 64K IC's costs \$60 million, and this expenditure allows only the minimum profit, furthermore, since the prices of many semiconductor industry products are falling rapidly. For example, the price of the same 64K IC's has fallen from \$20 per chip (1980) to \$5 (1982), and of the 16K model from \$20 to \$1. A singularity of the Japanese monopolies' strategy in the "electronics war" consists of their readiness to temporarily sacrifice profits for the sake of gaining control of the market, which has served as a reason for American and West European producers to accuse them of dumping. According to a representative of the British Plessey electronics firm, "the United States has now encountered the same dilemma which has long confronted West Europe..., a competitor who has little concern for profits and is interested only in gaining a share of the sales market." At the same time, however, as the sales manager for semiconductor instruments of the West German Siemens concern acknowledged, a company will begin the manufacture of IC's not only not counting on obtaining big profits but given zero profitability even since these instruments are determining the forward edge of technology and the assimilation of the techniques of their production is dictated by necessity.

However, there is also another reason of considerable importance for the strengthening of Japan's positions in trade in the latest electronics products. Whereas in the United States and West Europe this sector pertains to the category of military-oriented sectors since a considerable proportion of its products is used in the production of military equipment and arms, in Japan the military market is not such an important electronics consumer. The bulk thereof is designed to satisfy civil sector and export needs. The report of the U.S. Congress' Joint Economic Committee "International Competition in the Progressive Sectors of Industry" observes, inter alia, that for an improvement in the positions of America's semiconductor industry the U.S. Government should move toward the implementation of an applied program of a civil orientation similar to that subsidized by the Defense Department in the interests of the development of superfast IC's for sophisticated weapons systems. However, specific recommendations as to what civil product merits federal subsidies and which firms could be incorporated in the program did not follow in the report.

* See ELECTRONICS, 19 May 1982, pp 136-137.

Many American and West European semiconductor industry companies have been confronted by serious problems on whose solution their continued growth and very existence even depends. Commenting on the current situation, the president of a leading California electronics firm declared that "the threat hanging over America's semiconductor industry has assumed dangerous proportions and if Congress does not in the immediate future enact the appropriate sufficiently though laws, it will suffer the fate of the auto and steel industries."

Such pronouncements are not isolated, and pressure on the U.S. Administration with demands for a limitation of the continued growth of competition on the part of Japan is growing increasingly. The government is being called on to enact a law concerning retaliatory measures in respect of countries creating trade barriers in the way of American exports and to consent to such nontariff restrictions as the imposition of temporary import quotas or additional testing procedures, which would raise the prices of imported commodities. There is also talk of the need to limit imports of Japanese 64K IC's for national security considerations since semiconductor products constitute an important component of American military systems.

For the purpose of slowing down the spread of new Japanese commodities the government is currently studying the possibility of limiting the issue of licenses for the production of the latest types of product and the application of progressive techniques on U.S. territory.

The Offensive Against West Europe's Home Electronics Market

The successes scored in semiconductor industry were predetermined to a considerable extent by implementation of the Japanese monopolies' plan to become the biggest producers of domestic radioelectronic apparatus. Approximately 50 percent of the semiconductor product, which amounted to \$4.4 billion, was used in its production in 1981, whereas in West Europe domestic radioelectronics consumes 30 percent of the manufacture of this product, and in the United States only 15-20 percent.* The extensive use of semiconductors has contributed to the creation of many new types of domestic radioelectronic goods, sales of which have remained at a relatively high level even in periods of unfavorable economic conditions.

The increase in Japanese foreign economic expansion in the home electronics sphere is being underpinned by a continuous increase in the scale of R&D and, correspondingly, the constant expansion and renewal of the list of commodities representing a threat to competitors from the United States and West Europe. Added to transistor receivers, movie camera and photographic apparatus, television receivers, pocket calculators and office equipment on the eve and at the outset of the 1980's were electronic calculating equipment, mini- and microcomputers, precision electronic equipment and video tape recorders. Under the conditions of the chronic crisis upheavals of the world capitalist economy the negative consequences of the competitive clashes between the monopolies of the United States, Japan and West Europe assumed a highly dramatic nature as of the start of the 1980's.

* See BUSINESS WEEK, 24 December 1981, p 36.

Japan's offensive is being reflected particularly devastatingly in the economy of the EEC countries, where the structural reorganization of industry brought about by the development of high-technology sectors, including electronics, is belated and is occurring more slowly than in the United States and Japan. For this reason the problem of a strengthening of the community's positions on the world market of the latest commodities, particularly "telematics"--products of a set of sectors amalgamating the production of telecommunications equipment, computer technology and IC's--was particularly acute on the eve and at the outset of the 1980's. The EEC's share of the "telematics" market varied in this period from one-fifth for IC's to approximately one-third for telecommunications equipment. However, the West European countries have practically been driven from the struggle for the development of superlarge computers. On the world list of computer producers the biggest West European company is in only eighth place, 12 (!) times inferior to the American IBM in terms of sales volume. West European industry meets only 10 percent of the domestic market's need for the most intricate computer units and components, particularly microprocessors. The EEC countries are lagging behind the United States considerably in the creation of data banks and, in line with the continued improvement of American and Japanese minicomputer technology, are gradually losing their positions in the production of peripheral equipment (terminals and such).

West Europe is threatened with the danger of finding itself directly dependent on the United States and Japan in a principal area of technical progress.

Among the few sectors of electronics where the EEC countries continue to compete with the United States, outstripping Japan, is the production of computers and computer software. West Europe provides 30 percent of supplies of these products to the world market, two-thirds of which are to the credit of West European firms proper.

Japanese video tape recorders, color televisions and other home electronics products have literally inundated West Europe in recent years. The seriousness of the situation that has come about in this sphere is manifested sufficiently strikingly in the video tape recorder market, with which a sharp exacerbation of the mutual relations between West Europe and Japan is connected. This is hardly to be wondered at if it is considered, for example, that in 1982 the value of Japanese video tape recorder exports to Great Britain amounted to the value of automobile exports. The Dutch Philips concern, a partner of which is the West German Grundig firm, plays the part of the Japanese companies' sole competitor on the West European market of this product. In 1982 Japanese companies sold almost 5 million sets in West Europe or four times more than Philips.

For the purpose of protecting the domestic market and reducing the huge deficit in trade with Japan the EEC countries have been forced to demand of Japan a cutback in the exports of a number of commodities. At the meeting in Brussels in February 1983 (within the framework of trade consultations which have been held regularly since 1973) the community warned Japan against attempts to further increase the trade imbalance and forced it to sign an agreement on the limitation of exports of 10 products, including five types of home electronic products--video tape recorders, color television receivers and picture tubes

for them, stereo equipment and quartz watches. Japan undertook, in particular, to reduce exports of video tape recorders to the EEC countries in 1983 to a sum total of no more than 4.6 million--4 million completely assembled and 600,000 sets of components for final assembly at Japanese firms' daughter enterprises in Great Britain and the FRG. In 1984 the volume of exports was not to exceed 5.1 million (4 million finished products and 1.1 sets of components), which was to guarantee the Philips and Grundig concerns the production and sale of 1.2-1.3 million sets a year.*

No sooner had the intensity of the struggle on the video tape recorder market declined than the electronics firms of EEC countries began to express disquiet in respect of another technical novelty of home electronics--digital video disk players. Japanese firms proved to be ahead here also, having created 14 models of this product compared with the sole model of the Philips concern, which, strictly speaking, was the pioneer developer in this sphere. Fearing that Japanese companies, as in the case of the video tape recorders, could capture an overwhelming proportion of the West European market, Philips accused them of establishing "absurdly low prices" and demanded of the EEC a doubling (from 9.5 to 19 percent) of the import tariffs on video disk players.

Import tariffs were indeed raised as of January 1984, while as a form of compensation Japan was offered a reduction in the duty on reel-to-reel tape recorders. The Japanese side immediately lodged a protest with GATT, believing that such protectionist measures violate the principles of free trade and could slow down the high rate of renewal of the selection of goods and the very process of the introduction of innovations inasmuch as it is a question of a new type of product which has only just begun to come onto the market.

Expansion of the Front of the Struggle

At the same time Japan's positions on the world market of a number of types of intricate electronic products are as yet far inferior to the American and West European positions. Thus the leader in computer production remains IBM, which controls 50 percent of the market, while Japanese monopolies account for 10-15 percent. Compared with their exports of automobiles, home electronics and semiconductor products computer exports may be considered negligible. Thus in 1979 Japan sold on the external market only 7 percent of the computers it had manufactured, whereas it sold 50 percent of automobiles.

Having made a most important task a reduction in the lag behind the United States in the sphere of computers, Japanese monopolies obtained the support of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Industry, which charted as a national goal the winning by 1990 of 30 percent of the world computer market and 18 percent of the U.S. market. The Fujitsu company planned in the period 1982-1984 to move from fifth to second place on the list of world computer producers and double the proportion of export shipments and raise it to 30 percent. Nihon (denki) intends by 1985 to have raised this indicator from 30-40 percent, and the Hitachi company from 7 to 25 percent.

* See FINANCIAL TIMES, 19 November 1983.

Export expansion is becoming for Japan, in view of the narrowness of its domestic market, the decisive factor of a further increase in the production of computer equipment. Although in the period 1969-1979 the average annual growth rate of the Japanese computer market was in excess of 19 percent and with a sales volume of \$4.9 billion it is inferior now only to the American market, it is nonetheless a question of only 10 percent of the capacity of the latter (\$48 billion). Winning the confidence of American customers is difficult, and for this reason Japanese companies are endeavoring either to acquire partners in the shape of local specialized firms, as Fujitsu has done, having concluded an agreement with the Amdal and TRV companies, or set up a daughter branch headed by an experienced American expert in the development and production of computer equipment. Thus the income of Nihon (denki's) branch in Lexington (Massachusetts) is increasing annually now by \$100 million, approaching realization of its plans to achieve an income level of \$500 million by 1985.

Seeking certain successes in eliminating the lag behind the United States in the techniques of computer equipment production and the quality of the computer accessory equipment, Japanese companies see as their main task in the first half of the 1980's a reduction in the continuing discrepancy in the development of software. American computer experts consider this a difficult task, putting the creation of computer programs in the sphere of a "technical art" in which Japanese specialists as yet lack, in their opinion, the skill necessary to attain to the level of the United States. If this may be considered correct in respect of military and space computer programming, Japan's lag in the sphere of programs for commercial computers could well be not as great as the Americans believe. In any event, Japan has already developed the most progressive systems for serving and registering passengers in air transport and also electronic banking complexes.

Japan has now embarked on realization of the project for creating a fifth-generation computer, which in the 1990's is to replace the present-day computers. The project, costing \$400 million, has been prepared in accordance with the initiative of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Industry and is based on a period of 10 years. It is planned to carry out the work on creating the new family of computers, which was begun in 1982, in three stages. In realizing the first of them, lasting 3 years, the ministry formed an independent research group of 50 scientists for study of theoretical problems of a fundamental nature, in which specialists of the leading Japanese computer production companies were incorporated. At subsequent stages of the work, which is to culminate in the creation of the computer prototype, several hundred engineers and scientific workers will be engaged in the project.

Understanding that owing to the complexity of the project it will be difficult for Japan alone to achieve all the set goals, the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Industry hopes that other countries will join in its fulfillment and, given Japan's preservation of the leading role, will accept several participation in the development of individual areas. The United States has a skeptical view of the possibility of the joint realization of such an undertaking, while Britain and the FRG have displayed interest, having sent special delegations to Tokyo to study it. Questions of bilateral cooperation in creating

fifth-generation computer and the exchange of computer technology in the sphere of information, communications and data processing were discussed, in particular, in August 1983 during the visit to Tokyo of H. Riesenhuber, minister of research and technology of West Germany. If the attempts at interaction with other countries prove unsuccessful, Japan will be forced to "narrow" the project. However, representatives of the biggest Japanese computer production companies believe that its realization even in abridged form will produce significant results and represent an impetus to the further development of computer equipment in Japan.

The rapid growth of many science-intensive sectors of Japanese industry has been based on an efficient system of the collection of scientific-technical information. The activity of the information departments has made a considerable contribution to the realization of a number of large-scale scientific-technical projects. Thus, a number of American specialists believes, foreign information has provided 35-40 percent of the necessary data for realization of the program for the development of superlarge IC's, which set the goal of attaining to the U.S. level in this sphere. Software is also called on to play an important part in fulfillment of the plan to create a fifth-generation computer, particularly in an improvement in programming. Japanese companies are allocating annually from \$25 million to \$30 million to maintain in the United States 1,500 specialists engaged in collecting information pertaining to questions of programming. From the viewpoint of the level of professionalism in this sphere Japanese firms are not inferior to American firms, and the mounting dissatisfaction among the latter is increasingly often taking the form of accusations against Japan of scientific-technical espionage. Such actions were taken, in particular, in 1982 in respect of several employees of the Mitsubishi (denki) and Hitachi companies who had handed over more than \$600,000 to FBI agents posing as IBM employees in payment for the corporation's "secret documents" which they had offered. The use in the competitive struggle of such methods is explained by an endeavor to undermine the prestige of Japanese industry and persuade broad circles of the superiority of American technology and that it is being persistently chased by foreign firms.

At the same time, however, it should be noted that in the use of foreign technical experience Japanese concerns frequently overstep the bounds of legality, and this affords their competitors grounds for leveling perfectly justified charges. Thus recognizing the justice of IBM's complaints concerning their illegal use for their new computers of programs developed by IBM, in 1983 Hitachi and Mitsubishi and also Fujitsu paid it a fine which, according to the MAINICHI DAILY NEWS, amounted for Hitachi to \$300 million.

The high level of organization of the collection and processing of information in Japan is based on a sufficiently firm foundation. The country's industry for the production diverse types of office equipment--copiers, facsimile duplicating machines, microfilming apparatus, word processors and other clerical aids--has already earned by high product quality the corresponding reputation on the world market and created competition thereon under the conditions of which many specialized firms of the United States and West Europe simply cannot "survive".

In terms of individual types of office equipment Japanese companies already occupy leading positions on the American market. In particular, they have recently captured in the United States 75 percent of the sales of inexpensive electronic printers and 70 percent of the sale of high-speed facsimile duplicating machines. The Canon company sells monthly in the United States 8,000 such printers and is in first place on the copier market, the capacity of which is put at \$2.4 billion.

The American corporations themselves, which include Japanese clerical aids in the automated office equipment systems which they manufacture, have also partly contributed to this penetration. Thus the copiers of the Minolta Camera firm are an integral part of the sets of equipment supplied by IBM. The American Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing firm offers customers facsimile duplicating machinery of the Japanese Oki (denki) company, while the Burroughs firm offers the same from the Fujitsu company. In setting up in the United States a ramified sales network for individual types of office equipment the Japanese monopolies are gradually accumulating experience of their amalgamation in multipurpose batches and preparing a springboard for the capture of positions on the market of more intricate and costly types of office equipment and automated control systems. Thus the Matsushita (denki) firm has created an automatic office complex consisting of four components--facsimile duplicating and copying machines, a compact computer and a word processor. Matsushita's example is being followed by other companies also, which believe that broader sales prospects are opening up to apparatus which performs many functions simultaneously.

The positions of Japanese companies are also strengthening on the world market of communications facilities, particularly long-distance telephone communications using optical fibers. They have become a strong competitor of American telecommunications corporations here. Even now Japan possesses the most powerful television communications system based on optical fibers, the center of which has been created not far from Osaka. The Fujitsu, Hitachi and Nihon (denki) companies dominate the markets of these products outside of Europe and North America, creating communications complexes in Australia, Argentina and Brazil. Nihon (denki) has also succeeded in installing two small systems in the United States. A considerable expansion of the world communications equipment market is anticipated in the next few years. Sales merely of components thereof, including optical fibers, will increase, it is estimated, from \$143 million in 1981 to \$930 million in 1986.

Experiencing certain difficulties in attaining to the necessary technical level, Japan began exporting communications apparatus comparatively recently. However, the growing demand for it on the part of developing countries has contributed to an appreciable increase in the volume of quality of Japanese exports. Whereas at the start of the 1970's exports of these products constituted only roughly 8 percent of their aggregate sales, by the start of the 1980's its share was over 20 percent.

A significant part in the expansion of exports of communications facilities from Japan is played by the government, operating via the Japanese Electronic Industries Association, which was set up as a national state monopoly. Since it founded its constant and practically sole suppliers have been Japanese firms. Four companies--Nihon (denki) Fujitsu, Hitachi and Oki (denki)--which account for almost half of its purchases, including more than

90 percent of the equipment for data transmission, stand out among these. The Electronic Industries Association is engaged in almost all the basic sectorial R&D, maintains with private corporations close joint-labor relations in the sphere of production and contributes to price stabilization of the domestic Japanese communications equipment market. For many years the state monopoly has stood up for protectionist measures preventing American competitors from penetrating this market.

In the opinion of a number of American experts, government supports affords the Japanese producers of communications equipment extraordinary flexibility in establishing export prices and enabled Nihon (denki), for example, to outflank such West European electronics giants as Philips, Siemens and Ericsson, having obtained a 10-year contract worth \$1 billion for the creation of a national telephone system in Malaysia. Currently in third place on the world market in terms of the volume of sales of communications equipment, this company, will, according to some estimates, have moved into the leading positions by the end of the current decade. Even now its products are the cheapest in the world.

In recent years the Electronic Industries Association, whose spending on purchases of equipment constitutes quite a considerable sum (more than \$3 billion), has become one of the principal targets of the attention of American and West European suppliers of communications facilities and the subject of special negotiations between representatives of the United States and Japan. Reproaching Japan for opening its market to foreign goods too slowly and expressing discontent at the constantly growing deficit in the trade in telecommunications equipment, back in 1978 the United States demanded that the Japanese Government permit the state monopoly to acquire equipment from foreign companies on the basis of free competition. For the purpose of easing the discord with its main trading partner Japan satisfied the U.S. demands in 1980, and a special 3-year agreement was concluded between the two countries. However, in 1982 the Electronic Industries Association's purchases from American firms were expressed in a sum total of merely \$40 million, while in 1983, although turnover between them did increase, according to preliminary estimates, to \$140 million, it nonetheless constituted less than 5 percent of the total value of equipment acquired by the state monopoly. Therefore when at the end of 1983 Japan proposed an automatic extension of the agreement for a further 3-year term, the U.S. Administration, under pressure from electronics firms, put forward a number of additional demands aimed at an increase in sales of American equipment to the Electronic Industries Association. In accordance with the new agreement signed at the end of January 1984 in Washington by Japanese Foreign Minister S. Abe and U.S. Trade Negotiator W. Brock, the Japanese consented to a further simplification of the system of tendering, its greater alignment with international rules and procedures, a reduction in the time taken to study applications submitted by American companies and an increase in the sizes of the consignments of purchased equipment.

However, in April 1984 even M. Mansfield, the American ambassador in Japan, threatened in a conversation with S. Abe U.S. intentions of "opening a new front of the trade war". The reason for this conversation was the Japanese Cabinet's approval of a bill concerning intercomputer communications systems and means which had been prepared to protect Japanese electronics industry

companies against competitors' attempts to penetrate their scientific-technical secrets. M. Mansfield's pronouncements are viewed in Tokyo as the latest evidence of Washington's endeavor to prevent Japan achieving independence in the sphere of highly intricate technical developments, particularly those with a military application. There is also talk of the United States' endeavor, taking advantage of an agreement on the making available to it of Japanese military technology, to obtain as full information as possible about the scientific work being performed by Japan's electronics companies. This agreement was concluded on the eve of R. Reagan's visit to Japan in November 1983.

From Confrontation to Cooperation?

Intending to neutralize the protectionist measures of the EEC countries and circumvent the barriers being erected in the way of home electronics products, Japan is taking the path of increasing investments in the production of electronics products in West Europe. It is also a question of expanding scientific-technical and joint-labor relations with West European companies. In 1982 alone Japanese companies concluded with British and French firms 36 and 25 agreements respectively on industrial cooperation in the sphere of electronics and robot technology, the joint manufacture of various types of product and assistance in the assimilation of Japanese technology.* Special government channels have been set up for regular negotiations on these questions with a number of West European countries (Britain, Belgium, Italy, France), and it is planned to establish such contacts with the central authorities of the EEC.

A characteristic example is the production of video tape recorders. On the territory of the FRG and Britain alone JVC, Hitachi, Sony, Matsushita and Sanyo already have or are building seven enterprises for their manufacture with a capacity of 30,000-60,000 units a year each. It is planned to raise the productivity of some of them to 120,000. The manufacture of video tape recorders at the JVC plant in the FRG is carried out in conjunction with the Telefunken firm, and in Britain with the EMI company. The Robert Bosch concern in the West German partner of the Matsushita corporation. It is a question of assembly plants obtaining the basic components from Japan, which enables the Japanese companies to obviate complicated customs procedures, avoid the payment of duty and lower the cost of shipping the product. Japanese firms are now employing to preserve their video tape recorder market the same tactics which they employed in the latter half of the 1970's in the United States in respect of color television receivers. Following the signing with the United States in 1977 of a 3-year agreement on limiting color television exports, Japan rapidly developed their production on American territory and did not yield its positions in this market. At the same time, however, the commitments it assumed have formally been fulfilled since Japanese exports have declined to almost half of the level envisaged for the third year of the agreement.

The JVC company resorted to somewhat different tactics than in the FRG and Britain in France, where its product is sold under its trademark by the Thomson-Brandt firm. Taking account of France's particular "sensitivity" to

* See JAPAN ECONOMIC JOURNAL, 26 July 1983, p 1.

strengthening of the competitiveness of Japanese commodities on the electronics market, which in the industrial development program drawn up by the F. Mitterrand government is among the priority sectors meriting all-around state support, JVC signed a technical cooperation agreement with the French firm. It is assumed that the latter will enable Thomson-Brandt to master the Japanese techniques of the manufacture of video tape recorders and raise the share of French components to 75 percent of the cost of the finished product. The Philips company has expressed dissatisfaction with this deal, believing that it hinders the creation of intrinsic European technology and impedes efforts to develop cooperation between EEC countries.

No less considerable opportunities for the achievement of similar accords between the competing parties are opening up in the sphere of the military application of electronics innovations.

For many years the United States has attempted to involve Japan in its military-political strategy in the Far East and the Pacific, achieve a growth of its military spending and obtain official Tokyo's consent to the use of the results of scientific-technical progress in this country for the needs of the Pentagon. Throughout the postwar period a principle of Japanese foreign policy has been a renunciation of arms exports. However, in recent years, when Japan has scored big successes in the retooling of its industry, this principle has gotten in the way of the aspiration of the U.S. military-industrial complex to have at its disposal the latest achievements of science and technology. In 1980 Japan's National Defense Agency and the U.S. Defense Department set up a special consultative committee for the solution of questions of the mutual exchange of complex technology, and since then they have been discussed repeatedly at practically all levels. The Japanese side has in principle never refused the handover of virtually any data, but has endeavored to prevent use of the term "military technology".

Yet, according to MAINICHI DAILY NEWS reports, Japanese technology has long been used by the U.S. Army, since the time of the Vietnam war even. Compact video cameras, which the Sony firm produced for domestic needs, were installed on American bombs for their more accurate guidance to ground targets. The material of other press organs testifies that Japan has supplied American aviation-missile concerns with antiradar cover samples, emphasizing constantly here that it is a question of civil research products. Units and components manufactured in Japan which, Japanese companies claim, were also developed for civil industry have been used in the production of a number of American military radio engineering systems.

The Pentagon is particularly interested in obtaining the technology for the manufacture of optical fibers and laser communications means, missile system automatic guidance devices using infrared radiation, large-scale IC's needed for the creation of military-purpose computers and ferrite aircraft coverings making their radar detection difficult. The United States alludes here to the fact that the technology which it requires is not purely military and also claims that it has been developed partly thanks to American patents. In using scientific-technical achievements for military purposes the United States is attempting to assure Japan that it will not forget its commitments to ensure its security.

Reactionary circles in Japan and abroad are putting their hopes in the positive, they believe, significance of export of arms and modern "dual use" technology from the viewpoint of easing the trade conflicts with the main partners. As justification for military-technical "cooperation" between Japan and the United States official Tokyo representatives have repeatedly pointed to the Security Treaty and the Joint Defense Assistance Agreement in effect between the sides, emphasizing that these documents do not preclude the possibility of arms being made available to the United States. However, prior to the assumption of office of the Y. Nakasone government the previous conservative cabinet displayed caution on these issues, fearing the negative reaction of the opposition parties.

An official agreement on the transfer of Japanese technology to the United States was signed on the eve of R. Reagan's visit to Japan. One of its clauses provides for the setting up of a special bilateral commission on these problems. Operating via such, the United States will acquire an opportunity on the one hand to use Japan's technical thought in American military industry and, on the other, to limit Japanese companies' introduction of their achievements for nonmilitary purposes--to the extent that these operations come under the sections of laws governing the observance of military secrets on the basis of the Japanese-American Security Treaty. Shortly after the agreement was concluded the U.S. Defense Department initiated a trip to Japan by a group of military technology specialists to visit plants of the Nihon (denki), Fujitsu, Matsushita, Mitsubishi, Hitachi, Toshiba and a number of other leading companies of progressive sectors of Japanese industry.

Despite the attempts to settle the constantly arising trade-economic conflicts at interstate level and the expansion of scientific-technical cooperation and, to a certain extent, the interdependence of the electronics companies of the United States, Japan and West Europe, the seriousness of the conflicts among them is not abating. Developing at an accelerated pace the promising areas of electronics research and building up the industrial base for assimilating the results of the developments, Japan has conducted a broad offensive against the positions of the main competitors and is endeavoring to prove its capacity for solving the problem of independence of the United States in this sphere of scientific-technical progress also. The promotion on the world market of practically each new type of electronics product is being accompanied by bitter clashes between the leading producers contributing to the further expansion of the sphere of trade-economic rivalry in the capitalist world.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/13

TIKHOVINSKIY REVIEWS BOOK ON SCIENTISTS' ROLE IN PEACE STRUGGLE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 4,
Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 135-139

[Academician S. Tikhvinskiy review: "Most Important Mission of Science"]

[Excerpts] Physicists, medical men, biologists, ecologists, oceanologists and others whose sacred duty it is to show to people the entire danger of the nuclear madness have a great role. The overwhelming majority of these specialists explains convincingly that the use of weapons of mass annihilation will have an irreversible impact on man's entire environment and on man himself as a biological species. No less important a task is interpretation of the problems of war and peace from the viewpoint of the regularities of world-historical development. It is essential to reveal the actual causes of the menacing situation currently taking shape in international relations, have a clear idea of the correlation of socio-class forces in the world and seek and pave practical ways toward the prevention of a universal confrontation. The joint and selfless efforts of scientists of all specialties both in the sphere of the natural and social sciences are needed for tackling these interconnected and interconditioned tasks.

A striking example of such cooperation of Soviet scientists is the activity of the Scientific Council for the Study of Problems of Peace and Disarmament, which was set up a few years ago by the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, the State Committee for Science and Technology Board and the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace Presidium. The fundamental scientific research conducted by the council, the results of which are reflected in the series of publications "Peace and Disarmament. Scientific Research,"* is of great scientific and sociopolitical interest. The latest of them, which came out in 1984, has elicited extensive comment among the scientific community. Top Soviet scientists and political and public figures appear on the pages of this publication.

The book opens with an introductory article by Academician B.N. Ponomarev, candidate of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which is devoted to scientists' responsible role in

* "Mir i razoruzheniye. Nauchnyye issledovaniya. 1984" [Peace and Disarmament. Scientific Research. 1984], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka," 1984, p 431.

strengthening international security and preventing nuclear war. The articles of the collection, which belong to the pens of Academicians P.N. Fedoseyev, Ye.P. Velikhov, N.N. Blokhin, V.A. Legasov, A.V. Fokin and others, describe in detail the horrifying picture of a global war, into which any conflict involving the use of atomic weapons would inevitably grow. The American "local" nuclear war concept is refuted convincingly, and the contradictoriness and harmfulness of the said proposition, which creates the illusion of a "way out of a hopeless situation" affording an opportunity for the allegedly "prudent" use of weapons of mass destruction, but in actual fact pushing in the direction of an unchecked nuclear arms race are shown (p 70).

The value of the work in question is not only that it provides an authentic portrayal of the likely consequences of the use of weapons of mass destruction. The collection contains an in-depth characterization of the sociopolitical forces which are capable of opposing the forces of militarism and reaction and championing the cause of international security.

At the center of the authors' attention is an interpretation of the struggle being waged by the international workers movement headed by its combat vanguard--the communist parties, which are the most consistent defenders of the right of all peoples and sovereign states to a peaceful life. "A most important event of recent decades and even, more precisely, of recent years," the book emphasizes, "has been the truly unprecedented scale of the antiwar protests of the international working class and its political parties" (pp 123, 141).

The serious Marxist-Leninist analysis of the most important problems of the workers movement contained in the work shows that constant attention to international policy is organically inherent in the working class.

Communists of the most varied countries are actively in the vanguard of resistance to the reactionary antipopular foreign policy of the bourgeoisie, the highest and most serious manifestation of which is war. International social democracy also is joining increasingly often and on an increasingly extensive scale in the struggle against the military danger.

The collection distinguishes the main directions of the communist and workers parties' international activity to ensure security in the world and remove the threat of war. The first direction which is emphasized is the tremendous significance which is attached to communists' scientific analysis of the essence of the international situation and the nature of the tasks ensuing therefrom. The second is organizational activity aimed at mobilizing communists in the plane of ensuring their broadest possible participation in the antiwar struggle. And the third is the stimulation of activity in the broad masses and the utmost support for the antiwar movement.

The expansion of the scale and increase in the number of participants in the antiwar movement are leading to the increased diversity of its forms and the appearance of new organizations. The authors of the collection explain these new features also by the interweaving and merger of the working people's socioeconomic and antimilitarist demands. Militarism stimulates the growth of such negative social phenomena as the slowing of the rate of economic

development, inflation, structural unemployment, currency crises and so forth, which are reflected most disastrously in the working people's living standard. The book cogently reveals the groundlessness of the myth concerning the "salutory" influence of military spending on the economy.

A characteristic feature of the antiwar movement in the West is the deepening cooperation between scientific research establishments and the working people's professional organizations in the study of the social and other consequences of the arms race. This, in turn, is contributing to the intensification of the antinuclear protest and its participants' more profound recognition of the goals and tasks confronting them.

It is symptomatic that religious figures also are joining the struggle for peace increasingly extensively, to which, in particular, the article by Pitirim, archbishop of Volokolamskiy, "Preserving the Sacred Gift of Life" testifies. It says that many believers, "addressing the concerns of all mankind, have put at the center of their social assertiveness the most important present-day problem--the defense and preservation of peace." This problem, the author emphasizes, "has assumed worldwide significance in recent decades. It has enlisted in its solution the outstanding minds of the present day and captured the broadest strata of the population" (p 154).

The strengthening of the forces of peace supporters is all the more important at present, when the militarist policy of the most aggressive imperialist circles is creating an exceptional threat to universal security.

The collection in question makes a concise, but impressively profound analysis of U.S. foreign policy taken in its historical development. Both in the past and today commonsense in Washington's international actions has frequently given way to "extreme irreponsibility, emotions, conceit, hatred and the temptation to use technological innovations" (p 164). It is indicative that barely liberated from colonial domination as a result of the American revolution, the new ruling class which took shape in the country immediately adopted a policy of expansion and on the eve and at the outset of the 20th century made the transition to the accomplishment of global seizures. Essentially each decade, each year of the present century has demonstrated a constant strengthening of the "power" trends in the United States' international policy and the increased pretensions of its ruling circles to exercise the "leading" role in the world. "The case of the R. Reagan administration," the book emphasizes, "is particularly ominous inasmuch as it manifests a combination of various constituting factors": there is here American monopoly forces' hope for a return of former or, at least, the retention of their present positions in the world, preservation of the system of obtaining superprofits at the expense of the developing countries, the desire to amortize domestic social destabilization under the conditions of a reduction in the living standard of the bulk of the population and ideological prejudices (p 165).

At the center of American foreign policy strategy is nuclear blackmail and the aim of achieving hegemonist, imperial goals. This expresses the socio-class interests of the predominant monopoly groupings, which at the frontier of the 1980's switched abruptly from a policy of detente to a policy of confrontation and the spurring of tension. The reasons for this, as the collection's material

graphically shows, are rooted in the nature of the interests of an influential part of the economic, military and political elite of the United States, which sensed that the conditions of detente mean a loss of profits from military supplies, make a policy of plunder in the developing countries more difficult and reduce the authority of the cult of strength, to which the rulers of the United States have become so accustomed" [no opening quotes] (p 176).

The current situation in the world is the result of the confrontation of two diametrically opposite approaches to the central problem of world politics--that of war and peace--a confrontation unprecedented in its seriousness. Contrary to all scientific calculations and considerations of commonsense, Washington politicians are constructing their concepts of the use of nuclear weapons on the basis of the United States allegedly being capable of "depriving the Soviet Union of the possibility of having recourse to an all-devastating retaliatory strike" (p 192). They remain in the grip of ideas of the past and ignore the fundamental and in principle irreversible fact of the military-strategic balance of forces in the world. As the work shows, the USSR, on the other hand, proceeds from the fact that the global nature of the military danger objectively predetermines a global community of interests in preventing universal destruction (p 182). Accordingly, this dictates the objective need for adherence to the principles of peaceful coexistence for all states. The entire foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist community countries is geared to consistent defense of the interests of detente and peace and the sovereign rights of each people. This has been corroborated by each practical step of the CPSU and the Soviet Government throughout the existence of our state and by the specific measures in the foreign policy sphere which are being adopted at the present time.

The recent UN General Assembly 39th Session confirmed anew the consistency and purposefulness of the USSR's foreign policy and its resolve in the defense of world civilization against nuclear conflagration. A readiness for the sake of this to interact with all states and social forces which recognize the need for practical steps to ease international tension and a readiness to use all available levers, including such a one as the United Nations, are a distinguishing feature of the approach of the CPSU and the Soviet Government to international affairs. Two initiatives presented by the USSR at the last session concern problems currently at the center of world politics. The first concerns the nonmilitarization of space, its use for the benefit of mankind and opposition to the "star wars" program planned by the Pentagon. The second proposal concerns the impermissibility of a policy of state terrorism and any actions aimed at undermining the sociopolitical system in sovereign states. This is particularly urgent today, considering that the present Washington administration has adopted as a rule not only systematic political interference in the internal affairs of other states but also direct acts of aggression. The predatory attack on Grenada and the incessant interventionist activity on Nicaragua's borders are graphic confirmation of this.

Despite the considerable growth of aggressive and militarist trends in the international policy of imperialism, which is inevitably leading to a lowering of the threshold of nuclear war, there has been in parallel a strengthening of the positions of the peace supporters, the socialist community, the international workers movement, the antiwar movement of broad public circles and other social forces. This permits us to hope that wisdom will ultimately prevail in international affairs over nuclear madness and that it will be possible to achieve a turnabout from hostile confrontation toward the constructive cooperation of states with different social systems. As the material of the collection in question testifies, this proposition is not a pious wish. It is underpinned by actual events, which give us grounds for hope. The book investigates in detail the progress and results of the Madrid meeting of representatives of participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (November 1980-September 1983), which showed with full force the viability of the joint efforts of countries with opposite social systems in support of peace and cooperation (p 212). What is particularly important is that its successful completion was achieved in spite of the sharp exacerbation of the international situation and the unconstructive position of the U.S. delegation. In the summary document of the meeting in Madrid its participants expressed the resolve to make detente a more effective and viable process, seek solutions to unsettled problems only by peaceful means, curb the intensifying arms buildup and strengthen trust and security in interstate relations. It was possible for the meeting to achieve positive results only thanks to the scrupulous and at the same time flexible position of the USSR and the other socialist countries and support on the part of the neutral and nonaligned states. This indicates once again that ensuring international security and a halt to the arms race are possible only in persistent struggle and via the surmounting of the obstacles being erected by the aggressive forces of imperialism.

The cohesion and unity of all progressive and peace-loving forces at all levels of social life is a factor without which prevention of the nuclear danger is impossible. Soviet social scientists and specialists in the sphere of the natural sciences recognize fully the importance and urgency of this task and are contributing in every way possible by their works and their organizational activity to its accomplishment.

The knowledge and experience and great authority of scientists enable them to make an impressive contribution to the cause of saving mankind from nuclear catastrophe. This explains their increased responsibility in the modern age and considerable role in defense of the gains of human civilization and world culture. Pointing out the source of the military threat, uniting their efforts with the efforts of the foreign progressive scientific community, actively participating in the worldwide antiwar movement and mass meetings, gatherings, congresses, collections of signatures and peace marches and supporting the numerous federations which exist in the West of scientific workers who expose the explosive political plans of ruling imperialist circles, scientists of the USSR are performing their national and international duty. The book shows convincingly that Soviet scientists are profoundly attached to the cause of peace; they know, Academician B.N. Ponomarev writes in an introductory article to the collection, that "the CPSU and the Soviet state will

never use the fruits of their labor to the detriment of the cause of peace and the interests of the peoples. The USSR Academy of Sciences headed by its president. A.P. Aleksandrov, is marching in the front ranks of the defenders of peace" (p 24).

In completing the description of the collection it should be mentioned with satisfaction that, besides the scientific-analytical part, the publication includes an important section illustrating the activity of Soviet public organizations in the sphere of peace and disarmament (the Association of Soviet Lawyers, the USSR Youth Organizations Committee, the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, the Soviet Peace Foundation and others). The book also publishes a number of fundamental Soviet party-government documents of the last 2 years on questions of peace and disarmament, the texts of the summary document of the Madrid meeting and UN General Assembly declarations and resolutions and material disclosing Soviet scientists' struggle for peace. A brief bibliography on problems of peace and disarmament completes the collection.

The third installment of the "Peace and Disarmament" series is not only of a scientific-analytical but also reference-bibliographical nature. I would like to emphasize the comprehensiveness and multifaceted nature of this publication, which makes it exceptionally useful not only for professional international affairs scholars but also for VUZ students and all those with an interest in international problems.

At the same time it seems to us that the collection could have been supplemented by a special section illustrating the great organizational activity of the social scientists, primarily historians, aimed at mobilizing the scientific community in defense of peace and for the cohesion of all forces of the antiwar movement. In particular, a striking example of the efforts made by Soviet humanities scholars in this field was the international scientific conference "Ideas of Peace and Problems of Europe's Security: History and the Present Day," which was held 30-31 May 1984 in Moscow. This forum was organized by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World History and the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, and scientists of the socialist countries and their colleagues from Great Britain, Greece, the FRG, Switzerland, Sweden and Finland took part. The appeal adopted at the conference emphasized that scientists are vested with particular responsibility for the cause of the preservation of peace. The delegates called on all the world's scientists and all people of good will to multiply efforts to save the world from the threat of war.

I believe that the confidence may be expressed that in new installments of the collection its editorial board and group of writers will pay considerably greater attention to an analysis of the considerable amount of work which Soviet social scientists are performing in the plane of strengthening and developing the antiwar movement and enhancing its effectiveness. As a whole, however, the publication in question provides us with an actual example of the contribution which scientists can make to the cause of consolidating peace and the struggle against militarism and aggression, tirelessly exposing the antihumane bourgeois foreign policy and military-strategic concepts aimed at

disorienting the peoples, counteracting the attempts of reactionary forces to split and weaken the antiwar movement and showing the grim consequences of nuclear war. Profound, sincere concern for the historical destiny of human civilization and awareness of their involvement in the peoples' struggle for peace are distinguishing features of the high civic spirit and truly scientific position of Soviet scientists, which is clearly and precisely expressed in the book in question.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/13

BULGARIAN BOOK URGES FURTHER CEMA INTEGRATION

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No. 4, Apr 85 (signed to press 18 March 85) pp 140-141

[B. Pugachev review: "Objective Regularity of the Socialist World"]

[Text] The monograph in question,* which was prepared by specialists of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences Institute of International Relations and Socialist Integration (leader of the group--Prof Jacques Aroyo), represents a serious scientific study of the theoretical and practical problems of the all-around rapprochement of the fraternal socialist countries. Attention is attracted by the original approach to an interpretation of the very essence of the latter as a comprehensive, multifaceted process and the endeavor to examine the regularities of the socialist community in inseparable connection with the practice of economic and political cooperation. Analyzing a great deal of factual material, the authors have known how to interpret it in depth and provide correct conclusions.

Regarding the rapprochement of the socialist countries as an objective regularity of the socialist world, the Bulgarian scholars distinguish its three main features. First, the book observes, the process of equalization of the levels of economic development of the socialist states creating the prerequisites for the comparative evenness of their progressive advance. Second, the essence of the rapprochement is connected with the relative similarity and likeness of the socioeconomic structures, forms and mechanisms of the functioning of the socialist society in the fraternal countries. Third and finally, a tremendous role is performed here by the constant deepening of relations between the fraternal countries in the political, economic and cultural spheres and also the international socialization of production leading to the mutual adaptation, supplementing and interweaving of the national economic organisms and the deepening of the unity of the socialist states. Thus what we have is the development of all-around integration and the formation of common economic structures and elements of political and social life.

* "Ikonomicheskoto sblizhavane na stranite ot sotsialisticheskata obshchnost. Teoretiko-metodologichni problemi," Sofia, published by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1983, p 250.

The authors emphasize particularly that the goals of the rapprochement are the organic combination of the burgeoning of the socialist nations and the strengthening of the sovereignty of the socialist states on the one hand and an expansion and deepening of all-around relations and cooperation and the shaping of common elements in policy, the economy and social life on the other. To achieve these goals it is essential, as the book shows, to ensure a number of conditions. These include the accelerated development of the production forces and an improvement in international socialist economic relations; the further equalization of the economic and scientific-technical development levels of the fraternal countries; an expansion of the scale and a growth of the technical-economic indicators of the leading sectors of production; an improvement in the structures of the national economic complexes and increased social labor productivity and production efficiency both within the framework of the national economies and on the scale of the international socialist economy as a whole; and an improvement in the mechanism of control of international socialist economic relations. All this in sum should make it possible to satisfy the growing need of the fraternal countries' population for consumer goods and services and raise their peoples' living standard (p 27). The said tasks may be accomplished successfully on the basis of the life-tested principle of socialist internationalism.

Examining the forms of bilateral and multilateral cooperation, the Bulgarian scholars note that the centripetal thrust of socialist economic integration as a comprehensive process is being manifested increasingly distinctly at the current stage. They distinguish particularly the structural nature of the changes which are occurring in the industry of the CEMA countries caused by the relatively identical level of their technological development. An important place in the work is assigned the ascertainment of the increasingly great similitarity and likeness of the national economic structures in these states. A general trend connected with the intensive type of economic growth and an improvement in the economic mechanism is expressed here.

A separate chapter of the monograph is devoted to a description of the process of the gradual formation of uniform structures within the framework of the national economic complex of the CEMA countries which is taking shape. Specific areas of rapprochement are analyzed: problems of the cooperation and specialization of production, optimization of the national production complexes and the concentration of resources in the most promising areas of scientific-technical progress (p 145). Questions of an extension of the fraternal states' foreign economic relations attract the authors' close attention. Under the conditions of rapprochement, they observe, a transition is being observed away from production relations indirectly in the sphere of circulation toward close interaction in the sphere of direct production, while reciprocal trade is gradually changing from a means of communication between individual national economic complexes into a factor of ensuring the general proportionality of the uniform complex of the CEMA countries which is taking shape (pp 162-163). In this connection the book works up questions of the formation and development of international production relations as an integral system. A number of problems connected with the international development of socialist ownership and the emergence of international socialist ownership is put forward (p 203).

A few words concerning the work's shortcomings. First of all, it is hardly possible to agree with the direct identification of the process of rapprochement and the process of equalization of economic development levels (pp 7-8). Further, the above-mentioned three aspects and features of rapprochement are at times regarded as being self-sufficing, without a close direct linkage. And, finally, together with the use of Bulgarian and Soviet scientific literature it would have been useful, I believe, for the authors of the book to have drawn on material of studies from other fraternal countries.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/13

END