

JPRS 70503

19 January 1978

USA: ECONOMICS, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY

No. 12, DECEMBER 1977.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

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

20000405 054

124

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. JPRS 70503	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle USA: ECONOMICS, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY No. 12, December 1977		5. Report Date 19 January 1978	
		6.	
7. Author(s)		8. Performing Organization Repr. No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
		11. Contract/Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above		13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
		14.	
15. Supplementary Notes Translation of the monthly, SShA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA, published by the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow.			
16. Abstracts The report contains articles by Soviet public figures, Americanologists, and others, on Soviet-American relations and on political, military, economic, scientific, technological, and other aspects of life in the United States and Canada.			
17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors Political Science Sociology Economics Geography Propaganda 17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms 17c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 5C			
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22151		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 124
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price PCA07

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
Book Reviews	
Anatomy of U.S. Foreign Policy Machinery (Yu. A. Shvedkov)	72
U.S.--Southern Africa: Diehards Recommend (T. V. Kuznetsova)	76
A Chronic Malady (N. V. Bogacheva)	79
Problems of Nuclear Disarmament (V. S. Sheyin)	83
The Third President of the United States (V. V. Sogrin)	86
An Analysis of American Statistical Policy (E. F. Zhukov)	88
Food as Political 'Carrot' and 'Stick' (N. S. Beglova)	90
Boss Richard J. Daley of Chicago*	92
New Stage in Development of Electromobile (B. P. Gushcho-Malkov)	93
Harris Polls (M. M. Petrovskaya)	95
Statement of Central Committee of Communist Party USA	97
Cumulative Index for 1977	111

* Not translated by JPRS

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : USA: ECONOMICS, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY
No 12, December 1977

Russian title : SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : V. M. Berezhev

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo Nauka

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : December 1977

Signed to press : 15 November 1977

Copies : 34,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA -
ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1977

LIGHT OF GREAT OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 3-8

[Text] The 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution has gone by. The Soviet people, communists of all nations and all progressive mankind commemorated this important date festively and on a broad scale. The celebration of this glorious anniversary was an impressive demonstration of the achievements of the land of October and new conclusive proof of the invincible strength and vitality of the ideals of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and the strength and vitality of the socialist order.

L. I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, presented a report entitled "Great October and Progress of Mankind" at a joint festive session of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow. Addresses "To the Soviet People" and "To the People, Parliaments and Governments of All Nations" were adopted.

L. I. Brezhnev's report is an outstanding document of creative Marxism-Leninism and a great contribution to the theory and practice of scientific communism. The report contains a profound, thorough, brilliant and cogent description of the heroic path traveled by the birthplace of October, its remarkable achievements, its problems and its prospects and a scientific analysis of the international situation.

An international theoretical conference on "Great October and the Present Day," organized by the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee, the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee and the Higher Party School of the CPSU Central Committee, was held on 10-12 November in Moscow. After an introductory speech by M. A. Suslov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, B. N. Ponomarev, candidate for membership in the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, read a report entitled "The Worldwide Historic Significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution." The work done at the conference reaffirmed the tremendous significance of the October Revolution in the progress of mankind.

For 60 years now the Soviet Union has confidently advanced along a path cleared by the October Revolution and brilliantly outlined by K. Marx, F. Engels and V. I. Lenin.

Within an amazingly short period of time, backward Russia became a strong power with a highly developed industry and collectivized agriculture. On the eve of its 60th anniversary--in 1976--the Soviet Union was ahead of the most developed capitalist power, the United States, according to several economic indicators, producing 30 percent more oil, smelting 21 percent more steel and producing 26 percent more mineral fertilizer. Total industrial production in the USSR has already exceeded 80 percent of American production volume and agricultural production has almost reached the 85-percent level. Where are they now, those prophets of doom who told the entire world that revolutionary Russia and the Bolshevik regime would not last a week? Imperialism is still occupied with ill-will, and even overt hatred, for the land of October and with attempts to belittle the worldwide historic significance of the October Revolution and the achievements of the Soviet Union. Now, however, it is more and more difficult to ignore universally known facts.

The times are now insistently dictating the vital necessity of sober assessments of present reality and the lessons of history and a realistic calculation of historical prospects. In connection with this necessity, for example, the WASHINGTON POST wrote on the day of the 60th anniversary of October: "The Soviet Union at 60 is a powerful and proud state; today the Soviet Union is celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution that delivered Russia from age-old tsarist despotism and established a qualitatively new government which has been successfully ruling the nation on behalf of the people for 6 decades."

The path traveled by the Soviet land since October has enriched the history of mankind, not only with the experience of industrial development at unprecedented rates but also with the experience of the spiritual emancipation of the workers by placing the achievements of science, technology, literature and art at their service. "The meeting dreamed about by the best minds of mankind, the historic meeting of labor and culture, has taken place," L. I. Brezhnev said at the festive session. "This has been a turning point of tremendous significance in the history of our nation and in the history of world culture."

The national question--one of the most painful and most dramatic issues in human history--has been settled. A new historic human community--the Soviet people--has come into being, and the equality, fraternity and inviolable unity of the peoples of our union has become a fact.

The principles of social equality and justice have been established. The recently adopted new Constitution of the Soviet Union reaffirmed the fact that all transformations and changes occurring in the nation are aimed primarily at guaranteeing truly humane living conditions for each individual.

The basic law of the USSR proved conclusively once again that the concepts of freedom, human rights, democracy and social justice are only invested with true meaning in the socialist society.

A developed socialist society has been constructed in the Soviet nation for the first time on the planet and a communist society is being built for the first time. The possibilities of this society are tremendous. The complete realization of these possibilities is now our main objective. The extent of this realization is also the extent of the responsibility imposed on the CPSU and the Soviet people by history.

With a profound recognition of this responsibility, the CPSU and its Central Committee determined the strategy and tactics of communist construction during the present, extremely important stage at the 24th and 25th party congresses. In the economic sphere, a course of intensive growth in national production, increased efficiency and improved quality in all economic activity was chosen.

The progress in the implementation of this course has been impressive: suffice it to say that the economic potential of the USSR has virtually doubled during the last 10 years. There have also been profound qualitative changes; after all, scientific and technical progress is becoming an increasingly effective factor of economic development. Labor productivity levels are constantly rising and problems directly related to the need for improving the working and living conditions of Soviet citizens are being solved successfully. Much has been done to promote agriculture and to solve the housing problem and vast resources have been allocated for the expanded production of consumer goods. The real income of the Soviet people has increased by 60 percent in the last 10 years.

While giving these successes their due recognition, the party is quite aware that many problems still exist, many tasks have not been completed and an enormous amount of activity lies ahead.

As we approach communism, our tasks grow in size and complexity. This increases the importance of coordination, order and discipline or, in other words, highly organized work. "Highly organized work on all levels and in all links of the party, state and economic administrative systems and in each working position," L. I. Brezhnev said, "is an indispensable and essential prerequisite for the accomplishment of all the tasks set by the 25th Congress."

The party is aiming today's plans at the fulfillment of tomorrow's assignments so that the steep and difficult path to the heights of progress can be traveled successfully and under the best possible conditions. This attention to more than current needs alone is a distinctive feature of the party's agrarian policy and the large-scale comprehensive programs compiled in recent years--the programs for the development of Russia's nonchernozem zone and West and East Siberia, the program for the construction of the Baykal-Amur Railway and others. Science will play an important role in the work that lies ahead.

"The future of our economy," L. I. Brezhnev has stressed, "depend on greater efficiency. There is no other way to guarantee the successful and dynamic development of our national economy. It is precisely for this reason that the party has followed and will constantly follow a course of accelerated scientific and technical progress, improved planning and management and stronger organization and order in each working position and each administrative link."

Ideological work--the inculcation of aspirations to high social goals, ideological convictions and a truly creative attitude toward labor--represents an important front of struggle for communism. The results of economic construction and the sociopolitical development of the nation will depend more and more on the successes on this front.

The Soviet people associate all of their achievements and all of their victories with the communist party.

October changed the appearance of the world. The birth and development of the worldwide socialist system has been the most important consequence of October, a consequence which has determined the characteristics of the present era. The 60 years of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, Secretary General Gus Hall of the Communist Party of the United States said, is irrefutable proof of the fact that socialism is the highest point of social development and that its birth was not a historical accident, but, rather, the embodiment of a historical necessity; proof of the fact that the time had come for a transition from capitalism to socialism.

The October Revolution was primarily an affair of our nation, a radical way of solving the problems presented by history and the concrete conditions of our nation's development. At the same time, October indicated a way of solving the problems that had bothered all mankind for centuries. This, above all, constitutes its worldwide historic significance.

October had a tremendous effect on the development of the national liberation movement. The triumph of the October Revolution roused the consciousness of the colonial peoples and helped them to win great successes in their struggle for liberation from imperialist oppression. The eradication of the colonial system of imperialism in its classic form is an event of worldwide historic significance. It is exceptionally important that many liberated nations are rejecting the capitalist course of development and are setting themselves the goal of a society free of exploitation and are choosing the socialist course. The socialist states are true and reliable friends of these nations, friends willing to give them assistance and support in their development along the progressive path.

The triumph of October began a new stage in the international workers movement. The construction of socialism in the USSR and then in other nations promoted the political maturation of the working class in the capitalist world. Its ranks have become more organized. A force has come into being

which is to play a great role in history--the international communist movement. The front of the allies in the struggle against domination by the monopolies and for democracy and socialism has grown more extensive.

October and peace, socialism and peace are indivisible. Born under the sign of Lenin's Decree on Peace, the Soviet land has invariably and consistently pursued a peace-loving foreign policy and a course toward peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

Tangible successes have been achieved on the path toward peace. Mankind is entering the new year of 1978 under the conditions of the relaxation of international tension which has marked the entire present decade. The changes for the better can be seen most clearly in Europe, where relations of good-neighborliness, mutual understanding and peoples' interest in, and respect for, each other are growing stronger. The Soviet Union rates this achievement highly and considers it to be its duty to safeguard and strengthen it by every means. Therefore, the USSR attaches great significance to cooperation with countries like France, the FRG, Britain and Italy, with all large and small European states with different social systems.

The Soviet Union also attaches great significance to relations with the United States, striving to ensure that considerations of a long-term nature, dictated by concern for peace, are the decisive considerations in these relations, and to continue the development begun in relations with the United States on the basis of equality and mutual respect.

The principles of peaceful coexistence have now become quite firmly entrenched in international affairs as the only realistic and sensible principles. This is the result of the change in the correlation of forces in the world and, above all, of the growing might and international authority of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community. It is the outcome of the enormous amount of work done by the Soviet Union and the other socialist states in recent years with a view to achieving a restructuring of international relations in the direction of peace. It is also the result of the successes won by the international workers movement and national liberation forces.

Finally, it is the result of an understanding of new realities on the part of a certain segment of the ruling circles in the capitalist world.

International relations, as L. I. Brezhnev noted in his report, are now, as it were, at a crossing of the ways, leading either to the growth of trust and cooperation or to the growth of mutual fears, suspicions and the stockpiling of weapons--paths leading ultimately either to lasting peace or, at best, to brinkmanship. Detente makes it possible to choose the path of peace. It would be a crime to let this opportunity pass.

And the most important, the most urgent task now is to hope the arms race which is sweeping the world. The CPSU and the Soviet State have made and are continuing to make the greatest possible efforts to considerably reduce

and then totally eliminate the threat of nuclear war, to cure the arms race and to constantly reduce the level of military confrontation between the two sociopolitical systems.

On the day of the 60th anniversary of October, the Soviet Union came out with important new initiatives aimed at the speediest possible solution of the most important task of the present day. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's report at the festive session on the 60th anniversary of October made proposals for the simultaneous cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons by all states. To advance the talks now in progress on the banning of nuclear tests, the Soviet Union proposed agreement on the declaration of a moratorium on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes in addition to the banning of all nuclear weapon tests for a specific period. These proposals evoked the most lively interest and a positive response throughout the world. There was virtually no press organ of any size or importance which did not give impressive coverage to this new Soviet initiative.

At the same time, despite the realization by capitalist ruling circles of the simple truth that there is no sensible alternative to detente and despite the fact that detente has already furthered the solution, or opened up real prospects for the solution, of many vitally important international problems, the NATO powers and, above all, the United States continue to turn the crank of their military machine. Military expenditures are increasing. In the United States alone, these expenditures have exceeded the astronomical sum of 100 billion dollars for the second year in succession. New types and systems of weapons of mass destruction are being created, as, for example, neutron and radiological weapons.

Not only is military hysteria thus being stoked and the atmosphere of detente poisoned, but increasingly large sums, so essential for the needs of peaceful life, are being expended unproductively--and this at a time when the economy of the United States and the other Western countries is experiencing a virtually permanent crisis, into which it "slipped" at the beginning of the 1970's.

The initiator of this development of events was the United States, which, during the past year or two, has tended to "toughen" its policy toward the Soviet Union, resuming its attempts at interference in the internal affairs of the USSR and other countries and seeking military advantages for itself with a view to putting pressure on the Soviet Union right down the line, as they say. This course fundamentally contradicts the letter and spirit of the fundamental agreements and accords between the USSR and the United States. Naturally, this policy has encountered resolute resistance from the Soviet Union. It has also caused alarm and apprehension in the United States itself and in the camp of its allies.

We would like to hope that the outburst of experimentation with "tough" one-sided measures and methods from Washington has come to an end. Today the Soviet Union is pleased to note a recent definite turn for the better in relations between the USSR and the United States. This is strengthening

hopes of the further normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations and the achievement of important new agreements between the USSR and the United States, above all in the sphere of strategic arms limitation, which would accord not only with the interests of the USSR and the United States but also the interests of all other countries in the world.

There is important evidence--evidence which has emerged since the September talks in Washington between A. A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR foreign minister, and President J. Carter and other leaders of the U.S. Administration--attesting to the fact that talks on the further limitation of strategic offensive arms have advanced from a standstill and are developing constructively. Official U.S. circles have also given the proposals advanced in L. I. Brezhnev's report their due attention. This is borne out in particular by the fact that, on the same day that these proposals were heard from the rostrum of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, U.S. Secretary of State C. Vance described the appeal to declare a moratorium on peaceful nuclear explosions as an important step toward the total prohibition of nuclear tests and expressed the opinion that it would exert beneficial influence on the talks now taking place on this problem. In a telegram to L. I. Brezhnev, U.S. President J. Carter has stressed the United States' interest in ending the arms race and reducing the danger of war.

Peace and security, the curbing of the arms race and the development of international cooperation are essential to the Soviet Union for its further successful advancement along the path of communist construction. Peace and security, the curbing of the arms race and the development of international cooperation are vitally necessary to the peoples of all countries of the world, great and small, irrespective of their social systems or the conditions under which they live. The CPSU and the Soviet State proceed from the premise that if they succeed in resolving the main task--the task of preventing a new world war and ensuring lasting peace--then this will open up wonderful new prospects for the inhabitants of our planet. The necessary conditions will be established for the resolution of many other vitally important problems now facing all mankind. These include the need to provide enormous masses of people with food, raw material and sources of energy, the overcoming of the economic backwardness of many Asian, African and Latin American countries caused by colonialism and the protection of man from the perils threatened by further uncontrolled technical development.

Mankind is approaching an era when socialism, in one specific historically conditioned form or another, will become the dominant social system in the world, bringing with it peace, freedom, equality and well-being to all working people. The CPSU and the Soviet State, the entire socialist community and the fraternal parties, and millions of people everywhere are, by their struggle to bring this prospect closer, continuing the work begun by the October Revolution. However many more years may pass, the light of October will never wane. October 1917 has lit the way to the historically inevitable future for all peoples and countries.

DETENTE PROSPECTS AND SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 9-18 LD

[Article by V. M. Berezhev]

[Text] If you look back over the year coming to an end you can justifiably say that despite all the difficulties and obstacles the process of detente has continued to develop. The diplomacy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries has made a decisive contribution to this development.

The materials of the 25th CPSU Congress point out that "the main factor in our policy with respect to the capitalist states has been and still is the struggle for the assertion of the principles of peaceful coexistence, for lasting peace, for the easing and, in the long term, the elimination of the danger of the outbreak of a new world war." (Note 1), ("Materials of the 25th CPSU Congress," Moscow, 1976, p 16) The congress' program of further struggle for peace and international cooperation and for freedom and independence of the peoples sets specific tasks in Soviet foreign policy by which the Soviet Government is unswervingly guided in its practical activity in the international arena. The basic provisions of this program are clear and unequivocal:

--To increase the fraternal socialist states' active joint contribution to the strengthening of peace by steadily strengthening their unity and developing their comprehensive cooperation in the building of a new society.

--To try to halt the growing arms race, which endangers peace, and seek a transition to the reduction of weapon stockpiles and to disarmament;

--To focus the efforts of peace-loving states on the liquidation of remaining military hotbeds and, above all, on the implementation of a just and lasting settlement in the Near East;

--To do everything to deepen relaxation of international tension and its embodiment in specific forms of mutually advantageous cooperation among states. To actively pursue a line toward the full implementation of the final act of the all-European conference and the development of peaceful

cooperation in Europe. To consistently continue, in accordance with the principles of peaceful coexistence, the development of relations of long-term mutually advantageous cooperation in various spheres--politics, economics, science and culture--with the United States, France, the FRG, Great Britain, Italy, Canada and also Japan and other capitalist states;

--To achieve the safeguarding of security in Asia on the basis of joint efforts by the states of this continent;

--To seek to conclude a world treaty on the nonuse of force in international relations;

--To treat as one of the most important international tasks the total liquidation of all remnants of the system of colonial oppression, cases of infringement of the equal rights and independence of the peoples and all hotbeds of colonialism and racism;

--To seek to eliminate discrimination and all artificial obstacles in international trade and the liquidation of all manifestations of inequality, dictat and exploitation in international economic relations. (Note 2), (Ibid, pp 25, 26)

The past year has seen considerable successes in the implementation of this program. And although the enemies of peace have been making a desperate effort to prevent further positive shifts, international cooperation has made considerable progress. Speaking in New York at the 32d Session of the UN General Assembly, A. A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, was able to state with satisfaction that more and more responsible statesmen are coming to the conclusion that in the nuclear age there is no reasonable alternative to the policy of detente and peaceful coexistence. (Note 3), (PRAVDA, 28 September 1977)

During 1977 the Soviet Union's relations with the majority of countries with different social systems have developed very successfully and this has been an important contribution to deepening detente. Soviet-French relations are developing steadily. The recent visit to France by L. I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, imparted fresh impetus to mutually advantageous cooperation between our countries. The important documents signed as a result of this visit convincingly show that joint actions by the USSR and France make a major contribution to the relaxation of tension and the development of cooperation in Europe and beyond.

Our country's relations with the FRG have also been placed on a normal channel and are benefiting both countries, although there are certain circles in the FRG which are trying to inhibit this process. The Soviet side has repeatedly stressed the desire to widen and deepen ties with West Germany in various spheres. There is every reason for expressing satisfaction also in connection with the fact that the Soviet Union's relations with Finland, Italy, Austria, Britain and other West European states have been developing recently. Relations with these countries,

and with the other participants in the all-European conference, have been provided with a solid foundation--the principles and accords contained in the final act signed in Helsinki 18 months ago. The Belgrade meeting of representatives of the states which participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has, by and large, made yet another important contribution to the cause of detente on our continent.

The Soviet Union has also continued to pursue good-neighborly relations with Japan. Not everything is developing as it might in this sphere, but it is to be hoped that the situation will change for the better for the good of the peoples of both countries and in the interests of peace in Asia. The USSR's relations with other countries on this continent, in particular India, are taking on favorable shape. The deepening and enrichment of ties with India correspond to the interests of the peoples of the USSR and India.

The meetings between the top leaders of the Soviet Union and foreign states in the current year have been of great importance. As a result, the policy of strengthening peace, cooperation and good-neighborliness invariably pursued by the Soviet Union has borne fresh fruit.

An important task of modern times is the adoption of effective measures to curb the arms race. It is no secret that dangerous trends have once again been observed in this sphere, but in no way can the Soviet Union bear responsibility for this. In fact, the Soviet Union has put forward and continues to put forward more and more initiatives to curb the arms race and put the world on the path of disarmament at long last. At the last session of the UN General Assembly our country once again submitted them in summary form in the memorandum on questions of halting the arms race and effecting disarmament. This document expressed the Soviet Union's readiness both to seek new measures in the sphere of arms limitation and for progress toward complete disarmament. Everyone knows of the socialist power's contribution to the formulation and implementation, in conjunction with other countries, of a whole series of international treaties and agreements.

They have helped to check the build up of certain types of weapons and some of them have banned the arms race altogether in specific media. In this respect, special significance attaches to the signing of a convention prohibiting the military or any other hostile use of means of modifying the environment. If all states, without exception, subscribe to this convention it will be an important contribution to maintaining peace in our world.

A. A. Gromyko's speech at the 32d Session of the UN General Assembly reaffirmed the Soviet Union's readiness to take concrete and far-reaching steps in disarmament. He stressed that the most radical and effective method of preventing a nuclear war would be the total liquidation of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union has advocated this ever since "nuclear death" has been a factor.

The USSR foreign minister urged the United Nations to appeal to all countries to prevent the emergence of situations which may cause a dangerous exacerbation of relations among them and to avoid military clashes.

The strict observance of the principle of nonuse of threat of force in states' mutual relations and the conclusion of a world treaty on nonuse of force in international relations would be of great importance to strengthening peace. The danger of war, as A. A. Gromyko stressed, would be reduced if the nuclear countries agreed to withdraw ships carrying nuclear weapons from certain areas of the world ocean.

As is known, the Soviet Union has proposed the conclusion of a treaty banning all nuclear weapons tests and has expressed a readiness to participate in a quest for a mutually acceptable accord on the question of control. It has now taken yet another step forward: There has been positive response everywhere to L. I. Brezhnev's proposals in his report at the 2 November Kremlin ceremonial session on the simultaneous halting by all states of the production of nuclear weapons and on the declaration of a moratorium on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, in addition to a ban on all nuclear weapons tests for a definite period. This is fresh evidence of the USSR's good will and its desire to safeguard lasting peace.

At the present session of the UN General Assembly the Soviet Government submitted yet another proposal in the form of an important and urgent question--"on the deepening and strengthening of relaxation of international tension and the prevention of the danger of nuclear war." At the same time the USSR submitted for examination by the General Assembly two draft documents--a declaration on the deepening and strengthening of the relaxation of international tension and a resolution on preventing a nuclear war. Both documents have met with the support of the overwhelming majority of UN-member states.

Thus, there is no shortage of concrete proposals on curbing the arms race. Nevertheless, in practical terms, very little has so far been done in this sphere. It is in no way proving possible to embark on actual disarmament and the liquidation of the material means of warfare. There is special concern in the world over the long delay in the elaboration of a new, long-term agreement between the USSR and the United States on limiting strategic offensive arms. This sphere is directly linked to the entire problem of Soviet-American relations.

As is known, the past year has seen a certain decline in these relations. At the same time, it is clear that further progress in the policy of detente is made very difficult unless at least the minimum of trust and mutual understanding is maintained between the USSR and the United States. The experience of recent years has shown that important agreements and understandings can be arrived at and multifaceted mutually advantageous cooperation can be arranged only if both countries are guided by the principles of equality, mutual interest in the destiny of peace and noninterference

in internal affairs. If you look hard at the situation you are bound to see that the main reason for the subsequent stagnation in Soviet-American relations was the fact that Washington violated these principles by attempting to gain one-sided advantages to the detriment of the interests and security of the Soviet Union.

The tendency to depart from the understandings, based on acknowledgment of the principles of equality, identical security and nonuse of force, which were reached during the Soviet-American summit meeting in 1972 and subsequent years was observed in the United States during the 1976 presidential election campaign. As is known, this campaign was very heavily colored by anti-Sovietism and anticommunism. It is no secret that extreme rightwing and reactionary elements in U.S. ruling circles were particularly active during this period. These elements have always opposed detente and the course toward normalizing relations with the Soviet Union and they took advantage of the election campaign in order to put pressure on Washington. They were hoping if not to reverse the whole situation then at least to considerably inhibit the positive development of relations between the USSR and the United States. The weakness of President Ford's administration, which came to the White House under specific conditions brought about by the Watergate scandal which led to the forced resignation of President R. Nixon, undoubtedly had a part to play in this.

At the time the mass media launched a fierce campaign, clearly inspired by the Pentagon and a certain section of the academic circles, aimed at discrediting the Soviet Union's peace-loving policy and undermining detente. This campaign, which continued even after President J. Carter's administration was installed in January this year, unfolded in three basic directions.

First, the fabrication about the "colossus with feet of clay," which allegedly describes the Soviet Union, a fabrication which had repeatedly disintegrated ignominiously, was conjured up out of air. The idea was that all you had to do was to exert "pressure"--and Moscow would make the concessions that Washington wanted because the Soviet Union is allegedly experiencing great difficulties and is desperately interested in economic and scientific and technical ties with the West. Therefore, the United States should build up its military might to buttress its demands to the USSR.

The second direction amounted to an assertion that the Soviet Union poses a "threat" to the United States, that it has sharply increased its defense potential and is seeking to gain an advantage over the United States. And, for this reason, apparently, the United States is "compelled" to launch a new round of the arms race. As we can see, this version is in direct contradiction to the first propagandist direction. But this did not embarrass the organizers of the anti-Soviet campaign in the slightest since in both cases the aim was the same: to justify the unprecedented military budget and spur on the development of new weapons systems.

Finally, the third direction consisted of attempting to cast aspersions on the domestic systems in the Soviet Union, to discredit the socialist system, and to create preconditions for interference in the internal affairs of the socialist countries. It was precisely these objectives that were being pursued by the clamorous campaign about "the defense of human rights" on which leading Washington figures have taken a direct part. In some measure this campaign was regarded by the U.S. ruling circles as a means of making additional political capital within the country. But on the whole it poisoned the overall international atmosphere to no small degree and this could not fail to deal a blow to detente, too.

But in general the initiators of the campaign surrounding the problem of "human rights" thoroughly miscalculated in thinking that they would place the Soviet Union in a difficult situation. Soviet people have no reason to avoid discussing these questions. After all, one of the main goals of the October Revolution was precisely to guarantee human rights and freedoms. The new Constitution of the Soviet state which has been adopted and which entered into force on 7 October guarantees these rights for USSR citizens and, moreover, on a scale unknown to a bourgeois society. When these rights are being effected, only one condition has to be observed--that the interests of society and the state and the rights of other citizens should not be infringed. Scoffing at those critics of the Soviet way of life who attack this condition, and also the provision that the implementation of rights and freedoms is inseparable from citizens' fulfillment of their obligations, L. I. Brezhnev said: "...From the viewpoint of our class opponents, USSR citizens ought, evidently, to be granted one sole 'right'--to struggle against the Soviet state and against the socialist system, to the joy of imperialism. But we must disappoint such 'critics' of our Constitution: The Soviet people will never meet their wishes!" (Note 4), (PRAVDA, 5 October 1977)

Attempts to depict detente as a "one-way street" whereby the Soviet Union receives all the benefits, also continued. The authors of this myth displayed a diligence worthy of a better application. For over the last few years the people of many countries have been able to see convincingly with their own eyes the merits of detente, the chief result of which is that the danger of war has been reduced and the building of international relations on new, peace-loving principles has begun. The meaning of detente, which has brought everyone benefits, was revealed by L. I. Brezhnev in a speech which he delivered in Tula this January. "Detente," he said, "is above all the overcoming of the 'cold war' and the transition to normal equal relations among states. Detente is a readiness to resolve disagreements and disputes not by force, by threats or by saber rattling, but by peaceful means around the negotiating table. Detente is definite trust and an ability to come to terms with each other's legitimate interests." (Note 5), (PRAVDA, 19 January 1977)

It goes without saying that the appeals to exert "pressure" on the Soviet Union are senseless and attempts to act in such a manner are doomed to

failure. After all, if in past decades attempts of this kind have rebounded against their initiators, they are even more pointless today now that the USSR has become a modern great power and now that the mighty socialist community exists.

As far as arguments about the alleged Soviet "threat" is concerned, these arguments are just as senseless: It has been repeatedly stated most authoritatively by the Soviet side that our country has not attacked anyone and has no intention of attacking anyone. A law about the preservation of peace is in force in the Soviet Union and it has now been recorded in the new Constitution: "The USSR unswervingly pursues a Leninist policy of peace and advocates the strengthening of the security of the peoples and broad international cooperation." (Note 6), (PRAVDA, 8 October 1977) At the same time the Soviet Union will not allow anyone to dictate any particular set of terms to it. The Soviet country is prepared to have dealings with other countries and to reach agreement with them on specific problems solely on the basis of complete equality and the observance of the sides' interests.

Many Americans realize all this very well. During the hearings that were held this September in the U.S. House of Representatives on questions of Soviet-U.S. relations, the well-known U.S. scholar and diplomat G. Kennan admitted that the USSR "is clearly not seeking" a conflict with the United States and does not want the arms race. Former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union K. Hohler also expressed similar sentiments. I do not believe that the policy of detente gives one-sided advantages to the Soviet Union. This is a lengthy process and we must continue the course to improve relations between our countries."

But all the same, attempts are still being repeated to secure one-sided advantages over the USSR to the detriment of its security and national interests. It is precisely this that is the chief reason for the holdup in drawing up a new agreement--the so-called SALT-II.

After the signing in May 1972 of the interim agreement on certain measures regarding the limitation of strategic offensive arms, the Soviet Union and the United States succeeded, during lengthy and complex negotiations, in reaching an understanding on the basic parameters of a new, long-term agreement. This accord was consolidated at Vladivostok during a meeting between L. I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and G. Ford, then U.S. President. However, subsequently, the new Washington administration attempted to deviate from this accord. There is no need to detail here the course of subsequent events which led to the failure of the March visit to Moscow of U.S. Secretary of State Vance. It is worthwhile merely to recall that the essence of the proposals that Vance brought along amounted to an attempt to secure one-sided advantages although these proposals were presented as some sort of "new word" in disarmament. A. A. Gromyko had some apt words to say at the 32d Session of the General Assembly about "all-embracing" recipes for disarmament of this kind. He stressed that quite different objectives than the reaching of agreement are being pursued here.

"It seems that the calculations here go something like this: We put forward a proposal that we know is unacceptable to our partner and he rejects it; and we obtain a convenient opportunity first of all to make accusation against him and secondly, referring to this refusal, to carry out the kind of measures for building up armaments which without this camouflage would not look very seemly." (Note 7), (PRAVDA, 28 September 1977)

It is not fortuitous that just recently it has become known that new lethal types of weapons are being developed in the United States, in particular, the neutron bomb. These maneuvers are being opposed by the firm and principled stance of the Soviet Union which is seeking to secure real steps in arms limitation and disarmament and the prevention of the production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

The situation which has been created has aroused increasing concern in the United States, all the more so since it has not been possible to overcome the serious economic difficulties inside the country. The slight economic revival which has been seen since the beginning of 1977 has not resulted in any appreciable reduction of unemployment or in any substantial halt in the growth of inflation. In September NEWSWEEK noted that "fears were buttressed by a series of discouraging statistics that suggested that an economic slowdown has started." The optimism engendered by the alluring programs which the White House was recently advertising has been supplanted by confusion. "It's almost impossible to know what to do or what will work," NEWSWEEK writes, quoting one of President Carter's aides. "There's a real uneasiness among the political leaders--and I think the President shares it--that the people who are supposed to know where the economy is heading actually know nothing." (Note 8), (NEWSWEEK, 12 September 1977) All this is causing concern among broad circles of the American people. The public opinion polls carried out in the fall in the United States recorded a substantial drop in the new administration's prestige. According to this data, Carter's popularity has fallen sharply.

Speaking recently at the Californian Republican Party Convention, former U.S. President G. Ford declared that the Carter administration has been unable to curb inflation and is suffering setbacks in foreign policy. Carter's energy program, G. Ford continued, is ineffective by any standards. "We ought to criticize the activity of an administration which has broken 77 of its 612 election promises and which has not kept or has been unable to keep another 230 of them." However, it is by no means just a matter of ability or inability to work out an economic program. The trouble is that the continuing expenditure of tremendous resources in the United States on the arms race rules out the possibility of even starting on any serious measures to combat economic difficulties.

The voices of those who subscribe to the opinion that the country's objective interests urgently demand that resources be switched from the arms race, which by no means strengthens security but merely complicates the international situation, to solving domestic tasks--the struggle against

unemployment and inflation, the quest for ways of reducing the acuteness of energy, ecological and other problems--have been heard increasingly loudly in the United States recently. At the same time the social conflicts within the American system connected with the inequality and oppressed status of black Americans and the colored population and also of the millions of white poor have also been exacerbating. Practically nothing is being done to overcome the crisis in the cities or to improve education, public health and social security systems.

All this cannot help affecting foreign policy as well. However, the main factors and realities of the international situation have not changed lately. They still urgently dictate the need for all countries, including the United States, to avert nuclear war and to create a system of relations in the world arena which guarantees the security of all and favors the development of international cooperation.

The certain coolness in Soviet-American relations which has been observed lately has caused serious concern in the capitals of many West European countries. With the passage of time Washington has been increasingly criticized for its departure from the policy line pursued in the last few years of normalizing relations with the USSR.

Many people hoped that the positive course in foreign policy would be continued with the new administration's arrival in the White House and that the talks on preparing a new, long-term agreement on limiting strategic offensive armaments would make headway. This would also contribute to the further development of detente. Back during the election campaign J. Carter declared: "I approve of the concept of detente." (Note 9), (R. Turner, "I'll Never Lie to You," "Jimmy Carter in His Own Words," New York 1976, p 125). He assured people that he supported the continuity of the policy line of continuing the normalization of American-Soviet relations. However, a number of the new administration's foreign policy actions have subsequently resulted in a deterioration in the international climate and difficulties in the detente process.

The stagnation which has formed in Soviet-American relations has affected the practical links between the two countries somewhat less. Useful work in which many Soviet and American specialists are participating has continued here. However, many more complexities have begun to emerge on broad international issues and on the most important problems of bilateral relations.

Just recently Washington's leaders have again begun to stress the desirability of developing relations with the USSR. President Carter has also repeatedly spoken out in this spirit. This is finding a positive response in Moscow. As L. I. Brezhnev declared, if it is intended to translate remarks of this kind into the language of practical deeds, we will willingly seek mutually acceptable solutions. The Soviet side has repeatedly expressed its readiness to continue to develop mutually advantageous cooperation with the United States. But the efforts of only one side are not enough for this.

The trip by A. A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, to the 32d UN General Assembly Session made it possible to continue the business-like contacts between the USSR and the United States. The talks which A. A. Gromyko held in Washington were neither easy nor simple. Many hours of talks took place with U.S. Secretary of State C. Vance, and A. A. Gromyko twice met with President J. Carter. Assessing the results of the talks, A. A. Gromyko said that additional progress has been made--the divergences between the two sides' positions on issues relating to the conclusion of a strategic arms limitation agreement have lessened. "Both sides intend, firmly intend," the USSR foreign minister stressed, "to work toward the conclusion of a second agreement." (Note 10), (PRAVDA, 29 September 1977)

Specific arms limitation and disarmament issues were examined during the talks; a complete ban on nuclear weapons tests and nuclear nonproliferation; a ban on chemical weapons; a ban on new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction and particularly radiological weapons; and issues relating to the Indian Ocean. The great importance which the sides attach to real progress at the talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe was also stressed.

The results of the talks are reflected in the joint announcement which stresses the need for active efforts to find mutually acceptable solutions and which points out that the sides expressed a desire for the constructive and stable development of relations between them. As the joint announcement notes, the sides attach particular importance to the elaboration and implementation of further measures aimed at effectively preventing nuclear war, at arms limitation and at the transition of real disarmament.

The situation in the Near East was also examined. The joint Soviet-U.S. statement on the Near East notes in particular that "as cochairmen of the Geneva conference the USSR and United States confirm their intention, by joint efforts and acting in contact with all interested sides, to render every assistance for the work of the conference to be resumed no later than December 1977." (Note 11), (PRAVDA, 2 October 1977) Both sides voiced the opinion that the Palestinian question, including the insuring of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, should be insured within the framework of an all-embracing settlement of the Near East problems. In the same statement the Soviet Union and the United States have appealed to all sides to be aware of the need for a sober consideration of each other's legitimate rights and interests and to display mutual readiness to act appropriately.

The Soviet-U.S. Near East statement has given rise to great interest throughout the world. It has been assessed by many people as an admission of the fact that attempts at a one-sided solution of this complex problem have proved vain and a return to the initial procedure with the active participation of the two powers which are cochairmen of the Geneva conference opens the way to a practical solution of the Near East conflict.

Another joint Soviet-U.S. statement is devoted to questions of strategic arms limitation, to which a central place was allocated in the talks. The statement confirms the sides' determination to conclude a new agreement and speaks of their intention to continue active talks in order to complete work on this agreement in the near future. The USSR and the United States also rated positively the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems signed in Moscow in 1972 and the 1974 amendments to the treaty and pointed out that it serves the interests of the security of the two sides. In connection with the forthcoming review of the ABM treaty after it has been in operation for 5 years, the sides confirmed their adherence to this treaty. Alongside the joint statement, each side has made an identical statement with regard to its intention not to undertake any actions incompatible with the provisions of the interim agreement on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms, which expired on 3 October, or with the aims of the talks in progress on condition that the other side displays the same restraint.

The question of the possibilities of a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was touched on during A. A. Gromyko's meeting with President J. Carter. The President reaffirmed his desire to meet with L. I. Brezhnev. Both sides agreed that such a meeting requires preparation. In an interview on Soviet television A. A. Gromyko said that "it would be a good thing if such a meeting were indeed properly prepared and held. This would be a major step in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations and would have great significance for the cause of peace as a whole. (Note 12), (PRAVDA, 2 October 1977)

All these recent facts attest to the possibility of a positive new advance in Soviet-U.S. relations. Assessing the significance of the talks he had with U.S. leaders, A. A. Gromyko said: "It may be said that the two powers--the Soviet Union and the United States--have now emerged onto the road leading to an agreement." (Note 13), (Ibid).

The world press positively assesses the results of the exchange of opinions between the USSR and the United States. Commentators stress that an opportunity is now opening up for new steps in normalizing relations between the two largest powers of the present day and this in turn will have a favorable effect on the entire international situation. Opinion is being voiced that the United States is, as it were, withdrawing from the negative position it held in the recent past. France's LES ECHOS notes, for instance, that the changes in relations between Washington and Moscow "have been caused by President Carter's desire to restore his prestige after the failure of many diplomatic initiatives, the skirmishes in Congress, and Lance's retirement." (Note 14), (LES ECHOS, 28 September 1977) The London TIMES expresses itself in the same spirit, believing that "President Carter is acutely in need of a foreign policy success and would be glad to reach an agreement." (Note 15), (THE TIMES, 28 September 1977)

But a number of commentators glimpse deeper-lying reasons here. They believe that after an initial period of foreign policy "experiments" and the negative

experience it has acquired, the Carter administration is now inclined to take a more realistic position in international affairs. They point in this connection to President Carter's speech at the UN General Assembly session on 4 October, stressing the great significance of Soviet-U.S. relations. He expressed the idea that "in the nuclear era we can no longer see in war merely the continuation of diplomacy by different means." This is precisely what the Soviet side has frequently pointed out and which, briefly, comes down to the following formula: In the nuclear age there is no alternative to peaceful coexistence. But, having recognized this truth, it is essential to draw the logical conclusion from it with respect to the pointlessness of the further stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction. Consequently, effective steps should be taken for arms limitation and reduction and in the final analysis for total disarmament. International relations must be built on a totally new foundation, on the foundation of the nonuse of force and mutually advantageous cooperation among all states.

Speaking at the 2 November ceremonial session in the Kremlin devoted to the 60th anniversary of Great October, L. I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said: "Life itself demands that long-term considerations dictated by concern for peace should be the decisive ones in Soviet-U.S. relations. This is the line to which we adhere. We have no lack of readiness to continue the development begun in relations with the United States on the basis of equality and mutual respect.... We do not want to violate the approximate equilibrium of military forces which has now taken shape, for instance, between the East and West in central Europe or between the USSR and the United States. But in exchange we demand that no one else should try to violate it in their favor." (Note 16), (PRAVDA, 3 November 1977)

If the U.S. side displays a readiness to resume a constructive and realistic approach, this will benefit not only the USSR and the United States but also the peoples of all countries vitally interested in the consolidation and expansion of detente in the international arena.

CSO: 1803

PROBLEMS AND CONTRADICTIONS OF TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION IN UNITED STATES

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 19-29

[Article by V. I. Pavlyuchenko]

[Text] Contemporary American imperialism is making great efforts to adapt to the technological revolution and to use its achievements in its own interest. Until quite recently, bourgeois ideologists, economists, statesmen and businessmen were still associating the technological revolution with utopian hopes for the alleviation or even the elimination of the contradictions of capitalist society, the overcoming of the cyclical development of the economy and the stabilization of economic growth rates. Reality, however, conclusively refuted the hopes of the apologists for capitalism. "The promises to 'restore the health' of capitalism and establish a 'society of universal prosperity' within its framework," L. I. Brezhnev pointed out in the Accountability Report to the 25th Party Congress, "have obviously not been met."¹ As the technological revolution develops, the inconsistency between capitalist production relations and the requirements for the development of modern productive forces is revealed more and more. This revolution has not only failed to alleviate the old, traditional contradictions of capitalism, but has considerably intensified them and has simultaneously given rise to new contradictions, facing the capitalist economy with several difficult problems of recent origin.

The technological revolution in the United States is of a contradictory nature. It manifests two opposing tendencies that are characteristic of the development of productive forces in the capitalist society: on the one hand, a tendency toward progress and, on the other, toward deceleration--that is, toward depression. Among the capitalist nations, the United States occupies the leading position in the implementation of the technological revolution. It is ahead of the other highly developed capitalist countries in many important areas of scientific, technical and production development and exerts considerable influence on the world level of technological progress. In terms of expenditures on science, the number of scientists and engineers engaged in research and engineering, the number of patents issued, the cost of licenses sold and other indicators characterizing national technological potential, the United States is far ahead of the other capitalist countries. On the whole, it controls at least half of the technological resources in the capitalist world.

The United States has also been definitely successful in the utilization of technological potential: cases of the rapid materialization of scientific ideas in production and the speedy development of new products are frequent. Many scientific and technical discoveries are put into mass distribution earlier in the United States than in the countries responsible for these scientific discoveries or inventions. Scientific and technical progress in this nation is characterized by the rapid technical re-equipping of the basic economic sectors and the rapid distribution of new equipment, progressive technological processes and materials on a mass scale.

The position occupied by the United States in the realization of the technological revolution is the result of several specific economic, historical and other conditions governing the development of American capitalism. The present developmental level of productive forces and the colossal accumulations of national wealth permit the United States to spend enormous sums on research and engineering. In 1976, these expenditures reached 38.1 billion dollars, which accounted for 2.83 percent of national income. In absolute terms, this exceeds the amount spent in any other capitalist country by many times. The high degree of production concentration and the enormous sums at the disposal of the government permit the United States to provide the necessary economic resources for the incorporation of scientific and technical achievements in practice. The nation has accumulated abundant experience in the management of technological progress, which, in conjunction with existing resources, provides for high rates of development in several fields of science, technology and production.

When we make an objective assessment of the achievements of the United States, we cannot fail to also see the enormous obstacles and restrictions imposed on the technological revolution by capitalist production relations. This article has been written for the purpose of analyzing this problem.

In the United States, which has gone further than any other nation in carrying out the technological revolution, the contradictions between modern productive forces and capitalist production relations are particularly evident. Capitalist production relations slow down the technological revolution, restrict the use of its achievements and create an ever-widening gap between the possibilities afforded by the technological revolution for the resolution of socioeconomic problems in society and the practical application of its results. In the capitalist society, these can only be applied to the degree that they contribute to the acquisition of profits and frequently have negative social consequences or even extremely anti-humanitarian results (for example, the development of means of mass destruction); they are often used against the interests of the workers--that is, the overwhelming majority of the society's members.

The technological revolution is affected by the entire system of capitalist production relations and is negatively influenced by all of the most important contradictions of capitalism and, above all, the contradiction between the public nature of production and the private appropriation of its results, the contradiction between labor and capital. Modern scientific

and technical progress is conflicting more and more with the major goal of capitalist production, which is conducted for the sake of profits. In the 1970's, the lack of correspondence between the economic machinery of state-monopolistic capitalism and the requirements of the technological revolution became particularly obvious in the United States. Capitalist production relations make it impossible for science to become a direct productive force and impede its integration with production. Profound contradictions lie at the basis of the very motives for the integration of science with production in the capitalist society. The goal of capitalist production has been and remains the acquisition of profits. This goal has not changed during the course of the present technological revolution. The race for profits, the size of which is depending more and more on the use of scientific and technical achievements, compels capitalist firms to search for ways and methods of integrating science with production. Advantages in the competitive struggle are gained by the firms that are the first to incorporate scientific and technical achievements on a mass scale. At the same time, these firms strive to monopolize these achievements for the purpose of acquiring maximum profits and to keep them from their competitors as long as possible, thereby impeding the integration of science with production on the national scale. As soon as a monopoly comes into being, the stimuli for this kind of integration are substantially weakened. Monopoly, as V. I. Lenin conclusively proved, "inevitably gives rise to tendencies toward depression and stagnation. When monopoly prices are set, even if they are temporary, the motives for technical progress and, consequently, for any other kind of progress or advancement largely disappear; this then becomes an economic possibility for the artificial suppression of technical progress."²

Therefore, the contradictory nature of the integration of science with production in the capitalist economic system is manifested in the fact that the desire to acquire maximum profits and competition, on the one hand, contribute to the unification of science with production--on the level of individual companies--and, on the other, impede this process on the national level. While a relatively high degree of integration of science with production has been achieved in some units of the capitalist economy--firms and companies--there has not been and cannot be any complete, organic unification on the scale of the entire economy; they remain separate due to the antagonistic nature of capitalist production relations. The attempts at private appropriation of the results of scientific progress and at the utilization of these results for the sake of greater profit erect insurmountable barriers to the truly mass-scale embodiment of human intellectual achievements in social practice. In the capitalist economy, science and production remain just as separate as individual producers. In other words, the integration of science with production on the national scale is of a limited nature in the capitalist society.

The process by which science is integrated with production does not only consist in the establishment of science as an integral element of the production process, which is constructed on a scientific basis; the development of science itself becomes increasingly subordinate to the requirements

of production and, consequently, becomes part of the system of the economic relations regulating this production. The acquisition of profits, which is the main stimulus of capitalist economic transactions, has more and more influence on the selection of fields for technical research and engineering and for the assessment of the impact of innovations as the ties between science and production grow stronger. Science is drawn with increasing intensity into the sphere of influence of the market mechanism that regulates production. As a result, the market's influence on the choice of fields for research and design grows and the scales of this kind of developmental work become dependent on expected profits. In this process, scientific development becomes largely subordinate to current market conditions and does not depend on long-range social needs or the natural laws governing technological progress.

Even K. Marx demonstrated that the economic interests of capitalist producers had an excessively short time limit and, for this reason, they were guided by immediate goals in their decisions and actions. The expediency of a research or technical project is investigated by private firms from the standpoint of the possibility of acquiring maximum profits, and quickly. For this reason, industrial companies are interested above all in engineering projects that produce the speediest concrete and practical results, are less interested in applied research and are hardly interested at all in theoretical research, the expenditures on which are associated with great risks and the impact of which is uncertain and remote in time. This pragmatic approach to science and technology seriously impedes their development. It leads to imbalances and the inefficient distribution of resources among fields and stages of research, and fundamental research suffers the most. It is no coincidence that only 715 million dollars of the 16.55 billion dollars spent on research and engineering in industry in 1976, or only 4.3 percent, was spent on fundamental research. The proportional amount of expenditures on fundamental research in industry has decreased since 1953--at that time, it was 6 percent. Throughout the nation, expenditures on fundamental research rose from 9 percent of all expenditures on scientific research and engineering in 1953 to approximately 12.5 percent in 1976.³

N. Wiener, the founder of cybernetics, was already writing about the pernicious effects of near-sighted considerations of economic advantages on science: "In the business world, it is possible that they have become accustomed to the risk connected with lengthy operations, but this kind of risk is based on computations, and it is hardly likely that anything could be computed on such a small scale as the future benefits of a new idea.... We live in an era when profit considerations play such an exceptional role that everything else is submerged. The modern society (capitalist--V. P.) evaluates the cost of ideas in terms of dollars and cents, even though their value is much more lasting than the value of money. A discovery which might only produce something practical after 50 years has almost no chance of appearing profitable to those who must pay for the work needed to accomplish this."⁴

The fact that the bourgeois state, which ignored science until World War II, is now playing the deciding role in the determination and implementation of technological policy, the financing of research and the organization of large-scale scientific and technical projects attests to the inability of capitalist firms with their narrow pragmatic approach to ensure scientific progress. The criterion of maximum profits has turned out to be unsuitable for determining the areas and efficient proportions of scientific development.

The lack of correspondence between the market mechanism of economic regulation and the requirements of the technological revolution is apparent in the fact that many foreseeable and recognized social needs do not stimulate research and engineering for the purpose of satisfying these needs until market conditions result in price levels which will guarantee the pioneer firm the necessary profit level. The structure of market prices, however, represents a poor reflection, as we know, of future demand. For this reason, capitalist research and engineering projects which are supposed to anticipate future public demands are quite often too late; they are frequently only instituted as "emergence measures" when serious disproportions have already come into being in the economy. Even under these conditions, however, the market mechanism cannot always ensure a connection between research and engineering projects and public demands, and the capitalist state is forced to establish additional stimuli for scientific and technical progress.

For example, despite the fact that the rapidly approaching extremely serious energy difficulties were already apparent in the beginning of the 1960's, the work involved in the development of new methods of energy production, conversion and conservation was conducted on absolutely inadequate scales and was essentially only begun when the nation came into direct contact with a severe and prolonged energy crisis. The same is true of the work being done on environmental protection, public transport and several other problems.

The technological revolution ensured higher rates of production efficiency, intensification and economic growth. In the United States, these rates are much higher than they were prior to World War II. In 1947-1976, the average annual rate of production growth was 4.2 percent in industry and 1.7 percent in agriculture, while the respective figures for 1920-1940 were 2.65 percent and 0.85 percent. Labor productivity per man-hour rose by 2.45 percent a year in 1920-1940 and by 3.3 percent in 1950-1975.⁵ The national economy achieved enormous scales, but the technological revolution demanded, in addition to these grand dimensions, that it also be highly dynamic and capable of the timely and rapid rearrangement of structural proportions. The economic mechanism of state-monopolistic capitalism, however, was incapable of ensuring the necessary dynamism in the large-scale economy. The development of massive structural changes in the American economy is a complex and lengthy process which requires long-term investment programs, frequently covering a period of 10-15 years. This kind of lengthy period transcends the boundaries of the influence of the economic mechanism of contemporary state-monopolistic capitalism, which is limited by the relatively short-range interest of

private enterprise. For this reason, the structural crises in the American economy are not spontaneous; they are objectively determined by the developmental dialectics of social production in the modern capitalist society.

By increasing the dynamic nature of the development of productive forces in society, the technological revolution causes even greater instability in the capitalist economy, results in constant severe violations of the proportions of economic development, leads to destabilization and gives rise to structural crises. The market mechanism, the lack of planning and the largely retrospective system of economic regulation correspond less and less to the requirements of the technological revolution.

The development of the technological revolution in the United States has been connected with a colossal waste of public resources. The most significant form of this kind of wastefulness is represented by the militarization of science and the use of most scientific achievements for military purposes. Of the 273.4 billion dollars spent on scientific research and engineering in the United States during 1966-1975, more than 85.9 billion, or more than 31 percent, was spent on military purposes: the development of increasingly powerful means of mass destruction and new types of strategic and traditional weapons systems.⁶ The enormous "worthless"--from the standpoint of the satisfaction of public needs--expenditures on the militarization of science manifest the aggressive essence of contemporary American imperialism with particular clarity. Scientific achievements in the United States are primarily placed at the service of the arms race. During the last few years alone, the United States has spent many billions of dollars on the development of a new deadly weapon--the neutron bomb--as well as cassette nuclear warheads, winged missiles and the B-1 strategic bomber.

Although some of the scientific achievements obtained during the process of defense research are later used for peaceful purposes and produce certain socially useful results, this far from compensates for the sums invested in this research and does not make these expenditures efficient from the social standpoint. "There can be no doubt," Edwin Mansfield writes in this connection, "that we could obtain these benefits at a lower cost and with greater certainty if the resources were directly allocated for civil purposes."⁷

Wastefulness, which is by and large one of the main features of the capitalist economy, is also apparent in the simultaneous conduct of scientific research and technical engineering by different firms, in the too frequent and far from always economically justified replacement of old products with new models and, finally, in the underloading of established production capacities. At present, we know that the production equipment of American industry is underutilized by approximately one-fifth of its full capacity.

The halting of operations on the development of new equipment or even the withdrawal of recently perfected commodities from production due to competition, changes in market conditions or unforeseen setbacks in business activity are a common occurrence in American business practices. During the first

half of the 1970's, up to 80 percent of all new commodities were withdrawn from production in some branches of U.S. industry.

Therefore, on the one hand, huge amounts of economic resources are spent unproductively on research, engineering and the technical re-equipping of production while, on the other, the possibilities of scientific and technical progress are not used effectively. Wastefulness is apparent along the entire chain of the reproduction process--from research to the application of research results in production. Considering the limited nature of public resources and the enormous scales achieved by wastefulness in the United States during the development of the technological revolution, we must admit that this is one of the crucial factors that is considerably decelerating the technological revolution and inhibiting production efficiency and economic growth.

As the technological revolution develops, the contradictions in the American economy grow. As we know, K. Marx demonstrated that capitalism impedes the development of science and technology in general. One of the main causes of this consists in the restricted economic framework for the application of new equipment, which is not determined by a savings in all public labor, but only by a savings in the labor paid for by the capitalist. At a time of technological revolution, the area within which new equipment is effective from the vantage point of capitalist producers becomes even narrower. Several factors contribute to this process.

In the first place, the incorporation of scientific and technical achievements, particularly in fundamentally new areas, is usually connected with considerable risk, which results from the indeterminacy of future expenditures of economic resources and time and of the dimensions of the expected impact--an indeterminacy which is objectively inherent in scientific and technical progress. In the capitalist economy, this is accompanied by the indeterminacy arising from competition and the instability of market conditions. Consequently, capitalist production relations considerably augment the indeterminacy of the effective incorporation of scientific and technical achievements. In view of the fact that the completion of research projects, the development of new equipment and the incorporation of this equipment in the production process--equipment which rapidly becomes more complex--require larger and larger expenditures, the question of their recovery in the future becomes one of the important factors restricting the development of science at the expense of private firms as well as the use of new discoveries in practice. "Many producers," wrote BUSINESS WEEK in this connection, "are beginning to admit that the expenditures on innovations and the associated risk are becoming too great to be taken on by any company."⁸

In the second place, equipment is becoming obsolete more quickly and, consequently, the time limits on its effective use are more restricted. At the same time, the growing complexity of equipment is prolonging the research and engineering process. As a result, the period during which the producer and user of the new equipment can profit from its use is shorter than before.

This makes it difficult for firms to acquire the full economic impact of new equipment. The intensification of competition is also working in the same direction. "In comparison to the situation a few years ago," BUSINESS WEEK points out, "new equipment takes longer to develop and test, less new items reach the market, and those which do manage to reach it must often recoup the expenditures on their development much more quickly than in the past--sometimes in only one-third or one-half of the time.... Due to fierce competition in the market, the life span of many types of commodities is now 40-60 percent shorter than it was 10 years ago."⁹

In the third place, the results of scientific and technical development are becoming more apparent on the national scale, and not in the form of local impact, which guarantees profits for the producers of the new equipment. It is precisely for this reason that the following economic paradox can be seen in the United States. When reference is made to science's contribution to economic growth and greater production efficiency on the scale of the entire nation or large economic sectors, American researchers state that science produces enormous results, with a much higher yield than expenditures in other spheres of economic activity. In industry, expenditures on research and engineering provide for an average of 30 percent of annual profits--approximately double the profits from capital investments. According to the most conservative estimates, scientific and technical progress provides for at least one-third of the increase in the gross national product. A dollar spent on science has four times as much influence on economic growth as a dollar in investments.¹⁰

At the same time, American firms, according to many accounts in the press, are not allocating enough funds for the development of science and technology, there is less interest in research and engineering and the heads of corporations are becoming more indifferent to the introduction of innovations. To a certain extent, this is connected with the fact that, although the use of scientific and technical achievements on the national scale produces substantial economic results, it is more difficult for the individual businessmen taking part in their development and incorporation to acquire profits. The very nature of technological revolution is alien to the spirit of private appropriation and represents the denial of this spirit.

In the fourth place, scientific and technical progress is being impeded by the high degree of monopolization of its achievements. As we know, new equipment is incorporated in the capitalist society when it contributes to the growth of profits. Under these conditions, monopolistic levels of high profits acquired by the largest firms objectively serve as one of the most significant obstacles to the incorporation of new equipment. This equipment must ensure supermonopolistic profits; in other words, equipment which is effective from the standpoint of national production but which does not ensure a monopolistic level of profits will not be incorporated by the largest companies (in our opinion, this is precisely the reason why several technical innovations have been more likely to be incorporated by small and medium-sized firms).

The total effect of all of these factors gives rise to a contradiction between the growing possibilities for the use of scientific and technical achievements to increase production efficiency and the relatively narrow limits of their effectiveness from the standpoint of the interests of private appropriation.

At a time of technological revolution, as has already been pointed out, the complexity of research and all of the work involved in the development and mastery of new equipment increases rapidly and, consequently, the cost of all these operations rises dramatically. As a result, the resources of even the largest corporations, not to mention medium-sized and small firms, turn out to be inadequate for the financing of scientific research and experimental design work on the required scale and, in particular, the incorporation of new equipment in many important areas of scientific and technical development. As we know, the incorporation of production innovations costs much more than their development. The fact that the concentration of research and engineering is much higher in industry than production itself indicates that the successful incorporation of innovations in practice requires much more economic power than the effective organization of production. Because of this, industrial firms only take on research and engineering projects which they hope to incorporate in production.

A similar situation arises in the area of capital construction, which is frequently an essential concluding stage in the incorporation of innovations. For example, a modern full-cycle metallurgical plant can only operate efficiently if it produces at least 2.5 million tons of steel a year. According to FORTUNE Magazine, not one American steel company has the funds required to build this kind of plant.¹¹

Therefore, the technological revolution conflicts with the practice of capitalist accumulation and reveals its limitations and its lack of correspondence to the need for scientific and technical development and the technical re-equipping of production. The decelerating effect of this conflict on the technological revolution became particularly apparent at the end of the 1960's and the beginning of the 1970's. Many capitalist firms have virtually adhered to their previous level of expenditures on scientific and technical operations because they have had to deal with the limited supplies of resources, the growing difficulties connected with the development of equipment which rapidly increases in complexity and fierce competition in the sales market. Their behavior displays a quite obvious tendency to "squeeze" as much as possible out of existing products and technology and a reluctance to take risks by investing funds in the development and incorporation of new commodities. The goals of research have changed in the technological policies of many companies. The usual assumption has been that the cost of research will be recouped by means of the development of new types of commodities and technological processes. Now, however, 44 percent of all industrial firms regard the improvement of existing commodities as the main goal of their research projects. This has resulted in an obvious decrease in the number of new commodities developed. In 1976, new products accounted for only 13 percent of total sales in industry, while the figure in 1975 was 18 percent.¹²

Underinvestment in scientific and technical progress is becoming chronic. From 1967 through 1975, federal expenditures on research and engineering (in constant prices) decreased by 3 percent a year, while expenditures from other sources only increased by 1.8 percent a year (during 1953-1961 the average annual rates of increase in these expenditures were 13.9 and 7.7 percent, while the figures for the 1961-1967 period were 5.6 and 7.4 percent). The resulting potential losses in the gross national product for the next 10 years have been estimated at 100 billion dollars.¹³

The problems and contradictions of the technological revolution in the United States are apparent throughout the entire process of reproduction. The inability of American capitalism to adapt to the requirements of the technological revolution has become an important factor determining the critical state of the American economy during the first half of the 1970's and the increased instability of its development. Despite the greater opportunities for higher levels of production efficiency and, consequently, higher rates of economic growth provided by the technological revolution, there is an obvious process of deceleration in the United States. For example, the absolute increase in national income (in constant 1972 prices) was 160.4 billion dollars during 1960-1965 (an average annual rate of increase of 4.85 percent), 115.6 billion during 1965-1970 (2.85 percent) and 73 billion during 1970-1975 (1.6 percent).¹⁴ This tendency attests to the fact that factors impeding the development of science, technology and production are gaining influence in the contemporary American economy.

The potential impact of scientific and technical progress cannot be fully realized, particularly because of the chronic underloading of production capacities in the main sectors of the U.S. economy. Structural disparities--the existence of many production areas and enterprises with a low level of technical equipment and the profoundly unequal distribution of innovations in the economy--also work in this direction. For example, according to the estimates of the U.S. Department of Commerce, only 10 percent of all American firms make complete use of the nation's existing technical achievements in their sphere of operations. Calculations have indicated that, if the remaining 90 percent of the firms were to make effective use of the advantages of these known and tested innovations, labor productivity would at least tripled in the U.S. processing industry.¹⁵

One of the clearest signs of the further intensification of socioeconomic conflicts in the massive capitalist economy, which is developing under the influence of the technological revolution, was the birth of several long-term crises in the United States, such as the energy, raw material and ecological crises. Long-term crises in the key areas of the American economy have become an important factor impeding the growth rate of American economic efficiency in the 1970's. The United States has been forced to spend increasing sums to overcome the negative consequences of technological revolution in the capitalist economic system. In terms of the degree to which such crises and, for example, the energy and ecological crises have affected the nation's economy, the scales of this influence and the amount of the resulting damage, these crises are just as severe or, perhaps, even

more severe than the worst post-war crisis of overproduction in 1973-1975. For example, just the measurable losses incurred by the American economy as a result of the ecological crisis amount to approximately 30 billion dollars a year, while the losses arising from the energy crisis are estimated at tens of billions of dollars. Total expenditures in the American economy for the purpose of overcoming the energy crisis have been set at approximately 800 billion dollars and it will take at least 15-20 years to solve this problem.

The entire process of technological revolution in the United States conclusively demonstrates that it unconditionally requires a higher level of production collectivization than the current level or the possible level in the capitalist society. The objective tendency toward greater collectivization can be seen in the United States in the increased monopolization of research, engineering and the implementation of their results. It is quite indicative that this tendency is strongest in the most progressive areas, such as chemistry, the electronics industry and some of the more important branches of engineering, where the highest achievements of scientific and technical progress are implemented. As the most important areas of scientific and technical development are monopolized to a greater extent, however, further improvement is inhibited. In other words, the conflict between the technological revolution and the capitalist production relations impeding this revolution are reproduced on a new, higher level.

The working masses, as we know, represent the main impetus for technological revolution. Even in the recent past, the apologists of capitalism were widely propagandizing the myth that the technological revolution could supposedly guarantee universal prosperity within the capitalist framework, solve the basic social problems in society and even achieve harmony between labor and capital by establishing a "class peace." The events of recent years, particularly the crisis of 1973-1975, proved conclusively that capitalism is not capable of using the opportunities provided by the technological revolution in the interests of the workers. The New Program of the Communist Party of the United States states: "The assertions alleging that the main segments of the working class will be able to reduce the consequences of exploitation to a minimum as a result of higher wages and greater abundance are not consistent with reality. On the contrary...the continuation of technical progress is accompanied by more intensive exploitation and greater economic uncertainty about tomorrow. And this is not only true of the workers receiving the lowest wages, but also those with higher salaries.... The working class is also encountering a multitude of new problems arising from the process of production automation."¹⁶ At this time of technological revolution, which contributes to the colossal growth of productive forces, there is a high level of chronic unemployment in the United States, many social problems remain unsolved and often become more acute, inflation grows and economic instability increases.

Although American imperialism is incapable of using the achievements of the technological revolution to solve the most urgent problems facing the workers, it is energetically and extensively using them in the class interests of the

bourgeoisie, for the purpose of more intensive exploitation, higher profits and the redistribution of income in favor of the ruling class.

The capitalist utilization of technological achievements not only causes workers to lose interest in the technological revolution but also forces them in some cases to resist the incorporation of new equipment. For example, the use of some types of labor-saving equipment meets with a negative response from workers and unions, since this reduces employment and, consequently, increases unemployment. The American working class actively opposes the intensification of labor and favors the improvement of working conditions. The campaign being waged by the most varied segments of American society to prevent the negative social consequences of the technological revolution is acquiring greater scope. The conflicts between labor and capital in regard to the technological revolution and the utilization of its results and the fact that scientific and technical development in the capitalist society is used to the detriment of the workers--the main productive force in society--impose serious limitations on the technological revolution.

The augmentation and intensification of the contradictions of capitalism during the course of the technological revolution, naturally, do not signify the automatic collapse of the last exploitative society. The capitalist state and the monopolies are attempting to modify the economic mechanism and to introduce some elements of planning into this system. The many obstacles to scientific and technical progress arising from private capitalist economic operations are forcing the bourgeois state to search for new methods of economic stimulation. During the last 15-20 years, measures directed toward scientific development and the use of its results in practice have occupied an increasingly important place in the system of state-monopolistic regulation in the American economy. In some cases, the state has been able to achieve certain positive results in the implementation of individual scientific programs, such as, for example, the Apollo Project and the development of some new types of equipment. This suggests that state-monopolistic regulation has definite reserves for the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. State regulation, however, is conducted within the framework of capitalist production relations and it is precisely these that impose restrictions on the development of science and technology. Besides this, the very system of state-monopolistic regulation of scientific and technical progress is connected with great difficulties arising from departmental barriers, the conflicting interests of private companies, a multitude of bureaucratic obstacles and so forth.

The progress of the technological revolution in the United States demonstrates the futility of contemporary capitalism's attempts to adapt to its requirements. As national productive forces reach higher levels and embody the achievements of the technological revolution to a greater extent, the restrictive framework of the capitalist economic system and its resistance to progress become more obvious. The development of the technological revolution in the United States is being accompanied by the further intensification of the contradictions between productive forces and production relations in

the capitalist society and the disclosure of capitalism's inability to make full use of the potential possibilities of scientific and technical development and to place them at the service of the workers.

An analysis of the problems and contradictions of the technological revolution in the United States attests to the fact that freeing the means of production from the restrictions imposed by the capitalist method of production "is the only preliminary condition for the continuous and constantly accelerated development of productive forces and, consequently, the virtually unlimited growth of production itself."¹⁷ It confirms the truth of the conclusion drawn by the 25th CPSU Congress--that "the technological revolution can only take the correct direction, in the interests of the individual and society, under socialist conditions."¹⁸

FOOTNOTES

1. "Materialy XXV s"yezda KPSS" [Materials of the 25th CPSU Congress], Moscow, 1976, p 28.
2. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 27, p 397.
3. "National Patterns of R and D Resources," NSF 76-310, pp 28-29.
4. N. Wiener, "I Am a Mathematician," Moscow, 1967, p 345.
5. Calculated according to: "The Handbook of Basic Economic Statistics," April 1977, pp 72-73, 84, 91; "Statistical Abstract of the US," 1975, p 358; 1976, p 371.
6. Calculated according to: "Statistical Abstract of the US," 1975, p 546.
7. E. Mansfield, "The Economics of Technological Change," N. Y., 1968, p 228.
8. BUSINESS WEEK, 16 February 1976, p 65.
9. Ibid., p 57.
10. Ibid., 8 March 1976, p 90.
11. FORTUNE, January 1976, p 194.
12. "Technology and Economic Growth," Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Economic Growth of the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, Wash., 1976, p 55.
13. BUSINESS WEEK, 8 March 1976, p 90.

14. Calculated according to: SURVEY OF CURRENT BUSINESS, pt II, January 1976, pp 12-13; August 1976, p 6.
15. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 19 April 1976, p 2118.
16. SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA, No 12, 1970, pp 71-72.
17. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 20, p 294.
18. "Materialy XXV s"yezda KPSS," p 47.

8588

CSO: 1803

COOPERATION WITH CANADA: POTENTIALITIES AND PROSPECTS

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 30-42

[Article by L. A. Bagramov and V. B. Povolotskiy]

[Text] In defending and implementing the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different socioeconomic structures, the Soviet State has always interpreted this principle as not only the refusal to settle conflicts by military means, but also as egalitarian and mutually beneficial economic cooperation, reflecting the "imperative necessity" and objective need for worldwide economic relations.

This objective need has never been as apparent as it is in our time--a time of constant expansion of the international positions of socialism, the accelerated internationalization of economic life and unprecedented scientific and technical progress. Today, nations whose foreign economic activity has almost never taken place outside of the world capitalist market until recently have begun active cooperation with socialism. Canada is one of these.

In recent years, Soviet-Canadian economic and political relations have become much more active. Their volume has grown, the sphere of bilateral economic cooperation has become broader and new forms of cooperation have been practiced. The two nations have progressed from ordinary, frequently episodic commercial transactions to planned, large-scale economic cooperation on a long-term basis. In his Accountability Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 25th Party Congress, L. I. Brezhnev said: "Our relations with Canada are becoming richer in content; we feel that the prospects for these relations are not bad."¹

Objective Prerequisites

Today Canada is a highly developed industrial nation with a prominent position in the world economy. It has the sixth highest gross national product (190 billion dollars in 1976 in current prices; 118 billion in 1971 prices) in the capitalist world and, judging by forecasts, will outdistance England

within the near future as a result of its relatively high rate of economic growth. Canada is one of the leading Western nations in terms of labor productivity and the technical level of production. The latest methods for the management of capitalist economic operations and the automation of production processes and the newest electronic computer equipment are being widely used in Canada. In several branches, Canadian equipment is the most advanced in the capitalist world--its equipment for the lumber, wood-processing and pulp and paper industries, for the asbestos industry and some subbranches of nonferrous metallurgy, the equipment for construction and farming operations in the North, its nuclear reactors powered by unconcentrated uranium and its quicker-takeoff and landing aircraft. Canada has the seventh highest export volume in the capitalist world. Foreign trade plays a much more important role in the Canadian economy than in the U.S. economy. With its highly developed agriculture, Canada is the world's second largest (after the United States) exporter of grain, accounting for 20-25 percent of world wheat exports.

The high technical level of Canadian production, the nation's considerable export potential and its import requirements constitute objective economic prerequisites for its commercial, economic, scientific and technical cooperation with our country.

In turn, the Soviet Union with its economy which is rapidly developing according to plan, its gigantic domestic market and demand for various types of machinery and equipment, its highly developed multisectorial industry and its strong technological potential is a natural economic partner for Canada. As speakers at the 25th CPSU Congress stressed, the USSR is striving to take advantage of international division of labor for the successful resolution of economic problems, the elevation of production efficiency levels, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the resolution of global problems concerning the interests of all mankind. According to the Tenth Five-Year Plan (1976-1980), our nation's foreign trade turnover is to increase by 30-35 percent.

It is obvious that cooperation with the USSR can only contribute to the achievement of certain objectives proclaimed by the Canadian Government, such as the stimulation of economic growth, improvement in the "quality of life" and the guarantee of a harmonious environment.

The fact that the USSR and Canada belong to different social systems does not in any way inhibit their cooperation. The statements made by some bourgeois individuals to the effect that the Soviet Union is supposedly striving to gain one-sided advantages from cooperation with the West are unimportant and far-fetched. Experience has shown that prolonged large-scale relations with the USSR do not only give the Western nations commercial benefits, but also aid in stabilizing their economy, increasing the operational workload of enterprises and raising employment levels, and this is quite important for Canada, where production periodically experiences critical slumps and more than 8 percent of the labor force is now unemployed.

Usually, when reference is made to the objective economic prerequisites for cooperation between certain nations, attention is focused on the differences in the sectorial structures of their national economy, on the degree to which their economies are intersupplementary and on the ability of one partner to produce goods needed by the other partner. There is no doubt that the USSR and Canada can supplement one another economically to a certain extent. For certain reasons, each of these nations does not produce some of the goods it needs and these can be provided by the other nation. Canada makes great demands in the world market for various types of machinery and equipment (they constitute more than half of all Canadian imports), demands which could be largely satisfied by the Soviet Union. In turn, our nation could purchase many of the types of equipment and machinery produced by Canada.

But the future possibilities of Soviet-Canadian cooperation lie not so much in their differences as in the similarity of the sectorial structure of their economies, largely reflecting the similarity of their natural and geographic conditions. Their enormous territories in the North, which are remote, difficult of access and sparsely populated, their abundant supplies of minerals and hydraulic energy resources, their huge commercial timber areas, their vast prairies used for the cultivation of wheat and for livestock breeding, the seas and oceans bordering the USSR and Canada for thousands of kilometers, their great distances and lengthy transport and communication lines--all of these present both nations with common technical and economic problems calling for similar solutions--naturally, modified according to the differences in their social systems. These factors present opportunities for economically expedient division of labor, the exchange of positive economic experience, the development of industrial specialization and cooperation, joint construction projects on Canadian and Soviet territory, as well as the territory of other nations, and joint scientific and technical projects. It is precisely these forms of economic, scientific and technical relations, higher forms than ordinary trade, that will probably become the major types of cooperation between these two countries in the future. During the course of this cooperation, commodity exchange will also be expanded, but not only and not so much on a traditional commercial basis as on the basis of coordinated production activity.

The promising areas for cooperation include the exploration of the North and other regions difficult of access; agriculture; the oil and gas industry, including the transport of oil and gas; the chemical and petrochemical industry; mining; ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy; power engineering, particularly the construction of hydroelectric stations and nuclear power engineering; the lumber, wood-processing and pulp and paper industries; industrial and civil construction, including construction in permafrost regions; transportation and communications and the transmission of electric power over long distances; fishing and the fish industry; environmental protection.

Both sides have accumulated a great deal of experience and achievements in all of these areas and these can be exchanged with mutual benefit. Canada's scientific and technical achievements include the methods and means of geophysical operations, the technology for drilling oil and gas wells with ice platforms, the cooling of natural gas for its transport in permafrost regions, the technology for deriving oil from bituminous sand, the development of a heavy-water nuclear reactor operating on crude uranium, farming methods in regions with insufficient humidity, the methods for the accelerated breeding of valuable species of fish, logging operations with the use of combines, the development of transportation means that do not require roads (four-wheel drive vehicles and motor-driven sleighs), and the installation of long-distance high-tension power transmission lines.

In turn, Canada has displayed great interest in the economic, scientific and technical achievements of the USSR. For example, in the area of the exploration of the northern territories, it is interested in our technology for the construction of railroads and large main pipelines, buildings and installations on permafrost foundations, and ice cutters, the technology for the exploration of northern waterways, open-pit mining methods, outdoor vegetable cultivation, reindeer breeding, fur breeding, etc. "Your achievements here, under conditions of unfavorable...climate and permafrost, represent one of the modern wonders of the world, and one which serves as a model of life in the Arctic for all other nations"²--this was how Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau expressed his impressions of Noril'sk at the time of his visit to the USSR in May 1971.

The geographic locations of the USSR and Canada present extremely favorable opportunities for cooperation between the Soviet Far East and the Canadian Pacific region. Here the exchange of experience and cooperation could be organized in the large-scale development of coal, iron ore and other deposits under permafrost conditions, joint studies of the ocean and coastal shelf, joint participation with other Pacific nations in the regulation of fishing and the reproduction of fish resources, and environmental protection measures. The possibility of instituting more flexible forms of trade relations between the Pacific regions of the USSR and Canada also deserves consideration (on the model of our coastal trade with Japan).

The objective prerequisites also exist for cooperation in the area of fundamental and applied research. Without having sufficient material and personnel potentials for research in all areas of fundamental and applied science, Canada has still been quite successful in several of these fields--nuclear physics, physical chemistry, astronomy and astrophysics, the investigation of the upper atmosphere, geology and geophysics, geodesy, aerial photography and cartography, computer technology, laser technology, medicine, molecular biology, fresh-water biology, and the genetics and selection of grain crops.

At the same time, the Canadians realize that Canada's opportunities in the area of fundamental research are limited by its restricted national resources. This creates interest in cooperation with other countries. The report of the

Senate Special Committee on Science Policy states: "Canada should not act alone in carrying out any kind of large-scale project in the area of fundamental research, since this would require too much scientific and technical effort. We propose, therefore, that Canada...consider the possibility of joint programs in the major sciences."³

Naturally, the economic prerequisites for cooperation can only be implemented in a favorable political atmosphere. In this connection, we should remember that Soviet-Canadian economic relations were essentially brought to a standstill during the first postwar years by the beginning of the cold war. Canada actively supported the embargo on trade with the socialist nations and the extensive list of goods issued by the NATO Coordinating Committee, prohibiting the export of these goods to the socialist nations. By the mid-1950's, a more sober approach to interrelations with our nation began to gain ground in Canada. In February 1956, the first Soviet-Canadian trade agreement was signed in Ottawa; this still represents the basic legal document regulating the general commercial and political conditions of commodity exchange. In accordance with this agreement, the USSR and Canada granted one another most favored nation terms in trade, transit shipments and commercial shipping--a fact of extreme importance when we consider that the United States still refuses to grant us these terms.

The year of 1971, when Chairman A. N. Kosygin of the USSR Council of Ministers and Canadian Prime Minister P. E. Trudeau exchanged visits, represented an important milestone in the history of Soviet-Canadian relations. Their constructive talks and the agreements concluded at that time laid a firm foundation for the successful development of relations based on the principles of peaceful coexistence and for deeper and more extensive mutually beneficial cooperation in various fields. The two sides stressed the fact that any problems in relations between countries with different social structures should be solved by means of negotiations and that the thorough development of relations is in the national interest of the Soviet and Canadian people, promotes the relaxation of international tension and safeguards world peace.

Since 1971, the USSR and Canada have concluded several intergovernmental agreements, including an agreement on cooperation in the use of scientific and technical achievements in industry, the Protocol on Consultations and a general exchange agreement and, in July 1976, a long-term agreement on the promotion of economic, industrial, scientific and technical cooperation was signed,⁴ which, as L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, corresponds completely to the letter and spirit of the Final Act of Helsinki. In accordance with this agreement, a joint Soviet-Canadian commission was set up to manage the development of commercial, economic, industrial, scientific and technical cooperation.

Economic cooperation can now rest on a solid general political, legal-contractual and organizational basis which provides for the development of bilateral economic ties in the most diverse fields and forms--from ordinary trade to higher, more complex forms of cooperation. The Canadian Government's

desire to develop commercial and economic relations with the USSR is attested to by the 500 million Canadian dollars in credit granted to us by Ottawa to finance Soviet imports of Canadian machinery and equipment.

Canada's policy of diversifying its foreign economic ties is also of great significance for cooperation. The purpose of this policy is to reduce the nation's dependence on the United States by developing relations with all regions in the world and creating a "counterbalance" to the influence of Canada's southern neighbor. As P. Trudeau announced, "Canada needs new friends and trade partners so that it can establish its independence."

As early as 1970, the first comprehensive document expressing the Trudeau Government's foreign policy precisely formulated this government's intention to expand Canadian foreign trade relations in every way possible beyond the boundaries of the North American continent. Two years later, in an article which can be regarded as the official Canadian platform in regard to relations with the United States, M. Sharp, who was then the Canadian secretary of state for external affairs, opposed any kind of course which would directly or indirectly promote Canada's even closer convergence with the United States, and favored the diversification of Canadian foreign trade, which would permit Canada to "make relative advances, which, in time, could reduce Canada's dependence on one market and, in the broader sense, could reduce the vulnerability of the Canadian economy as such."⁵

Development of Trade

Trade now occupies the central position in Soviet-Canadian economic relations. During the 20 years after the conclusion of the first trade agreement (1956-1976), commodity turnover rose from 24 million rubles to 541 million--by 22 times (see table). The structure of commodity turnover was improved. The USSR began to export modern types of machinery and technical commodities to Canada, including machine tools, tractors and turbines. Deliveries of machinery and equipment also increased dramatically in our imports from Canada.

It should be emphasized, however, that the lion's share of the commodity turnover is still made up of our purchases of grain and flour. This signifies a considerable disparity in the trade balance in favor of Canada. During 1963-1976, the USSR's total deficit in trade with Canada was 2.8 billion rubles and the ratio between our exports and imports was 1:12.5 (exports--244 million rubles, imports--3.058 million). In view of the fact that the USSR always purchases certain quantities of grain from Canada--regardless of the scales of its domestic production⁶--the problem of eradicating this disparity in the trade balance by means of the expansion of Soviet exports acquires particular significance.

What is Canada's place and role in our foreign trade? In the USSR's total foreign trade turnover for 1967-1976, Canada accounted for 0.75 percent; 1.38 percent in imports and 0.14 percent in exports. During the same period, Canada accounted for 2.77 percent in Soviet trade with the developed capitalist states--4.53 percent in imports and 0.57 percent in exports. In the

group of the 24 developed capitalist states representing the USSR's trade partners, Canada occupied the 10th place in terms of commodity turnover in 1976 (after the FRG, the United States, Japan, Finland, Italy, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Belgium), the 7th place in imports and only the 19th place in exports--that is, one of the last places, behind not only all of the large trading powers in the West, but also such nations as Austria, Denmark, Greece and Norway. These comparisons suggest that the scales and degree of the development of our trade with Canada far from correspond to the scales and degree of the development of both nations' economies and the existing requirements and opportunities for the expansion of commodity exchange between the two countries.

Dynamics of Trade (Average Annual Data for 3-Year Periods),
In Millions of Rubles, 1961 Prices

(1) Годы	Экспорт СССР	(3) Импорт СССР из Канады		(4) Оборот	
	(2) в Канаду	(5) весь	(6) без зерновых	(5) весь	(6) без зерновых
1956—1958	2,6	17,6	1,6	20,2	4,2
1959—1961	4,2	21,2	8,5	25,4	12,7
1962—1964	3,4	150,5	3,8	153,9	7,2
1965—1967	15,2	222,1	7,0	237,3	22,2
1968—1970	11,9	87,0	6,8	98,9	18,7
1971—1973	17,3	220,5	9,8	237,8	27,1
1974—1976	34,2	840,2	40,8	374,4	75,0
1974	28,9	82,1	6,5	111,0	35,4
1975	31,9	439,3	57,4	471,2	89,3
1976	41,9	499,3	58,4	541,2	100,3

Key:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Years | 4. Turnover |
| 2. Soviet exports to Canada | 5. Total |
| 3. Soviet imports from Canada | 6. Excluding grain |



Calculated according to: "Soviet Foreign Trade. Statistical Review" for the different years.

Until the 1970's, basic Soviet exports to Canada were raw materials, semi-manufactured products and some consumer goods. The major exports were cotton fiber, fabric, furs, pelts, goods for cultural and general use, plywood, wood-fiber sheet and splint slab, and ore. Machinery and equipment occupied an insignificant place.

An important role in the development of our exports and in positive changes in their structure was played by the establishment of several Soviet-Canadian joint stock companies. At present, four such companies are operating in Canada: Belarus Equipment of Canada (for the sale of Soviet tractors and other agricultural equipment), Stan-Canada Machinery (for the sale of machine tools and forging and pressing equipment), Electrical Machinery and Equipment Trading, or EMEQ (for the sale of power engineering equipment) and SOCAN (for the sale of aviation equipment, primarily the Yak-40 aircraft, which have been successfully test flown in Canada).

Although the activities of these joint companies have the ultimate goal of commercial sales, their operations essentially transcend the framework of ordinary trade and also involve the establishment of contacts with dealer firms, technical installation work, post-sale maintenance and even some production operations. For example, Belarus Equipment employs around 100 dealers in various regions of Canada for sales and technical maintenance operations. In Toronto, Montreal and Regina, the company has its own technical centers, where the products are perfected to meet the demands of the Canadian market and where warehouses of spare parts and display showrooms have been set up along with repair shops for technical maintenance. EMEQ installs the power equipment it sells with the use of Canadian manpower and with the participation of Soviet chief mechanics. EMEQ has served as the middleman in the conclusion of contracts for the delivery of Soviet turbines and generators for four large Canadian hydroelectric stations.

With the aid of these joint companies, Soviet industrial exports to Canada have begun to increase rapidly. For example, the sales volume for machinery and equipment rose from 0.4 million rubles in 1972 to 18.2 million (more than two-fifths of all exports) in 1976. As a result, even though our exports to Canada have not reached large absolute dimensions, they have acquired a modern and progressive commercial structure.

Among the latest Soviet exports to Canada, special mention should be made of the deliveries of oil and petroleum products that began in 1974 and immediately occupied a leading position. The prospects in this field are becoming increasingly favorable due to the fact that Canada is experiencing growing difficulties in its attempts to supply the nation's eastern regions with oil and had already become an importer of oil rather than an exporter by 1975.

Traditional Soviet exports to Canada still play an extremely significant role. This applies primarily to goods for cultural and general use (watches, cameras, sports and hunting equipment, handicrafts and toys), fabric, furs, pelts, cotton fiber and plywood.

The assortment of Soviet imports from Canada is distinguished by less variety and has virtually not undergone any serious changes for the last 10 years. As we have already pointed out, the dominant role in imports belongs to grain--wheat, barley and wheat flour. Until 1975, imports other than grain were insignificant in volume and limited in assortment (synthetic rubber, special types of cellulose, leather and hides, breeding stock, sulfur, steel and rolled ferrous metals). There was later a dramatic increase in imports of Canadian machinery and equipment--from 1.6 million rubles' worth in 1974 to 24.8 million in 1976. The assortment was also considerably broadened--it now includes foundry equipment, equipment for the gas industry, the timber, pulp and paper and wood-processing industry and the textile industry, industrial fittings and maritime equipment. Even with this considerable increase in purchases of machinery and equipment, however, the proportion accounted for by this exceedingly important category of goods in total Soviet imports from Canada is still negligible--around 5 percent.

When we compare our nation's trade with Canada to commodity turnover with other Western nations, we must always remember that Soviet-Canadian trade relations are still young. While Soviet trade with France, Italy, the FRG and England is based on established and solid traditions, Soviet-Canadian trade does not have these kinds of traditions as yet. This is almost entirely an area of virgin soil, where the force of inertia, suspicion and sometimes even prejudice on the part of many Canadian businessmen must be overcome. If we assess Soviet-Canadian trade from a retrospective vantage point, if we compare the present to the recent past and if we take new progressive trends into consideration, we must admit to indisputable progress.

Scientific and Technical Ties

Common technical and economic problems connected with the similarity of the two nations' natural conditions and the economic impact of the mutual supplementation of the resources and efforts of both sides create an objective basis for economic cooperation which goes beyond the boundaries of ordinary commercial transactions. Of all the areas of Soviet-Canadian noncommercial cooperation, the most developed is that of scientific and technical ties.

These began in 1958, when the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Canadian National Research Council concluded an agreement on cooperation and exchange. Envisaging purely scientific contacts, it nonetheless permitted specialists from both nations to learn of one another's industrial and technical achievements and to investigate the possibilities for the development of more extensive ties.

In 1964, the USSR State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic Energy and a Canadian state corporation, Atomic Energy of Canada, concluded an agreement on cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy, which was once again extended for another 5 years in 1973. An extensive program of cooperation is being carried out in accordance with this agreement--mutual visits by scientific delegations and the exchange of information on nuclear physics and solid-state physics, as well as on questions connected with the construction of atomic electric power stations, the disposal of radioactive waste and the use of radioactive isotopes.

In 1969, Polysar--a government-controlled corporation and one of the world's foremost producers of synthetic rubber--concluded an agreement on scientific and technical cooperation with the State Committee of the USSR Council of Ministers for Science and Technology. Within the framework of this agreement, sessions of a joint commission are convened each year and visits to enterprises are organized, as well as operational seminars and the exchange of scientific and technical personnel, experimental models, and scientific and commercial information. The cooperation with Polysar has permitted the Soviet Union to master the production of new types of copolymer rubber, dramatically reduce the use of natural rubber by substituting chloroprene rubber for part of this, and develop new types of rubber for hydraulic systems. In exchange, this corporation has acquired valuable scientific

and technical information on many matters. As a company representative said at a "round-table" conference at Carleton University, held to discuss Canada's participation in East-West commerce, "the annual expenditures of 25,000 dollars necessary for the functioning of the agreement are regarded by the Polysar Company as a small price for the present and future benefits of cooperation."

An important catalyst in the development of scientific and technical ties was the intergovernmental agreement on cooperation in the use of scientific and technical achievements in industry (January 1971), which governed the activities of the joint commission on these matters⁸ that was established the same year and its task forces (for the oil, gas, pulp and paper, timber and wood-processing industries, power engineering, transportation, agriculture, etc.). Within the framework of the agreement, the two sides exchanged more than 90 delegations of specialists in 1971-1976, convened 12 seminars and symposiums and organized the active exchange of experimental models.

After studying the achievements of both nations, the joint commission and its task forces began to plan and carry out large-scale joint research projects. For example, Soviet turbodrills of various types and dimensions are being tested in accordance with a contract signed by the Mashinoekspost Foreign Trade Association and a Canadian research association on drilling in the North of Alberta Province. The tests have shown that turbodrills are more economical than rotary drills in some of Canada's geological formations. According to Hugh Laper, chairman of the Canadian association, the Soviet turbodrills can drill ten times faster in some regions of West Canada.⁹ During the course of these operations, it also became apparent that turbine drilling equipment and technology need further improvement and modernized turbodrills are now being developed in the USSR which are capable, on the strength of their technical and economic parameters, of completely meeting the specific requirements of Canadian utilization.

The use of Canadian drilling equipment is being investigated in the Soviet Union. In February 1976, Mashinoimport and the Global Trading Firm signed a contract on the delivery of special equipment and materials to the Soviet Union, as well as on supervisory installation services and technical consultations for the purpose of organizing the joint drilling of oil wells in the permafrost areas of the USSR.

A special place in the program for scientific and technical cooperation is occupied by the joint compilation of a standard blueprint of a thermal electric power station for the installation of such facilities in third nations. Plans call for the construction of electric power stations with two power units in two models--of 125 or 200 megawatts. The Soviet side is responsible for designing and equipping the machine room of the power station and the Canadian side is responsible for the boiler division. Auxiliary facilities are also to be equipped on a cooperative basis. Each side will pay the expenses of its part of the project. The general coordination of project activities is the responsibility of the Soviet side.

Joint scientific research projects not only accelerate the resolution of specific problems, but also stimulate commercial ties between the nations, the sale of machinery, equipment and industrial raw materials, the rendering of engineer services and the exchange of technical documents and "know-how." With a view to these factors and the need to expand scientific, technical and economic cooperation, the two sides have made the decision to develop and improve the cooperative mechanism. In accordance with the intergovernmental long-term agreement mentioned above (July 1976), various fields of economic cooperation are being organically combined. The functions of the task forces now working within the framework of the unified joint commission have been considerably augmented; they have been given the authority to concern themselves with not only exchange in the area of science and technology, but also with fields of industrial economic cooperation and the investigation of possibilities for the development of trade. This will make it possible to incorporate the results of scientific and technical research in economic practice more quickly and more efficiently and to expand trade more intensively.

The agreement also envisages promotion of the purchase and sale of licences, patents and the rights to technology, plans and production processes. Several bilateral agreements have already been concluded on the trade in licenses. Canada and the USSR are also party to multilateral licence agreements. For example, our Litsenzintorg Foreign Trade Association, Canada's Kaiser Resources and Japan's Mitsui Mining have signed a trilateral licence agreement on cooperation in the field of hydraulic coal mining. License agreements produce a greater economic impact than the simple purchase and sale of licenses, since they frequently envisage the exchange of "knowhow," technical services and deliveries of specialized equipment.

The conclusion of the abovementioned intergovernmental agreement marked the beginning of a new stage in Soviet-Canadian economic, scientific and technical ties.

Problems and Reserves

Despite the substantial progress in Soviet-Canadian cooperation, the scales and nature of this cooperation; as we have already pointed out, are far from commensurate with the economic potential of both nations, their role in international economic relations and other objective preconditions. In particular, although such forms of long-term ties as production specialization and cooperation and the joint construction of enterprises, including the construction of enterprises in the USSR with payment for the contribution of the Canadian side by means of product deliveries (compensatory transactions), have been planned, they are still not being practiced. This is not only due to the fact that Soviet-Canadian economic relations are still young and lack any kind of more or less established traditions, but also to the effect of various other types of inhibiting factors.

The most significant of these are the territorial proximity of Canada and its major economic regions to the huge American market, the fairly deep economic integration of the two North American states, the common language

spoken by the majority of their inhabitants, their common technical standards, the Americanized tastes of Canadian consumers, etc. An extremely important role is also played by the fact that a significant part of the Canadian economy, primarily consisting of the largest and most technically advanced enterprises, is controlled by foreign capital, mostly American. This means that the behavior of many Canadian companies is determined abroad. Even Canada's formally independent national firms are frequently made dependent on U.S. corporations by the system of subcontracts.

All of this has made many Canadian businessmen display obvious indifference to "overseas" markets. The Canadian businessman usually feels it is more convenient to simply pick up the telephone receiver and quickly make a deal with one of his familiar partners in the United States than to search for a new partner and establish overseas contacts, which involves considerable financial expenditures and efforts in different fields of marketing. In this connection, Canadian businessmen differ greatly from the businessmen in the United States, the FRG, France, Italy and, in particular, Japan, who are famous for their enterprising and aggressive market strategy. The Canadians display particular caution in regard to our nation's market, which is still terra incognita for many Westerners. It is indicative that, in contrast to other Western companies, not one Canadian firm has opened a branch in Moscow.

To some extent, the development of Soviet-Canadian commercial and economic ties has been inhibited by the geographic distance between the two nations.

Certain obstacles still exist in the area of trade policy. The discriminatory regulations in regard to trade with the socialist nations, which were adopted during the cold war, are still in effect in Canada. Canada is a member of the notorious NATO coordinating committee (COCOM), which compiled a list of "strategic goods" banned from export to the socialist countries. And many "non-strategic" goods can only be exported from Canada to these nations in accordance with government licenses, which complicates trade.

Finally, the realization of future possibilities for the expansion of economic ties will require a precisely functioning promotional mechanism. While certain positive advances have already been made in this connection on the federal level, as we have already pointed out, the mechanism for the promotion of business contacts on the nongovernmental level (chambers of commerce and firm representatives) in our relations with Canada is still virtually nonexistent. The need to create this kind of mechanism was emphasized at the first session of the joint commission.

In recent years, Soviet foreign trade organizations have done much to establish business contacts and to promote the sale of our goods in the Canadian market. But opportunities in this area are far from exhausted.

Practice has shown that opportunities exist for the improvement of the quality and external appearance of commodities. It is also important to improve information services, to augment and perfect commercial advertising

and to make active use of national, specialty and international exhibits and fairs for this purpose. Naturally, it is also extremely important to be fully aware of the economic potential of our partners.

This potential depends a great deal on the dimensions of their enterprises. Despite the high degree of production and capital concentration, Canada has less companies that can be regarded as industrial giants than the other leading Western nations. Only three of the hundred largest industrial corporations in the capitalist world are Canadian (Ford Motor of Canada, General Motors of Canada and Imperial Oil), and all of these are affiliates of American transnational monopolies. Only 17 Canadian companies had a sales volume of more than 1 billion dollars in 1976 (the United States has around 230 such corporations). This is of great practical importance to our economic relations with Canada. It means that it would be unrealistic to give our Canadian partners large orders for a broad assortment of goods. It would also be unrealistic to expect Canadian firms to completely take on the installation or delivery of complete sets of equipment for large Soviet projects. It would be to our mutual advantage, however, to involve Canadian companies in the construction of facilities of average size or in participation in the construction of large facilities.

One exception to this rule can be found in Canadian project planning (consultative) firms in several fields (mining, the oil industry, the pulp and paper industry, power engineering, transportation, communications and industrial and civil construction), which are among the leading firms of this type in the capitalist world. The great international prestige of Canadian project planning firms is attested to by the fact that the cost of the total orders filled by them for overseas clients has increased by 500 percent in the last decade. We could enlist the services of these firms in the construction of various facilities, particularly extremely large ones. (At present, the Vancouver Simons International company is doing the planning work for a large pulp and paper combine in Poland.)¹⁰

Furthermore, it is a well-known fact that American control deprives many Canadian companies of freedom in the decision-making process. Naturally, this makes it difficult to establish direct contacts with these companies. Nonetheless, it would be incorrect to regard American capital as only an obstacle to the expansion of our ties with Canada. In the first place, many of these Canadian affiliates have a substantial degree of autonomy and are able to make their own decisions in regard to trade and other relations. In the second place, the parent firms in the United States frequently try to use their affiliates and branches for the expansion of their own economic ties, particularly in those fields where U.S. legislation imposes restraints on their initiative.

Naturally, it is much simpler to establish and develop contacts with Canadian national companies. We must remember that Canada has many medium-sized and small firms which are capable of supplying us with the high-quality products we need.

The most favorable prospects can probably be found in our cooperation with state companies, which lend themselves best to planning. The Canadian Government controls railroads and highways, maritime transport, aviation, the telephone and telegraph companies, the radio broadcasting companies, electric power stations and enterprises in the synthetic rubber, uranium, petroleum and other industries. The government controls the St. Lawrence River and Seaway and the major ports and--and this should be underscored--takes an active part in the exploration of new, difficult of access and sparsely populated regions (geological prospecting, cartography and the development of an infrastructure). The proportion of scientific research and engineering taken on by the state sector is quite high in Canada (2.5 times higher than in the United States); this is a factor which considerably facilitates our scientific and technical relations.

When we establish cooperation on the governmental level, we must remember that the Canadian provinces enjoy a relative degree of independence. They control many enterprises of "public use" (electric power stations, the telephone network and the gas companies) and--and this is particularly important--mineral and timber resources. This makes it expedient to establish all possible contacts with the provincial governments, which are able to not only influence the position of local businessmen but also act in the capacity of business partners.

The Canadian banks could play an important role in the development of cooperation. Due to the specific features of the nation's historical development, its banking capital has been concentrated and centralized to an exceptionally high degree. Legislation imposes strict limitations on the entry of foreign capital into credit and finance establishments, and control over the banks has remained in Canadian hands. This presents additional opportunities for the long-term crediting of exports of Canadian goods to our nation and of joint projects.

At the dawn of Soviet rule, V. I. Lenin recommended that "a few trained and conscientious persons" be sent to Germany, the United States and Canada to study the organization of labor.¹¹ Today the USSR sends highly skilled Soviet specialists to Canada. They can be seen at the oil and gas deposits in Alberta and on the wheatfields of Saskatchewan. Their Canadian colleagues are studying the experience accumulated on the gasline routes of Siberia and in the kolkhozes of the Kuban'. The Soviet Union and Canada are exchanging commodities, technology, licenses, economic experience and scientific and technical achievements. As the Canadian magazine INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES remarked, "both sides see an opportunity for mutual benefit in closer ties."¹²

This is how the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence is confirming its vitality.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Materialy XXV s"yezda KPSS" [Materials of the 25th CPSU Congress], Moscow, 1976, p 21.
2. P. E. Trudeau, "Conversation With Canadians," Toronto and Buffalo, 1972, p 146.
3. "A Science Policy for Canada," Report of the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy, vol II, Ottawa, 1972, pp 455-456.
4. For a more detailed discussion of this agreement, see B. V. Povolotskiy's article in No 10 of the magazine for 1976--Ed's note.
5. INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES, Autumn 1972, p 23.
6. Because of the comparatively low cost of maritime transport, it is more economical for us to import grain to the Far East from, for example, Vancouver, on Canada's west coast, than to ship it by rail from the main grain regions of our nation.
7. "Canada in East-West Commerce," East-West Commercial Relations Series, Carleton University, Ottawa, Working Paper No 4, June 1974, p 14.
8. In accordance with the long-term agreement of 14 July 1976, this commission and the consultative commission on trade were converted into the single joint commission on economic, industrial, scientific and technical cooperation mentioned above.
9. FINANCIAL TIMES OF CANADA, 26 May 1975.
10. GLOBE AND MAIL, 22 January 1977.
11. V. I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 45, p 395.
12. INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES, January-February 1972, p 1.

8588

CSO: 1803

FOLLOWING SOVIET-AMERICAN STATEMENT ON MIDDLE EAST

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 43-48

[Article by A. K. Kislov]

[Text] "Of all the regional conflicts in the world today, the most dangerous is the conflict in the Middle East," U.S. President J. Carter acknowledged in a speech at the 32d Session of the UN General Assembly. "The war there has almost led the world to the brink of nuclear confrontation. It has disrupted the normal development of the world economy and brought cruel deprivations to the people of the developing and developed nations."

Some of the U.S. President's statements about the causes of the economic crisis in the capitalist world might be disputed, but it would be difficult to disagree with his completely justified and serious concern about the situation in the Middle East.

For this reason, the extensive international repercussions of the joint Soviet-American statement on the Middle East, published on 2 October 1977, are quite natural. This statement described the most important aspects of the Middle Eastern problem and outlined the means of its settlement. This magazine has already pointed out the need for concerted action by the USSR and the United States for the purpose of aiding the parties involved in the Middle East conflict to find a mutually acceptable solution and has stated that that Soviet Union regards this as one of the concrete and completely realistic objectives of its foreign policy.¹ The joint Soviet-American statement on the Middle East demonstrates, in particular, the way in which these objectives are being attained. It also attests to the fact that the Soviet Union has invariably and consistently worked toward a just and lasting peaceful settlement in the Middle East and has made a significant contribution to the planning of concrete steps toward the resolution of this problem of such vital importance.

The statement was agreed upon during the course of an exchange of opinions on the continuing explosive situation in the Middle East between A. A. Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of

1. SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA, No 7, 1977, pp 22-23.

foreign affairs, and American leaders during the last third of September 1977. In this statement, the two sides expressed their conviction that the vital interests of the Middle Eastern peoples and the interests of the consolidation of peace and international security as a whole "insistently dictate the need for an immediate just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. This settlement must be all-encompassing, covering all concerned parties and all issues." The statement specifically points out the fact that all concrete issues must be settled within the framework of an all-encompassing settlement of the Middle Eastern problem, including such cardinal issues as the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied Arab territories, the Palestinian issue, including the safeguarding of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, a cease fire and the establishment of normal peaceful relations on the basis of mutual recognition of the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence.

As the joint document stresses, "the only correct and effective way of ensuring a cardinal solution for all aspects of the Middle Eastern problem in combination is negotiation within the framework of the Geneva Peace Conference specially convened for these purposes and with the participation of representatives from all parties involved in the conflict, including the Palestinian people, and a legal contract formulating the decisions made at the conference." As co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference, the USSR and the United States affirmed their intention, "in contact with all concerned parties, to do everything possible to ensure that the work of the conference is resumed no later than December 1977."

On the whole, the joint Soviet-American statement on the Middle East represents a good basis, established by the two co-chairmen, for the resumption of the work of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East, or at least for the beginning of real progression toward a comprehensive Middle Eastern settlement, the urgent need for which is no longer being disputed in the world by any sensible person. It was precisely this thought that was foremost in the broad spectrum of opinions expressed about the Soviet-American document in political and public circles and the press organs of various nations.

Naturally, this does not mean that most people believe that all of the complex problems of the Middle East settlement have already been overcome or that the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference on the Middle East are in complete accord. If we were to make this kind of statement, we would be closing our eyes to the real facts--the facts that the almost 3 decades of permanent warfare in the Middle East have led to the accumulation of so much bitterness, so much mutual distrust between the sides directly involved in the conflict and such mutually exclusive use on the most cardinal aspects of the settlement, that the convergence of the positions taken by the parties will naturally require additional efforts and time. Nonetheless, it seems that the main thing now is not that all of the exceptionally dangerous obstructions of the past have been eradicated by a single stroke of the pen, but the fact that the co-chairmen of the Geneva Peace Conference seem to agree more than ever before on the fundamental aspects of Middle East settlement, and this presents

promising opportunities for the eradication of the explosive situation in the Middle East and the establishment of peace in one of the "hottest spots" of our planet.

UN Secretary General K. Waldheim called the Soviet-American statement one of the most significant attempts to overcome existing difficulties in the resumption of the work of the Geneva Peace Conference on the Middle East, which was established by a special UN decision precisely for the purpose of a comprehensive Middle East settlement and which has been acknowledged as politically acceptable by all concerned parties. "The joint document," he stated, "contains the basic elements for the resolution of the Middle Eastern problem." The statement was also commended by the overwhelming majority of delegates attending the 32d Session of the UN General Assembly. Pointing out the fact that the very publication of this statement had a great and positive effect on the course of the discussions on the Middle East at the session, they stressed the importance of joint Soviet-American efforts in the interest of a settlement in the Middle East.

Special mention should be made of the Palestinian reaction. Z. L. Terzi, permanent UN observer from the Palestine Liberation Organization, made the following announcement in connection with the publication of this document: "We commend the Soviet position, which demonstrates the USSR's interest in achieving a comprehensive political settlement in the Middle East which will safeguard the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs. The Soviet Government has reaffirmed the indisputable fact that the rights of the Palestinian Arabs to national self-determination and to their own state must be guaranteed when the Middle Eastern problem is solved." Zuhayr Muhsin, PLO chief military officer and head of the Palestinian al Sa'iqa organization, expressed the view that the joint statement "has forced the United States to depart from the resumption of separate initiatives." "Besides this," he added, "I see the statement as the beginning of U.S. agreement with the idea of the official recognition of the Palestinian people and the PLO." The fact that this is the first document signed by the U.S. Government in which the words "guaranteeing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people" are formulated was specially pointed out by many other observers and commentators. "The United States," stressed, for example, the NEW YORK TIMES, "has agreed for the first time to the idea of Palestinian rights."

It was no accident that, according to the general view of the world press, the reaction of the Arab world to the Soviet-American statement was, on the whole, positive. "In the Middle East," the FINANCIAL TIMES, the newspaper of the English business community, summed up this reaction, "most of the Arab states with a direct interest in the settlement of the conflict were pleased with the document." This conclusion is confirmed, for example, by a news report in the Lebanese newspaper AL-NAHAR, which specifically underscored the idea that the Soviet Union's efforts to settle the Middle Eastern conflict are beginning to bear fruit.

The joint Soviet-American statement was also commended by many international forums, including the international conference held in Paris to discuss the just settlement of the Middle East crisis, which was attended by delegates and observers from 60 states and representatives from 20 international non-governmental organizations. The document had great and generally positive repercussions in the western European nations and the other capitalist states and in all of the socialist countries. According to the London press, this document "might indicate a way out of the increasingly irrevocable diplomatic deadlock that, to all indications, has been reached by the Middle Eastern negotiations."

Having said all of this, however, we have only touched upon, so to speak, one side of the coin. Even in the Arab world, there were some who tried to cast suspicion on this exceedingly important document. For example, several Egyptian press organs commented on certain alleged "Soviet concessions" on fundamental issues, and Egyptian Foreign Affairs I. Fahmi implied in an American ABC news broadcast that, in the joint Soviet-American statement on the Middle East, the Soviet Union had supposedly resorted to a compromise on the PLO issue. Certain ultra-leftist elements in the Arab world, representing themselves as "true revolutionaries," also added their "bit" to the attempts to discredit this statement. According to their statements, the statement "does not serve the just cause of the Arabs and their fight against aggression."

If this kind of statement really requires rebuttal, the Arabs themselves, including the Palestinians, are doing this splendidly. For example, the PALESTINE NEWS AGENCY distributed a special commentary in connection with the joint Soviet-American statement, which said that even though the PLO is not mentioned in this document, the positive nature of the statement in regard to the Palestine Liberation Organization was made obvious in USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs A. A. Gromyko's speech at the 32d Session of the UN General Assembly, in which he said, in particular, that the Soviet Union favors the immediate resumption of the work of the Geneva Peace Conference with the participation of all concerned parties on an equal basis, including representatives of the PLO. F. Khaddoumi, PLO chief political officer, described the Soviet-American statement as an exceedingly important event and as a document containing positive statements which provide the hope of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Particularly spiteful and odious attacks against the joint Soviet-American statement on the Middle East came from Israeli ruling circles, opposing any steps toward genuine settlement in the Middle East, and pro-Israeli lobbies in the United States. "We are displeased with the very existence of this Soviet-American statement," Israeli Foreign Affairs Minister M. Dayan unequivocally declared.

Two basic tendencies manifested themselves even more clearly in the American political arena in connection with the publication of the Soviet-American statement: one reflecting a more realistic approach to the resolution of the most important and most complex problems of the present day, and another,

in which the intensified activity of American reactionary circles, opposing any improvement in the international climate, is particularly apparent.

In explaining the reasons for the Carter Administration's belief that it was not only possible but also necessary to approve and publish a joint statement with the USSR on the Middle East, Secretary of State C. Vance said: "We felt that it was extremely necessary and expedient for the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference to state the principles reflecting their views. We hoped that this would serve as a stimulus to the parties concerned so that progress could be made in Geneva and serious work could begin on the problems that must be solved." The American Administration's approach met with understanding and support from many prominent political and public figures and foremost American press organs. The position occupied by the influential CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, which printed several editorials and articles on the joint Soviet-American statement, has been characteristic in this respect. This statement, one of the articles stated, "represents the most important step taken to date by President Carter in the sphere of foreign policy." Pointing out the fact that "this step is also the most debatable," the newspaper stated: "By uniting their efforts in search of peace in the Middle East, the United States and the Soviet Union have considerably reinforced the means of influence they can exert on the parties involved in the conflict that has dragged on for decades in this region. The most important aspect of all this is the fact that the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference have agreed that the settlement in the Middle East must guarantee the 'legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.' This is causing the greatest arguments at the present time. In doing this, the United States has taken this important issue further than ever before."

Unfortunately, however, the considered and thoughtful approach to international issues is still not characteristic of the entire American political spectrum. As soon as the joint Soviet-American statement on the Middle East was made public, the most genuine hysterics began in the more reactionary American circles, hysterics in which the agents of the military-industrial complex, the bosses of the AFL-CIO and other anti-Soviets took a most active part alongside the American Zionists. The very idea of the possibility of Soviet and American agreement on any issue affects these circles like a red flag waved in front of a bull. "Washington has betrayed Israel," "a conspiracy with the Russians," "a U.S. surrender to the USSR," "a move contrary to all of the United States' past promises to Israel"--these were the slogans of the extensive campaign waged in the United States against the Soviet-American statement. This campaign was accompanied by overt threats leveled at the administration, which, they said, by agreeing to the joint statement with the USSR, could lose "much," since it had "made serious confrontations possible between Israel and its American supporters on one side and the administration on the other." The pro-Israeli coalition in the U.S. Congress also became actively involved in this campaign. Representatives of this coalition demanded an "explanation" from President Carter and let it be known that any attempts to exert pressure on Israel would be "resisted" on Capitol Hill. The Republican leaders in Congress also hurriedly accused

the President of "allowing the Soviet Union to revive its influence in the Middle East" by sanctioning the joint Soviet-American statement.

It must be pointed out that this campaign had definite results. Striving to avoid a head-on confrontation with the coalition of strong forces opposing any attempt at genuine progress in the eradication of the consequences of Israeli aggression and in the achievement of a just and, therefore, lasting peace in the Middle East, the American President felt it necessary to make a statement which, according to the NEW YORK DAILY NEWS, was intended to "dispel the fears of the Israelis." He stressed the fact that "the main element of American policy in the Middle East...is the strength, independence, freedom and peace of the people of Israel," that "the statement compiled by the United States and the Soviet Union is not a compulsory document which must be fully and completely acknowledged by the Arab and Israeli governments before they go to Geneva," that he "had never spoken in favor of the establishment of an independent Palestinian state" and had not supported the "establishment of an independent Palestinian state on the West Bank of the Jordan River or, in general, on any presently occupied territory in the Middle East" and so forth. The American President stated the appropriate assurances of his "support for Israel" and the delegation of American congressmen representing pro-Israeli circles who had made a special trip to Israel.

These actions on the part of the head of the Washington Administration evoked a dual reaction in the United States (in addition to the approval of Israeli supporters and overt anti-Soviets). On the one hand, these statements by the American President gave rise to "a growing certainty" in the United States, J. Reston wrote in the NEW YORK TIMES, "that as long as the Israelis can continue to receive economic and military assistance from Washington while ignoring its recommendations, they will refuse to consider the political and territorial concessions regarded as absolutely essential by Washington." "The question naturally arises--Does Israel control more votes in the U.S. Senate than the President of the United States?" J. Harsch said in the same vein. On the other hand, the view was also expressed that it was unnecessary to attach much significance to the zigzags in the Washington Administration's approach to the problems involved in the Middle East settlement, since, as the NEW YORK TIMES commented, "the domestic political aspect of this situation demands that the President alternate the exertion of pressure with conciliatory tactics, alternating between opposition and support or alleviating obvious diplomatic differences by acknowledging the duty to safeguard Israeli security."

In connection with the last statement, it should be pointed out that, in the first place, it is real actions and not words that are significant in the final analysis. And these actions have taken the form of U.S. allocations of 1 billion dollars for the delivery of weapons and 800 million for the rendering of economic assistance to Israel for the third fiscal year in succession. Besides this, half of the total sum of military appropriations falls into the category of direct nonrefundable subsidies. "And, to all

indications," the WASHINGTON POST remarked, "Israel and Congress will exert extremely strong pressure to ensure that total military aid will be increased by a minimum of half a billion dollars" in the next fiscal year. In the second place, and this should evidently be specially emphasized, it is highly unlikely that Israel's negative reaction to any attempt to achieve a just and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East and Washington's actual support for this line will not lead to a more rigid stand on the part of the Arabs, who have thus far displayed sufficient flexibility in the search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

Pointing out the fact that "serious efforts have been expended during the last few months to promote a comprehensive settlement of the conflict in the Middle East," L. I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, expressed the hope that "the parties directly involved in the conflict will make use of these new possibilities with the aid of the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference." This appeal must be heeded. As for the Soviet Union, it will continue to do everything within its power to achieve the kind of settlement in the Middle East that will establish lasting and just peace in this region of the world without frustrating the legitimate rights and interests of any people or any state.

8588

CSO: 1803

NUCLEAR THREAT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 48-53

[Article by V. F. Davydov]

[Text] When TASS announced that the work on the development of a nuclear weapon in South Africa was nearing completion and that preparations were being made for the testing of this weapon in the Kalahari Desert, "the report was not taken seriously in the West," according to the NEW YORK TIMES, at first. Moreover, some correspondents quickly represented this as a "propaganda maneuver" carried out by the USSR for the purpose of torpedoing the Anglo-American plan for "settlement in Southern Rhodesia" (ultimately aimed at the protection of the Vorster regime in South Africa) and strengthening its own influence in southern Africa. The international public, however, did take the TASS announcement seriously and began to worry. The persistence of Soviet diplomacy and that of the other socialist countries and the statements made by public and government figures in several African states forced ruling circles in the West to take a realistic look at the Soviet warning. Washington, London, Paris and Bonn made the proper inquiries in Pretoria. Officially, South Africa denied the "rumors" about the impending nuclear test. But the pictures of facilities in the Kalahari Desert, taken by an American satellite, left no room for doubts about Pretoria's actual intentions. Washington turned these photographs over to the United States' chief allies. These registered protests in Pretoria. South Africa was forced to go back on its word. As U.S. President J. Carter said in a press conference on 23 August, Pretoria promised not to engage "in nuclear tests, either present or future."

Now foreign political correspondents in the West have unanimously noted that the USSR's timely warning and the subsequent diplomatic efforts expended by all concerned nations made it impossible for South Africa to carry out its plans to test the nuclear weapon. As the WASHINGTON POST reported, "if it had not been for outside pressure, South Africa would probably have set off the bomb within a matter of weeks, if we consider the fact that it has the material for its production and it has decided to move full speed ahead."

But the newspaper ignored another question of equal importance: How was South Africa able to come this close to the development of a nuclear weapon? The history of the cooperation between the Western countries and South Africa in this field is quite eloquent.

Immediately after World War II, the United States and England effectively assisted in the creation of a South African uranium industry, attracted by the large reserves of uranium ore, which was necessary for the development of their nuclear potential (South Africa occupies the third place in the capitalist world). With the direct participation of Anglo-American firms, 27 mines and 17 enrichment plants were built. South African revenues from the export of uranium ore, primarily to the United States and England, amounted to around 2 billion dollars by 1977. At present, as testimony in congressional hearings held in the summer of 1977 attest, South African uranium enterprises occupy one of the leading positions in the secret uranium cartel, cooperating closely with associated monopolies in the United States, Canada, Australia and France to divide the sales market and regulate the prices of this strategic raw material. At the beginning of the 1960's, the United States sold South Africa its first atomic reactor, which was put into operation in Pelindaba, near Pretoria, with the aid of American specialists. This reactor, which was named SAFARI-1, became the basis of South Africa's own nuclear program. The enriched uranium needed for its operation, which, as we know, can also be used in the manufacture of an atomic bomb, is regularly delivered to South Africa from the United States.

Western specialists believe that it was precisely this imported enriched uranium from the United States that played a perceptible role in the development of the South African nuclear program, since there were no other sources for its acquisition in the beginning. Most of the 120 physicists sent to the West by the South African Government were trained at the laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission in Oak Ridge. When South Africa began to equip its experimental facilities for the enrichment of uranium, the American Foxboro Corporation sold it two computers, which were urgently needed by South Africa. At present, a long-term agreement is in effect on deliveries of slightly enriched uranium in the capacity of fuel for the atomic electric power stations built in South Africa.

South Africa's nuclear cooperation with the other Western nations is also being developed intensively. In particular, Bonn eagerly agreed to contacts between the nuclear physicists of both nations and encouraged the exchange of scientific information in the expectation of receiving its share of the African uranium resources (40 percent of the uranium now used in the FRG is imported from South Africa). The closest ties have been established between specialists in Pelindaba and the West Germany atomic center in Karlsruhe. The English OBSERVER reported that South Africa now maintains contact with 15 scientific research centers in the FRG, including the Max Plank Nuclear Physics Institute. The easy access to scientific research projects being conducted in the FRG in the field of nuclear physics naturally contributed to the development of a "new, unique process" for the enrichment of uranium

in South Africa, as the heads of the South African nuclear program announced at the beginning of the 1970's. It is true that the secret of South Africa's success and achievements was disclosed by West German physicist E. Becker, who was heading the work in this field in the FRG. According to the NEW YORK TIMES, he declared that the "West German technology was illegally appropriated by the South Africans."

According to experts, in the mid-1980's, when operations began in the uranium enrichment plant in Walindaba, built with the assistance of the West German STEAG firm (as attested to by DER SPIEGEL), South Africa will not only be "completely independent of foreign supply sources" but will also become one of the largest exporters of strategic raw materials, suitable for use in the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

France also contributed to the development of the South African atomic program. In the summer of 1976, at a time of fierce competition with the American General Electric concern and West German and Dutch monopolies, a French consortium headed by the Framatom firm concluded an agreement with South Africa on the delivery of reactors for two atomic electric power stations of around 1,000 megawatts each. The cost of the transaction was 11 billion dollars. Considering the fact that South Africa does not have an urgent need for additional sources of electric power for peaceful purposes, Western experts have expressed the opinion that the powerful atomic stations will mainly produce energy for the uranium enrichment plant. In June 1977, the French press reported that a bargain had been concluded by the (COGEMA) nuclear fuel corporation and South Africa, according to which the French firm agreed to grant Pretoria an interest-free loan, in the capacity of advanced payment for deliveries of crude uranium, of 103 million dollars for the further development of the uranium industry.

In the fierce inter-imperialist struggle being waged by the United States and the Western European countries in the contemporary markets for nuclear technology and materials, thoughts about the effect of the sale of nuclear technology on the work being done to promote the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and about the need for effective control frequently take a back seat to the desire for commercial advantage. In 1974, the revenues of the United States alone from the sale of nuclear technology and materials were approximately 4 billion dollars. Pending contracts promised to increase this sum by 1.5 billion dollars a year before 1980. According to experts, world investments in atomic energy during the next 25 years will amount to around 300 billion dollars. Pretoria is still playing its trump card--crude uranium--in the inter-imperialist competition of the Western countries to receive the technology it needs for the development of its atomic program in exchange.

Even this brief account of the "milestones of cooperation" between South Africa and the Western nations conclusively indicates that, without active assistance from monopolies and scientific research centers, Pretoria would hardly had been able to independently reach what experts call "a high level

of atomic engineering," which has brought it so close to the development of its own nuclear weapon. A. J. A. Roux, head of South African atomic research, frankly admitted this in the beginning of 1977: "To a significant degree, we owe our present successes to the training and assistance that was so eagerly offered to us by the United States during the early years of our nuclear program, when some of the Western powers united their efforts to lead our scientists and engineers into the atomic age."

These compliments sound like vicious ridicule of the near-sighted policy of the leading capitalist nations in relation to Pretoria, especially now, after the intensive campaign to prevent nuclear tests in South Africa. It has become obvious that South Africa's nuclear potential is a poisonous offshoot of the cold war, sprouting in the 1970's. It was precisely at the height of the cold war, when the United States was the leader in the race for nuclear arms, that the demand for uranium as a strategic raw material led to the birth of a uranium industry in South Africa. A parallel course toward the inclusion of South Africa in the military-strategic system of the West for a fight against the "communist threat" took the form of large deliveries of weapons--missiles, aircraft, naval ships, radio navigational systems and so forth--from the United States and its NATO allies. After the imposition of the embargo in the 1970's on the direct delivery of arms from the United States, England and France, Pretoria continued to manufacture them in accordance with purchased licenses and to receive them through third nations. Even without conducting nuclear tests, South Africa, according to military experts, already has the modern means for the delivery of such weapons, particularly the English Buccaneer and French Mirage aircraft. Even now, in the military-strategic plans of the West, South Africa is invariably assigned a leading role in the so-called "defense" of the sea lanes of the "free world" at the Cape of Good Hope, where the Indian and Atlantic oceans meet.

This approach to the strategic significance of South Africa in the world balance of power was the reason that ruling circles in the capitalist nations essentially closed their eyes to the rapid development of the South African nuclear program and did not react in the proper way to the many warnings of authoritative experts and organizations. The London Institute of Strategic Research long ago placed South Africa and Israel at the top of the list of states likely to develop their own nuclear weapons "in the near future." In February 1977, the WASHINGTON POST admitted that South Africa would need "2 to 4 years at most for the production of an atomic bomb" and that this time period could be reduced to "just a few months" if Pretoria were to accelerate its program. Pretoria itself has repeatedly made transparent hints that it is capable, "if necessary," of developing its own atomic bomb. Pretoria's course toward the development of its own nuclear potential also explains South Africa's refusal to sign the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which has now been signed by more than 100 states.

Despite all of the obvious signs and realistic predictions, the West could not (or did not want to) take preventive steps until the USSR had sounded the alarm. Apparently, the dangerous "inertia" in foreign policy thinking

is still inhibiting the timely ascription of priority to new problems over the obsessive concern about the West's strategic positions and the continuation of a policy of military confrontation with the East.

South Africa's cancellation of its nuclear tests under the threat of severe economic penalties and political isolation does not mean, however, that the danger of the development of nuclear weapons in this nation has been eliminated. Most correspondents agree that Pretoria's promise to not conduct nuclear tests does not represent a sufficient guarantee that it will abandon its plans to equip itself with nuclear weapons. It is true that some Western experts are of the opinion, largely inspired by Pretoria's announcement of the "peaceful nature" of its atomic program, that South Africa has no need for nuclear weapons, since these weapons would be of no strategic value to a nation which is not being threatened by outside danger, and since the use of nuclear weapons for the suppression of rebellion within the nation would have catastrophic consequences for the white minority. This argument, however, cannot stand up to criticism. As T. Greenwood, researcher from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, correctly pointed out in his book entitled "Nuclear Proliferation" which was published in 1977, "political, and not military, calculations now play the dominant role when an answer must be found for the question: To be or not to be a nuclear power." In this connection, the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR remarked: "Like Israel, South Africa has realized that it is quite convenient in the political sense to reserve the right to keep a 'bomb in the cellar.'"

Therefore, the danger that Pretoria will acquire a nuclear weapon has not been eliminated. It has simply been postponed indefinitely. This conclusion is confirmed by the defiant statements made by representatives of the Vorster regime. For example, Minister of Finance Horwood announced: "It is time to let Carter and some other people know that if we ever wish to use our nuclear potential in some other way, we will calmly do this, and exclusively on the basis of our own judgment."

In addition to all else, South Africa's development of a nuclear weapon would have serious consequences for the struggle against the further proliferation of nuclear weapons throughout the world. A nuclear South Africa would not only serve as an example for those nations which have still not abandoned their intention to acquire their own atomic weapons, but would also become a supplier of the technology and materials needed for their production. The press regularly reports that South Africa is already playing a perceptible role in the spread of nuclear danger by establishing close bilateral contacts with several "near-nuclear nations." For example, according to the NEW YORK TIMES, an agreement has been in effect for a long time between South Africa and Israel, in accordance with which Pretoria has promised to make "guaranteed deliveries of uranium," necessary to Tel Aviv for the development of its nuclear potential, in exchange for nuclear technology and information. The BOSTON GLOBE has reported similar contacts between South Africa and South Korea and South Africa and Taiwan. Pretoria's

production of a nuclear weapon would deal an appreciable blow to the desire of independent Africa to turn the continent into a zone free of nuclear weapons and would aid in beginning a race for nuclear arms in the African countries.

This threat makes it urgently necessary for the Western powers, primarily the United States, to take immediate measures to nip the aspirations of the South African racists in the bud. It is a well-known fact that the United States, England, France and other nations maintaining close economic and political contacts with South Africa have quite effective means at their disposal to exert pressure on South Africa for this purpose, from the cessation of deliveries of enriched uranium and the cancellation of South African orders for reactors to the complete economic and political isolation of Pretoria. Naturally, this requires full realization of the fact that the trade in nuclear technology and materials is a political issue rather than a commercial matter.

We should also pay attention to the fact that South Africa has made its preparations for nuclear tests at the same time that the development of new nuclear weapons systems has been accelerated in the United States--winged missiles and the neutron bomb. The South Africans apparently expected the world public to concentrate its efforts on a campaign to protest the neutron weapon and, consequently, to react less sharply to the nuclear tests conducted by Pretoria, which would have made it simpler for the latter to begin equipping itself with nuclear arms.

This indicates that the Pentagon's attempts to gain one-sided strategic advantages and to stimulate the race for nuclear arms ad infinitum is completely contrary and negative to the long-range security interests of the Western nations, since this only complicates the struggle against the proliferation of nuclear weapons throughout the world. Only a firm course toward the limitation and reduction of existing nuclear stockpiles can establish the kind of psychological climate in international relations that will provide opportunities for the prevention of this course of events.

The danger of the continued proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world makes it urgently necessary to decisively reject the foreign policy legacy and dogma of the cold war, when all changes in the world were viewed through the prism of bilateral confrontation between the East and West. Only a course toward the relaxation of international tension and toward cooperation in the cardinal areas of world politics can guarantee the successful resolution of the new acute problems facing mankind, including the problem of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. To a certain degree, this is understood in the West as well. For example, the WASHINGTON POST, commending the interaction by Eastern and Western nations that led to the cancellation of the nuclear tests in South Africa in August, expressed the hope that this kind of interaction could and would continue.

The Soviet Union has called for this kind of interaction for a long time, stressing the fact that it is in full accord with the vital interests and security of all nations, since the proliferation of nuclear weapons will increase, as L. I. Brezhnev said in a television appearance on 29 May 1977, "the danger of nuclear conflict...and then no 'nuclear umbrella' could serve as protection against the lethal storm." It was precisely due to the fact that the CPSU and the Soviet Government are fully aware of this hidden danger that the 25th CPSU Congress decreed that the "institution of further effective measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons throughout our planet" must be regarded as one of our most important objectives, underscoring the fact that the USSR is not only willing to cooperate but will also keep a vigilant eye on the intrigues of the enemies of peace. It was this policy that ensured the timely warning against the danger that a nuclear weapon would come into the possession of the racist Vorster regime.

8588

CSO: 1803

PENTAGON PLANS IN NORTHERN EUROPE

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 54-57

[Article by S. I. Baranovskiy and V. I. Bogachev]

[Text] The political scandal which began in Oslo this fall over American military facilities in Norway became a unique illustration of the Pentagon's declared plans to reinforce NATO's left flank. In particular, it was learned that two Loran-C radar navigation stations had been established on the Norwegian Arctic Islands of Vesteralen and Jan Mayen without the knowledge or permission of the Norwegian Storting and that American nuclear submarines with Polaris ballistic missiles were being used. Considering the fact that it is with the aid of the Loran-C systems that American submarines determine their location at a time of combat duty--and this is of decisive importance in the accurate strike of missile targets--many observers have justifiably come to the conclusion that the operations of these stations are essentially tantamount to the presence of foreign nuclear bases in Norway and, consequently, contradict Norway's repeated refusal to allow the establishment of foreign bases on its territory in a time of peace.

Representatives of opposition parties have stressed the fact that, by concluding a secret bilateral agreement with the United States in 1960 on the establishment of the Loran-C stations on the Arctic Islands, the Gerhardsen Government had concealed the true meaning of this project from the Storting by omitting to report that these stations were supposed to serve American nuclear submarines. The most important objectives of the Loran-C system were only known to a small group of individuals--military leaders and only those members of the Norwegian Cabinet who were members of the defense committee.

At the height of the scandalous disclosures, it was learned that these stations were not the only military facilities established by the United States on Norwegian territory. In an interview with a correspondent from the Norwegian newspaper DAGBLADET, former American intelligence agent V. Marchetti said that the U.S. CIA, in conjunction with the Norwegian intelligence service, had established monitoring stations in the North of Norway, which were working

against the Soviet Union and were being maintained by CIA agents. Officials in Oslo admitted the existence of American monitoring stations on Norwegian territory. It is true that, in an attempt to calm the public, they announced that it was not CIA agents but employees of the American Embassy in Oslo who were "overseeing the equipment in these stations to ensure that it was functioning normally." It was also learned that, while American "diplomats" were engaged in intelligence activities in Norway with the approval of its government, Norwegian intelligence agents were engaged in espionage against the USSR at the request of the American CIA, using the territory of Finland without the knowledge of the Finnish Government (reports on the subversive activities of the employees of the Norwegian Embassy in Helsinki were printed in the Norwegian newspaper NY TID under the heading "Norwegian Intelligence Agents Enlist Finnish Fascists for Espionage Against USSR").

After these unpleasant facts became known to the public, they evoked a wave of protest in Norway, Finland and other northern European countries against the authoritarian use of foreign territory by CIA and Pentagon agents. Statements by several deputies of the Norwegian Storting stressed the fact that Norway's membership in NATO had led to the use of its territory for secret operations by the Pentagon and the CIA, which were disregarding Norwegian laws and Norway's sovereignty and were, by their actions, endangering its friendly relations with the Soviet Union and Finland.

The history of Norway's participation in NATO has largely been a history of undercover bargains with the United States which have threatened Norway's national interests. The Pentagon became more active in Norway after it announced that its objective for the 1970's was to "strengthen the flanks" of NATO. Norwegian territory is a convenient location for controlling the waterways connecting the Atlantic and Arctic oceans, as well as the air lanes between the North American continent and the Soviet Northwest. The Norwegian province of Finnmark has a common boundary with the Soviet Union of around 200 kilometers. The Pentagon's special interest in Norway is also dictated by its desire to move the operational sphere of American nuclear submarines equipped with intercontinental ballistic missiles closer to Soviet territory. It should be noted that the NATO military command is not only trying to use Norway's continental territory for its own purposes, but also its island possessions, particularly the Spitsbergen Archipelago. At one time, the Soviet Government informed the Norwegian authorities that the use of the archipelago for military purposes contradicted the status of Spitsbergen, established by the Paris Treaty of 1920.

When Norway joined NATO, it assumed the obligation of maintaining military, political and economic cooperation with the other members of this bloc, participating in the creation of united armed forces, carrying out military preparations and accommodating "Allied" (mainly American, English, Canadian and West German) troops on its territory in wartime or in so-called emergency situations, and augmenting national armed forces in accordance with the requirements of the NATO command.

The United States has played a large part in creating and equipping the Norwegian Armed Forces. In the 1950's, the Pentagon arsenals delivered considerable quantities of arms to Norway. American military aid to Norway in 1950-1975 has been estimated at approximately 900 million dollars. Each year, Norwegian servicemen are trained at academic centers of the U.S. Armed Forces. At first, the U.S. Department of Defense paid part of the cost of Norway's acquisition of some weapons systems (for example, the Americans financed part of the cost of the 15 submarines built for Norway in the FRG), and during the 1970's, military equipment has been delivered for cash or on credit.

A program for the purchase of 125 million krone's worth of American Tow antitank projectiles is now being concluded. Norway is one of the participants--or, more precisely, one of the victims--of the so-called "deal of the century." It has agreed to purchase American F-16 tactical bombers for its air force for a sum of 2.9 billion krone (the cost of the program will apparently exceed the planned sum). Plans have been made to purchase American antiaircraft missiles being developed in the United States on the basis of the Franco-West German Roland-2 antiaircraft missile complex and surface equipment for a sum of 580 million krone. The fact that the Norwegian Armed Forces have mainly been outfitted with technical combat equipment of American production has increased their dependence on deliveries of spare parts and equipment from the United States.

All of these factors have combined to increase the United States' influence on Norwegian foreign policy.

After Norway joined NATO, its territory became the scene of rapidly accelerated work on the establishment of an infrastructure for this bloc. By the beginning of 1977, the cost of NATO facilities on Norwegian territory exceeded 3 billion krone and Norway itself had spent more than 1 billion of this sum. In 1977, the Norwegian defense budget allocated 270 million krone for military construction operations, including more than 190 million for the national defense program and 80 million for the construction of military facilities in accordance with the program for the NATO infrastructure. But the end of the work on the "technical equipping of the potential theater of combat operations" is not in sight, because the NATO leaders are constantly compiling new plans for the development of the infrastructure and the United States is constantly modernizing and augmenting the network of facilities serving the American Armed Forces. For example, in July 1977, the Norwegian press reported that the United States has sent a "request" to Oslo in regard to the modernization of the navigation systems constructed on Norwegian territory. The American command plans to use the Loran stations for much more than the mere servicing of nuclear missile-carriers. According to plans, the stations in Norway are to become part of the extensive Clarinette-Pilgrim system of communications.

The scales of the construction work on the military facilities are attested to by the following facts. So far, 11 air bases have been constructed in Norway, 8 naval bases have been built or remodeled, and a network of radar

centers and stations has been established and made part of the unified anti-aircraft defense system of the NATO bloc in Europe. A station of the American Omega global radar navigational system has been constructed in the region of Brattland and a large radio communications center has been built in the Bodo region to monitor American submarines in the North Atlantic. A long-wave radio station has been located on the island of Gussen for communications and the monitoring of the ships of the NATO naval forces in the Atlantic and a network of radio stations, part of the Decca short-range radio navigational system, has been built. Several coastal artillery positions have been set up along the Norwegian coastline. The "Ice-High" line of NATO tropospheric communications runs through the entire nation and a network of radar stations has been situated along the coastline for the detection of surface targets and low-flying aircraft. Pipelines have been laid to transport fuel from the ports to the major air and naval bases.

The program for the construction of Norway's Armed Forces and the development of the NATO infrastructure is requiring increasingly large expenditures. Norway's defense expenditures have increased from 370 million krone in 1949 to 5.5 billion in 1977 (more than 1 billion dollars), that is, they have increased by almost 15 times. In terms of per capita defense expenditures, Norway occupies the fourth place among the NATO countries. In the future, the burden of defense expenditures will apparently grow: NATO leaders have requested all members of the bloc to increase their defense expenditures by 3 percent each year.

Taking Norway's strategic position into consideration, the Pentagon has set specific tasks for the Norwegian Armed Forces. These were picturesquely described by Finnish Lieutenant-General Jorma Jarventausta: "The responsibilities of the Norwegian Armed Forces include the establishment of favorable conditions for the combat operations of Norway's allies--that is, as a 'scapegoat' of the NATO bloc, Norway is to raise its horns and contribute to the organized efforts of NATO."

Officially, Norway has not allowed American nuclear ammunition to be located on its territory, but, in practice, it is training its troops with a view to the possible use of atomic weapons and other means of mass destruction in time of war. As early as 1969, the Norwegian weekly ORIENTERING reported that, according to NATO's plans, "Norwegian troops will assist the Americans in the use of tactical atomic weapons" in northern Norway. In actuality, the nation attached itself to the NATO nuclear strategy long ago. After a nuclear planning committee was established as part of the NATO system in December 1966, Norway was recruited to participate in its work for the purpose of "consultation," and since 1 January 1970, it has taken a direct part in the compilation of plans for the use of nuclear weapons as a temporary member of the nuclear planning group.

The Pentagon has long regarded the northern European countries as a base for the extensive use of means of mass destruction, regardless of whether these nations are members of the NATO bloc or neutral powers. A few years

ago, STERN, a magazine published in the FRG, and the Italian ASTRO LIABIO reported the news of the secret "10-1" plan regarding the conduct of war in Europe. This plan envisaged the creation of "operational regions" for the conduct of war on the territories of all European nations, including the northern European countries (Norway, Denmark, Sweden and Finland). The existence of this plan signifies that the military leaders of the United States and NATO do not intend to consider the vital interests of not only the members of the bloc, but also of the neutral states in this region. Addressing a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee in August 1977, U.S. Secretary of Defense H. Brown announced that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was preparing an "unprecedented program" for the next 25 years which would guarantee NATO opportunities for the effective conduct of war. A short-range program was drawn up at the same time to increase the military preparedness and strength of NATO: the plan calls for the implementation of 140 measures agreed upon by each nation individually. Brown said that "the United States has already accelerated the creation of stocks of weapons and ammunition" on foreign territory and plans to situate means for the conduct of war in forward positions in advance. This program assigns an obviously subordinate role to the United States' allies: they will be given "extremely valuable guidelines for national programming and national support for the NATO program." In actuality, this means that the states belonging to NATO will be given future instructions on carrying out certain sections of the program and on financing the plans drawn up in the United States.

All of these facts indicate that the scandal in Oslo was not coincidental in any way. The secret illegal actions of the CIA and the Pentagon in Norway, which represented overt intervention in the affairs of this nation--and to the detriment of its relations with other nations--are the logical result of Norway's membership in NATO. The only coincidence in this entire affair was that Norwegians, including members of Parliament, learned about these actions.

8588

CSO: 1803

AMERICAN PUBLISHERS AT MOSCOW BOOK FAIR

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 57-58

[Article by V. A. Voyna]

[Text] The first Moscow international book fair and exhibit held this autumn attracted representatives from 1,531 publishing firms in 67 countries. Here, 100,000 books on all branches of knowledge and other types of printed materials in all of the world's major languages were exhibited. And although this was the first exhibit of this kind in Moscow, the publishers who attended it were of a unanimous opinion: Moscow is rapidly becoming one of the leading centers of the international book trade and the fairs that will be held here every 2 years will become an important event for those who write, publish and distribute the printed word.

Printed materials from American corporations and firms were widely represented in the pavillions of the Exhibit of National Economic Achievements. These firms included Times Mirror, Macmillan, Prentice-Hall, New American Library, Houghton Mifflin, Holt-Rinehart and Winston, Harper and Row, Addison-Wesley and others. More than 250 book titles were sent by the Association of [American] University Presses: its collective stand displayed the products of 49 central printing houses located in different states. Some 24 American publishing concerns had their own individual stands at the exhibit and such firms as Alfred Knopf and Farrar, Straus and Giroux sent representatives to Moscow to investigate new prospects for the book trade.

Small firms also took part in the exhibit along with larger publishing associations; these small firms included, for example, Ardis Publishers: all of the work in this publishing firm is done by Professor C. Proffer, slavic scholar, and members of his family (the firm specializes in the publication of works by Russian and Soviet authors, American literary experts and poets). The degree to which the publishing companies participated in the exhibit also differed--from a few dozen titles to the 500 books exhibited by the Prentice-Hall Company. On the whole, the almost 5,000 American books displayed at the fair provided some idea of the research being conducted in the United States in the area of science and technology, of current trends in art and of the present status and concerns of American literature.

Most of the books were purchased for Soviet libraries and for sale in book-stores and these purchases frequently involved partial editions rather than isolated copies. For example, a great deal of scientific literature was purchased from the Plenum Publishing Corporation, John Wiley and Sons and the Academic Press, printed materials were purchased from Time-Life Books and children's literature was purchased from Lerner Publications; the Times Mirror firm alone received orders for more than 40,000 different publications.

Finally, contracts were signed for the sale of copyrights, as a result of which Soviet and American readers will be able to acquire interesting new translations in the near future. As Leo Albert, head of Prentice-Hall, jokingly remarked, he signed so many contracts in Moscow that he felt like a popular movie star giving out autographs. But even his record was topped by William Halsey from the Macmillan concern: he bought the rights to the publication of 49 books by Soviet authors and will soon publish an entire library of Soviet science fiction in the United States, consisting of 100 books.

In a conversation with our correspondent, Leo Albert, chairman of the board of directors of Prentice-Hall, said that the next exhibit in Moscow, in 1979, will certainly be participated in by many more American publishers and the firms will be represented on an even higher level, since the Soviet book market appears to be quite promising.

"All of us are extremely pleased with the interest displayed in our books in Moscow," said L. Albert. "For us, the Soviet publishing market is a genuine discovery. I am convinced that the Moscow Book Fair has not only been distinguished by serious commercial success; the main thing is that it has become another step toward the development of relations between our nations."

8588

CSO: 1803

TIRE INDUSTRY

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 59-69

[Article by V. N. Glukhov]

[Summary] The tire industry is a relatively small but important branch of the processing industry. Its importance is mainly due to the fact that it serves one of the largest branches of the national economy--the automotive industry. It must react quickly to all technical, structural and other changes in this larger industry.

The United States produces around half of all the tires manufactured in the capitalist world. It is ahead of the other capitalist nations in terms of the technical level of production, the level of mechanization, the productivity of equipment and the automation of preparatory and warehousing operations. The tire industry occupies a relatively modest place in the American economy. The value of its production in current prices was 6.85 billion dollars in 1975, or only 0.7 percent of the total production of the processing industry. It employs around 100,000 persons, or 0.5 percent of the total manpower employed in the economy. Each year, approximately 200 million new tires are produced and 50 million used tires are reconditioned.

American tires are produced by 18 companies in 62 plants. The five largest companies produce 80 percent of all tires and more than 98 percent of the tires for new automobiles. American foreign trade in tires is developing briskly. But the United States has had an invariably passive balance in this trade in the 1970's. This has been due to several factors. In the first place, it has been difficult for foreign capital to enter the American tire industry because of strong competition by the more powerful local monopolies, which have protected themselves with every possible legislative barrier. For this reason, foreign firms have made their entry into the American tire market by means of intensive exports. In the second place, many of the American rubber monopolies have moved their plants overseas, where it is easier to make a profit through the exploitation of cheaper labor. In the third place, Japan and several of the Western European

countries are ahead of America in the development of new types of high-quality tires, including radial tires.

The tire industry is a relatively old branch of the American economy but it would be incorrect to regard it as an idle area of production. Substantial structural advances are constantly being made in this industry due to the incorporation of scientific and technical achievements, the augmentation of the product assortment and the modification of technology. The constant increase in the production of automobiles will ensure the continued growth of the tire industry in the future.

8588

CSO: 1803

BOOK REVIEWS

ANATOMY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY MACHINERY

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 70-72

[Review by Yu. A. Shvedkov of two books: "Remaking Foreign Policy. The Organizational Connection" by Graham Allison and Peter Szanton, New York, 1976, 258 pages; and "Appendices. Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy," June 1975. (In seven volumes). Washington, 1976]

[Text] Shortly before the present administration came to power in Washington, there was published in New York, under the auspices of the influential Council on International Relations, a book by Graham Allison and Peter Szanton, consisting of a critical analysis of the operations of the American foreign-policy mechanism and containing recommendations on how to restructure it by taking into account the present-day realities in the world. Somewhat earlier, after considerable delays, there were published in Washington seven volumes of research material relating to the activity of American foreign-policy organizations. This material was prepared back in 1974-75, for use by the official Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy, otherwise known as the "Murphy Commission." * The appearance of these volumes on the market had a peculiar political undertone.

The point is that Graham Allison, a Harvard professor, had been the principal researcher of the Murphy Commission on questions of defense policy and arms control, while Peter Szanton, the former head of the New York branch of the RAND Corporation, had been the Commission's director. Both of them proved to be in opposition to the leadership of the Commission, headed by Robert D. Murphy and David M. Abshire. The Commission spent about three million dollars, attracted more than 300 prominent researchers, and questioned hundreds of American embassies abroad as well as government offices in Washington -- only to reach some conclusions of very limited significance.

In the book under review, Allison and Szanton decided to outline their own views and recommendations which, moreover, are shared by many other authors of the material published by the Commission. The chairman of the Council on

*See issue No 6 of our journal for 1976, page 96 -- Ed.

International Relations, B. Manning, supported this idea and headed a group of prominent American politologists as they reviewed the manuscript of the book.

Unlike their predecessors, Allison and Szanton examine foreign policy as the product of a complex internal political struggle between different interests represented in the American government mechanism, and they see the make-up of this mechanism as reflecting the policy which defines certain interests, premises, and political perspectives. It is precisely because, throughout this book, there is carried the idea that while some specific form of organization of the foreign-policy mechanism does not necessarily determine the political content of a given policy -- much less its success -- some special characteristics of the present foreign-policy mechanism and the interplay of forces represented in it, do have an adverse effect upon policy.

Specifically, the authors seek to prove that America's present-day foreign-policy mechanism is outdated in many respects and no longer corresponds to the new realities both on the world stage and at home.

Since the time this mechanism was created, some profound changes have taken place in the world situation. "Erasing the borders" between foreign and domestic policy resulted in the drawing into the foreign policy sphere of a large number of government departments and agencies, though their functions were formerly exclusively in the domestic field. The organization, as set up in the 1940's, proved incapable of filtering the necessary information and insuring the taking of decisions on a broad range of new problems. "The resulting gap between the work which needs to be done and the means for doing it is not merely a sign of inefficiency, but is actually dangerous," state the authors. "This gap," they continue, "is the principal reason why, for 15 years, the White House tried to govern without the government, bypassing cabinet ministers and the Congress, all of which severely aggravated the isolation of the President and demoralized the competent officials, as well as embittered the relations between the executive branch and the Congress." (p XI).

Citing numerous examples of unsuccessful and ineffective decisions by the American government in the field of foreign policy -- relating to such things as Vietnam, the oil crisis, the status of the Panama canal and other problems-- Allison and Szanton come to the conclusion that the future will prove to be even more difficult. The authors advocate, first of all, the use of new forms and methods for an integrated examination of complex modern problems which involve both U.S. foreign policy and its domestic affairs, and the adoption of thoroughly evaluated decisions. For one thing, they urge the abolition of the outdated National Security Council and its replacement by an Executive Committee of cabinet officers. The appropriate reorganization, they suggest, should be carried out within the White House, the principal government departments, and in the Congress.

At the same time, both the Allison-Szanton book and the research material of the Murphy Commission demonstrate with complete clarity that the greatest

problem facing the U.S. government mechanism is the question of the role and influence of military and intelligence organizations in the formulation and implementation of the country's foreign policy. It is precisely these organizations which seek to impose, even today, the outdated, narrowly-military concepts of America's present-day "national security" problems as they promote purely military solutions for non-military situations and hold back the taking of overdue decisions in the field of arms limitation and disarmament. A striking example of such a stubborn policy on the part of the military is the fact that members of the Committee of the Joint Chiefs of Staff conditioned their acceptance of the ratification of the SALT agreement by demanding the urgent development of new systems of strategic weapons -- the Trident submarines and B-1 bombers, the neutron bomb, and winged missiles -- all of which could only render more difficult -- and, indeed, did render more difficult -- the further negotiations between the U.S. and the USSR. The yearning of the military departments for larger budgetary appropriations resulted systematically in a distortion of the information they were supplying regarding the correlation of the armed forces of the U.S. and the USSR. As Allison and Szanton note, "inasmuch as the principal official evaluations of the external threat are provided by the Department of Defense while it seeks to justify its budget, Soviet military might is usually exaggerated, while the American possibilities are underestimated." (p 183). And this is a very dangerous procedure.

In the opinion of many researchers who had participated in the work of the Murphy Commission, departmental prejudices and anti-communist views dating back to the Cold War days characterize also the positions of the CIA and other components of the so-called "intelligence community." This is convincingly described in the foreword to the Commission's material, written by the noted specialist in the field of American intelligence, H. H. Ransom. Commenting on the remarks of another specialist in the same field, W.J. Barnds, to the effect that, "even today, the efforts of the American intelligence community are focused largely on military considerations and the uncovering and evaluation of potential military threats," Ransom adds: "It is possible to find military threats which actually do not exist. In other words, the paranoid search for such threats usually leads to the discovery of the expected danger with the aid of distorted and selective evaluations." (Vol.VII, p.49).

It is characteristic that the attitude of the military and intelligence organizations in Washington -- negative as regards the relaxation of international tensions -- does not just show itself in purely military matters, such as the expansion of the arms budget or the development of new weapons systems, but also in many other areas such as, for example, the holding back of trade between the U.S. and the socialist countries. This subject is discussed in detail in the report prepared for the Murphy Commission by Robert E. Klitgaard and Richard Huff, dealing with restrictions on exports out of "national security" considerations. "Although Congress," write these authors, "adopted clearly and deliberately, in 1969, measures to change the objectives of the control over exports. . . these same bureaucrats continue to regulate and control exports, and they have not altered their views as to the importance of economic warfare." (Vol. IV, p 447). From this material

it becomes clear that this criticism is aimed primarily at the officials of the Pentagon who seek to regard any export of American goods to the Soviet Union and to other socialist countries from a narrow, military point of view. This criticism also involves the officials of the CIA who distribute tendentious evaluations of the development of science and technology in the socialist countries. As a result, say the authors, American firms lose hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of orders which are passed on, instead, to their Western European and Japanese competitors.

As a final point, it should be noted that many of the conclusions of the researchers of the Murphy Commission, with which the leadership of the Commission did not chose to agree, are continuing to find their way into the pages of the American scholarly and political literature. They are reflected in the articles of such prominent American specialists as B. Manning, Charles Yost, and others. The first steps of the Carter administration in the matter of reorganizing the government apparatus -- expanding, for one thing, the composition of the National Security Council through the inclusion in it of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers -- show that the White House is paying attention to the conclusions of the Murphy Commission researchers.

At the same time, one also cannot help but mention the fact that the maneuvers of the leading officials of the military and intelligence establishments, seeking to step up all the hullabaloo about the alleged "Soviet threat," merely show once more the great power of routine thinking and the narrowly departmental interests which still prevail in the American government mechanism.

5875
CSO: 1803

U.S.--SOUTHERN AFRICA: DIEHARDS RECOMMEND

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 72-74

[Review by T. V. Kuznetsova of the book "Trial in Africa: The Failure of U.S. Policy," by W. P. Yarborough. Washington, The Heritage Foundation, 1976, 86 pages]

[Text] The Democratic administration in Washington which took over from the Republican administration, continues to exert active diplomatic efforts in South Africa in order to prevent the overthrow of the Smith regime in Salisbury and that of Vorster in Pretoria by national-liberation forces supported by the "front-line" independent African states. In the light of these developments, the former Anglo-American plan for settling the situation in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), prepared by the Republican administration, had to be modified. The latest plan (the contents of which were made public early last October) contains a number of new premises, including the establishment of majority rule in the country in 1978, following a "transition period" during which Southern Rhodesia would be governed and prepared for "general elections" by a "resident commissioner" appointed by London, while "armed forces of the U.N." would be introduced into the country.

Generally speaking, the policy of Washington and London with respect to the South Rhodesia problem, which was artificially separated from that of the problem of the Republic of South Africa, was designed to prevent the coming to power in Salisbury of "radical groups" and to assist "moderate leaders" of the native population of South Rhodesia. The U.S. and Britain thereby would like to assist the formation in South Rhodesia of the kind of government which would be guided, in its foreign and domestic policy, by the economic, political and strategic interests of the U.S. and other Western countries in South Africa, and which would support good-neighborly relations with the Republic of South Africa. Still, the attempts of both Washington and London to achieve a "peaceful solution" in the South of the African continent by means of methods much more flexible than formerly, reflect an element of realism: neither the U.S. nor England can afford to ignore the extremely explosive nature of the situation in South Africa and the growing rate at which the relationship of forces has been changing in favor of the liberation movements.

Washington's "new African policy," as applied to the South African region, has raised severe criticism among the independent African states, including

the "front-line" states such as Tanzania, Zambia, Mozambique and Angola, since it is well understood there that the "good services" of the U.S. are dictated primarily by a desire to gain time and achieve the kind of settlement that would, to a maximum extent, meet the interests of the white minority and the general interests of imperialism -- including the South African variety of sub-imperialism."

At the same time, the flexibility which Washington is obliged to use, arouses active attacks on it at home, on the part of representatives of America's most aggressive imperialistic circles. These circles accuse the administration of "irresponsible liberalism" and of "conniving with communist penetration into Africa," etc. Such hardliners exert considerable, and, often, effective pressure on the administration. Their influence is reflected in the formulation of basic trends in the "new African policy" and in carrying out specific actions in this connection.

A book recently published under the auspices of the conservative "Heritage Foundation" and entitled "Trial in Africa: The Failure of U.S. Policy" is of definite interest in studying the broad spectrum of the origins and perspectives of this new policy. The author of the book is the retired Lieutenant-General William Yarborough, and he accuses the administration of insufficient understanding of the situation in Africa -- especially in South Africa -- a fact which, in his opinion, results in a weakness of the American position as regards the independent African states and in "excessive toughness" toward the regimes in Salisbury and Pretoria. The author calls upon Washington to "learn the lesson of Vietnam" so as not to attempt to transplant onto the soil of Southern Africa and the Republic of South Africa "the American democratic form of government" -- including the right of universal suffrage. (p 50).

First of all, the general insists on total elimination of restrictions on trade with Southern Rhodesia and the South African republic, since doing so, he says, would be in the "national interest of the U.S." Recalling the growing dependence of the U.S. upon energy-producing raw materials, the general stresses the fact that the territory of the Republic of South Africa contains the richest reserves of uranium, needed to meet the requirements of the atomic energy industry. For this reason, he says, the U.S. should display a "political and psychological" maturity, in order to eliminate the "obstacles which interfere with the purchase of uranium in the South African republic." (p 69).

The general also reminds his readers that the U.S. produces only 10 percent of such an extremely important metal as chrome, while Southern Rhodesia has the most abundant reserves of this metal. The U.S. is also forced to import cobalt, platinum, lead, nickel, copper, etc. -- all of which are present in abundance in Africa, including South Africa. For this reason, says Yarborough, "the central theme of American national strategy must be the assurance of an uninterrupted input of all these raw materials into our economic system, which, in turn, requires a coordinated and mutually interrelated foreign, economic, psychological and military policy, which would give full meaning to the national strategy." (p 70).

As a military man, the author of this volume devotes special attention to the strategic importance of the South African region for the "defense" of the

seaways around the Cape of Good Hope, and he blames the Washington administration for failing to "understand" and thus underestimating the role of the South African republic in the overall military strategy of the West. (pp 55-56).

The author reinforces his demands for all possible U.S. government assistance to the regimes of Smith and Vorster by asserting that keeping these regimes in power and strengthening them meets not only the interests of the United States but also those of the Africans themselves. Unlike the situation in many other African countries, suggests the general, "individual rights" and "human dignity" flourish both in Southern Rhodesia and in the Republic of South Africa, since these are countries of "law and order," while "terrorism, threats and subversion are the very antidotes of legality" and "it is precisely this fact that the United States should bear in mind in its approach to the African problems." (p 81).

The general writes approvingly of the policy of "bantustanization" being carried out by the Vorster regime, which resulted, as is known, in the formation in 1976 of the "independent state" of Transkei on the territory of the South African republic. He describes this policy as a policy of "detente" with the black population of the South African republic (p 77). Calling for the support of such a policy, he insists on efforts to "prevent a Soviet campaign designed to isolate South Africa even more than it is from any moral, political or economic support" of the "rest of the world." (p 55).

At the same time, he thinks that the U.S. should "reject any kind of support for any group seeking, by force or subversion, to overthrow the governments of Rhodesia and the South African Republic." (p 77).

As for the recommendations of this "Africanist" general regarding overall directions of the American policy with respect to all countries of black Africa, his views fully correspond to certain aspects of Washington's "new African policy." Here we find recommendations to support, in every possible way, the principles of "free enterprise," as well as recommendations to provide economic support for those African states the economy of which is formed on the "Western pattern," and to propagandize in every possible way the "successes and bright perspectives of the economy of Western-oriented economies" while seeking, at the same time, "constantly to uncover flaws in Marxist economic projects." (pp 74, 75).

The author calls for close coordination of efforts by the U.S. and former colonial powers in order "not to permit any further aggravation of African economies modeled by Europeans," and he urges in this connection the use of the experience gained in colonial times. "It is necessary to look up the old colonial plans and projects, shake off the dust, and study them all over again, while taking Africa's new character into account," he says. (p 73). All this would, of course, reflect efforts directed at "suborning the course of events to American interests." (p 83).

The recommendations of those circles for whom General Yarborough and The Heritage Foundation can be regarded as spokesmen, have had -- and continue to have-- considerable influence upon the formulation of Washington's official "new African policy" and one can assert with assurance that these recommendations will yet result in a good many policy failures in the future.

A CHRONIC MALADY

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 74-77

[Review by N. V. Bogacheva of the book "Living Together. A Study of Regional Disparities." Ottawa, Economic Council of Canada, 1977, 247 pages]

[Text] Severe disparities in the level of socio-economic development of the various regions of Canada, as evidenced by the existence of extensive "regions of poverty" and chronic unemployment, contribute to the aggravation of social contradictions in the nation and to a serious crisis in federal-provincial relations. Different government organs are trying to work out measures designed to bring about a "balanced" development of regional economy. Nevertheless, despite major financial expenditures by the Federal government, the results achieved so far in this respect remain minimal. To a considerable extent, this is precisely what has prompted such an authoritative organ as the Economic Council of Canada (the ECC) -- a consultative organization responsible to Parliament, and seeking to define and implement solutions to the country's socio-economic problems -- to intensify its research in the field of regional problems so as to develop some new directions and methods for carrying out regional policy. As a result of a three-year effort, a special research group of the ECC has now published a report entitled "Living Together. A Study of Regional Disparities."

The report analyzes the results of state regulation in the area of regional economies of Canada during the past 15 years. It lists the ECC's research findings regarding regional disparities, and makes certain recommendations in search for ways to overcome such disparities in matters of income levels and unemployment.

In analyzing the origin of these disparities, the authors write that ever since the formation of the Canadian Confederation, the pattern of the territorial economic structure was dependent primarily upon the characteristics of geographic location, the level of available transportation network, and the distribution of natural resources. Next, the view is expressed that during the last half-century and compared with traditional sources, there has been a constant rise in the importance of such factors as the "quality of the labor force" in a given

region, the unequal level of utilization of the latest technology, and differences in the levels of urbanization which were formerly underestimated, (such as differences in the breakdown of the economy by branches, the volume of capital investment, assured availability of resources, and various transportation possibilities). (pp 8, 9, 213).

In assessing the condition of regional disparities as regards the level of per capita income and the amount of unemployment, the ECC was forced to recognize that, despite a certain decline in such differences, "regional disparities in income level and job opportunity continue to be very real and stable." (p 60). Thus the average per capita income in Ontario continuously exceeds the corresponding figures in the Atlantic provinces by 20 to 30 percent. And as for differences in unemployment levels during the past 20 years, they have been, on the average, twice as great in the Atlantic provinces as in Ontario.

The report devotes much attention to a study of the problems related to regional fluctuations in the levels of labor productivity, which the authors accept as the principal factor determining income level. In this connection they assert that the per capita volume of production being turned out by the work force in each of the industrial branches determines the level of labor productivity to a greater extent than does the industrial structure of the economy of a given region. Moreover, the ECC emphasizes that significant factors in any increase in labor productivity of a given region are the "quality of the labor force," which depends upon the level of education, age, and sex, as well as the use of the latest technology, expansion of scientific research and development work, and improvements in the management system. By way of example, the authors cite data showing the Atlantic provinces as lagging behind all other regions of Canada in the matter of using the latest technology. This, in the authors' opinion, is one of the principal reasons for the continuing depressed state of the economy of this area. (p 98).

In one of the principal chapters of the study under review, the Economic Council advances the proposal for a policy of "stabilization," differentiated according to regions, as one of the new methods of regional policy, directed toward a reduction of regional disparities in the level of unemployment. Pointing to a number of technical and political obstacles in the way of carrying out such a policy, the authors nevertheless seek to defend the realism of their idea and make two specific proposals for carrying it out. The report states that, by implementing a policy aimed at stabilizing the level of overall demand by regions, it is possible to pursue, at one and the same time, two objectives. In the first place, the Federal government can use, in various ways, the usual means of regional financial policy, in line with the respective levels of unemployment in each region. Secondly, the provincial authorities themselves can carry out a financial policy of their own, within the framework of their own province, aimed at stimulating the demand for goods and services, resulting in a decline of the levels of unemployment. (p 120).

The authors of the report also raise the question of the interrelationship of regional disparities in the level of urbanization, the profile of the urban population, and any disparities in the rates of population growth, per capita

income level, and unemployment. Having arrived at the conclusion that the rates of population growth and income levels increase in direct proportion to the size of the city, the authors express the view that measures designed to increase urbanization and change the structure of the municipal population in individual regions, could make a definite contribution toward reducing the regional disparities in income level and population growth. At the same time, the report notes that there is little likelihood of such measures having any effect upon reducing the disparity of unemployment levels.

The ECC identifies the following as the basic objectives of regional policy: a reduction in differences among regions with respect to unemployment levels and the number of available jobs; elimination of regional disparities in social security levels; a reduction in differences in the life style and the rates of growth, and availability of jobs in the principal "socio-cultural" regions of the country. The authors point out that there exists a number of contradictions between the objectives of regional policy and certain objectives of national policy. Thus, for example, they point out that while the diversification of industrial branches in each region has a positive effect upon the reduction of disparity of income levels and the rate of unemployment, it may also lower the total gross national product. In this connection, the ECC examines the possibility of resolving each of such potential conflict situations on an individual basis. (pp 17, 18).

Also of some interest is the chapter in the report devoted to the theories of bourgeois economists in the field of regional disparities. The report examines five such fundamental theoretical approaches: one involving raw materials, and the others -- the growth theory, and neoclassical, keynesian, and regionalist thinking. Here is how the authors themselves describe these various approaches: "Not one of these economic theories can explain the essence of the regional disparities, since there exists so far, among the economists, no clear concept regarding the theoretical approach to this question." (p 23). As for regional policy being carried out in Canada, the study points out that it is not based on any of the theories mentioned, but that individual premises identified with one or another of these schools of thought are occasionally used in the development of current policy.

A special place in the report is reserved for a description of measures being taken by the Ministry of Regional Economic Development (MRED) to smoothen regional disparities, and an assessment of the efficacy of these measures. Recipients of financial support from the MRED ministry are divided by the ECC into four separate groups. These involve: direct financing of the private sector for the purpose of stimulating the development of industry in individual regions; the subsidizing of a program for the development of a regional infrastructure; a program for financial aid to agricultural regions, designed to improve the infrastructure in agricultural communities and improve production methods in areas of raw-material specialization; and, finally, the program for financing the area of labor resources and scientific research and development.

In the closing section of the report, the ECC comes to the conclusion that "disparities in Canada are extremely profound" and are much more significant than many members of the Council had originally believed. (p 21).

The authors point out that a study of the experience of other capitalist countries in the solution of their respective regional problems did not reveal any new effective methods that Canada could use in order to reduce its own regional socio-economic disparities. The authors divide their recommendations on the subject into two parts: The first one, aiming at reducing the existing disparities in labor productivity, and the second -- designed to reduce differences in the levels of unemployment. The ECC believes that it is necessary to urge the provincial ministries to increase their own participation in the matter of carrying out measures designed to eliminate regional disparities.

The lack of results from the efforts of Canada's federal authorities to lower regional disparities clearly demonstrates the deadlocked condition of the state-monopoly regulation of the regional economy and the lack of validity of bourgeois theories on this subject. This, too, is clearly seen in this report of the ECC, wherein the authors concede, somewhat in a mood of self-criticism, that "we do not doubt that this report will be found to have failed to meet all requirements, because it does not provide too many clear-cut conclusions in many areas of the analysis described, while on many of the subjects it does not provide any conclusions at all." (p215).

For our part, let us note that, in preparing this report, the research group of the ECC, despite its authoritative makeup, undertook a task that was plainly beyond it. The reason for this is the insurmountable barrier to the achievement of proportional development of regional economies inherent in the very system of capitalist economy, based on private property and the domination of the monopolies, which continuously seek to maximalize their own profits at any price--including that of a disparate development of the economy. As Lenin already once pointed out, "in the world of capitalism there never was -- and never can be-- any uniform, harmonious or proportional development." Under conditions of the domination of monopoly capital, measures taken by the state shall not eliminate any disparities in regional development. At best, they could -- and, even so, only temporarily -- abate or, rather, veil the negative consequences of the capitalist methods of managing the economy.

5875

CSO: 1803

PROBLEMS OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77, pp 77-78

[Review by V. S. Sheyin of the book "Yadernoye Razoruzheniye" (Nuclear Disarmament) by A. E. Yefremov. Moscow, "Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya," 1976, 302 pages]

[Text] The book under review is devoted to a study of one of the key problems of modern times -- the problem of preventing a nuclear war and bringing about nuclear disarmament.

The book stresses the fact that throughout the postwar period the Soviet government has been waging a stubborn struggle for nuclear disarmament and that it is continuing to do so to this day. The vital need for such disarmament was pointed out, for one thing, at the XXVth Congress of the CPSU. The author examines the concrete practical steps in this direction taken by the USSR, starting with the initial ones, undertaken by this country as far back as the latter part of the 1940's. He notes that in June 1947 the USSR had already proposed the signing of a convention banning the production and utilization of nuclear weapons. However, the United States refused to conclude such a pact. The book emphasizes that America's refusal to accept a ban on atomic weapons had serious negative consequences and, for one thing, stimulated the development of atomic weapons in England, France, and China.

The question of the creation of nuclear-free zones is also analyzed in detail. In this connection, the author notes the duplicity of the position of the Western powers, which rushed to reject their own proposals, containing some rational elements, as soon as they found that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries were showing an interest in them. Examined in detail here is also the initiative of the USSR and its allies which received wide recognition under the title of the "Rapacki plan," calling for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe, as well as similar Soviet proposals.

A special section of the book is devoted to the question of banning nuclear arms tests, which create a serious danger to the population through radioactive fallout. The author analyzes in detail all stages of the Soviet struggle in favor of banning nuclear tests and reveals the specifics of the American

position, in which the U.S. Government, on one hand, opposed the conclusion of a treaty for a total ban on all nuclear tests, and, on the other -- could not ignore the will of the overwhelming majority of countries which were demanding an end to nuclear blasts. Under these conditions, the signing in Moscow, in August 1963, of the Moscow Treaty on banning nuclear tests in three spheres, was a major victory for the peace-loving forces. The author of the book under review stresses the great importance of this treaty.

Discussing the problem of nonproliferation of nuclear arms, the author cites some interesting data showing the growth of the technical production facilities for the manufacture of atomic bombs. Actually, even in the 1960's, a number of other countries, including West Germany, Italy, and others, also had the potential possibility of becoming nuclear powers. By that time, the prevention of further proliferation of nuclear weapons had become one of the most pressing problems of the day. Sharp disputes arose in the political circles of some countries -- including the United States -- over ways to resolve this problem. On the whole, however, American ruling circles themselves shared this concern over the proliferation of nuclear weaponry. The viewpoints of the socialist and capitalist countries on this question thus came much closer together, which made it possible to conclude the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Atomic Weapons, which came into force on 5 March 1970.

At the same time, the Soviet Union and the socialist countries sought to hold down the arms race. The author tells of the efforts of the USSR directed -- among other things -- at banning the use of cosmic space for military purposes. An important achievement in this respect was the signing of the 1967 treaty on principles to guide the activity of states in the matter of research and utilization of cosmic space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. This treaty, stresses the author of the book, represents new evidence of both the feasibility and indispensability of joint efforts to impose maximum restrictions in the field of permissible nuclear weapons, with a view toward eventual nuclear disarmament. Of great importance, too, is the treaty on banning the placement of nuclear arms -- or other weapons of mass destruction -- in the depths of the seas or in the ground beneath their bottom, concluded in 1971.

The most important chapter in the book is the one devoted to an analysis of measures taken by the USSR to carry out the Program for Peace, advanced by the XXIVth Congress of the CPSU. The author evaluates the development of Soviet-American relations, analyzes the struggle of opposing tendencies in American ruling circles, writes of the specific achievements of Soviet-American negotiations, and describes the Soviet-American treaties and agreements signed between the two sides during the first half of the 1970's, -- including the treaty on the limitation of anti-missile defense systems and the provisional agreement on certain measures in the field of limiting strategic offensive weapons, as well as the further course of negotiations between the two powers on questions of relaxing the threat of nuclear war and strengthening international security. The book also points out the inconsistencies of the American position, running counter to the spirit of the agreements already signed between the two sides, and tending toward an expansion of the arms race in areas not specifically covered in the agreements.

The book under review consistently examines also the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and weapons in Central Europe. It tells of the struggle of the USSR and other socialist states for strengthening the principle of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and describes efforts directed at resolving the problem of a total halt of all nuclear testing. It also reveals the activity of opponents of disarmament and detente not only in the United States but also in other capitalist countries and shows the dangerous role of Peking, which counteracts efforts designed to overcome international tensions.

Yefremov's book contains a wealth of factual material. In writing it, the author had access to the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR. It represents the first complete analysis of the problem of nuclear disarmament produced in our country.

5875
CSO: 1803

THE THIRD PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian. No 12, Dec 77, pp 78-79

[Review by V.V.Sogrin of the book "Tomas Dzhefferson" (Thomas Jefferson) by G. N. Sevost'yanov and A.I. Utkin. Moscow, "Mysl'," 1976, 392 pages]

[Text] Thomas Jefferson was the first Secretary of State, the second Vice-President and the third President of the United States. He was one of the nation's "founding fathers" and headed the original political grouping of "Republicans." But it is by no means any of these positions that ensured him an outstanding place in American history. Jefferson's true greatness consists of the fact that he, together with Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Paine, exerted an enormous influence upon the formulation of the democratic ideological-political tradition in the United States. The book under review is devoted precisely to an analysis of this influence.

Even at the beginning of his political activity, during the struggle of the North American colonies for independence, Jefferson acted as one of the most outstanding representatives of the left wing of the patriotic movement. When he was entrusted, in 1776, with the task of preparing the Declaration of Independence -- the unique political manifesto of the American revolution-- Jefferson boldly transformed it by substituting the right to seek happiness for the traditional interpretation of natural rights as taught by John Locke, which involved the right to ownership of property. Unlike Locke, whose views were respected by the bourgeois patriots like the Holy Writ, Jefferson believed that land was originally awarded to men for their common possession. As the book shows, the democratic spirit permeated Jefferson's struggle for socio-political transformation in his native Virginia, where, for a brief period, he was governor of the state, starting in 1779. Despite the desperate resistance of the conservative bloc of plantation owners headed by Edmund Pendleton, he had a good measure of success in this struggle. Evidence of this can be seen in laws abolishing entail and primogeniture of land property and reaffirming religious freedom -- all of them passed on Jefferson's initiative.

The book examines many of Jefferson's advanced ideas regarding the people's sovereignty, the right of each generation to alter the constitution according

to their own views, and many others. At the same time, the authors should have devoted more attention to those traits of Jefferson's world view which reveal not so much the harmony as the contradictions in some of his positions. A good many times Jefferson sacrificed his democratic principles to the will of the dominating class. After 1776, he rejected the idea of a free allocation of 50 acres of land to each of the poor, and he supported the plantation owners in urging the sale of government-owned land. Following the establishment of a bourgeois republic in the United States -- and plainly idealizing its concept-- Jefferson concluded that the right of a people to a revolutionary overthrow of a regime they don't like -- as proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence-- had already been exercised here, once and for all. Advocating a gradual liberation of black regions, Jefferson believed it indispensable to pursue, in the future, an expatriation of blacks from the United States. These points of Jefferson's thinking do not vitiate, of course, his general assessment as an outstanding representative of bourgeois democracy. But it is nevertheless important to point them out.

The authors discuss at a somewhat exaggerated length the political battles of Thomas Jefferson while he was Secretary of State and, later, President. On questions of domestic and foreign policy he sought to resist the federalists-- the party of Alexander Hamilton -- which determinedly urged the development of the United States along the path of industrial capitalism, which Jefferson branded as the English way. Himself, he dreamt of another, socially homogeneous America of farmers, in which the small and medium-size land owners enjoy the fruits of their own labor. Such dreams inevitably came to naught as they clashed with the logic and laws of bourgeois progress, and President Jefferson was forced to capitulate before the demands of capitalist development. But, as the book justly shows, to the end of his life he never reconciled himself to the extremes of the social consequences of capitalist progress. In this, he was primarily concerned over the fate of political democracy in the United States.

5875
CSO: 1803

AN ANALYSIS OF AMERICAN STATISTICAL POLICY

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian, No 12, Dec 77, pp 79-80

[Review by E. F. Zhukov of the book "SSHA: Izmereniye Ekonomicheskovo Rosta" (USA: Measuring Economic Growth) by A.A. Poduzov, V.G. Klinov, and A.V. Morozov. Moscow, "Nauka," 1976, 246 pages]

[Text] The study of the theory and methods of American statistics is being carried out by the authors of this book from the positions of Marxist-Leninist political economy and statistics, and covers the system of leading indicators which characterize different components of economic growth -- production and distribution of the output, reproduction of basic funds and labor resources, the dynamism of the price structure, etc.

The most interesting and profound chapters in the book would seem to be those wherein the authors analyze the basic concepts and methodology of bourgeois statistics of economic growth. They justly share the position of those Soviet economists who believe that, under conditions of the scientific-technical revolution, the sphere of public production in the United States, includes those branches of the economy which deal with the production of material goods, also a number of others, involving the production of services as well as those which create a non-material form of wealth. In saying this, the authors juxtapose the Marxist principles of assessing the results of economic growth, based on the theory of labor costs, to the bourgeois economic concepts, based on the theory of production factors and the limit of usefulness. (p 11). Such tenets, serving as the basis of the methodology of American statistics, result in numerous distortions in the assessment of the economic growth of the U.S., tending to exaggerate its real level. The authors convincingly prove this by means of juxtaposing a critical analysis of the statistical mechanism and the actual economic processes taking place in the postwar economy of the U.S. In this connection, much attention is devoted in the book under review to statistics dealing with the gross national product -- the decisive indicator of economic growth.

The stormy development of the scientific-technical revolution contributes to a rapid change in the type of production. Taking this change into account therefore constitutes a most important factor for evaluating real economic

growth. The book cites numerous examples to show that, despite great interest in this problem, neither American scholars nor official statistical organs of the U.S. have so far been able to arrive at positive conclusions.

Much space in the monograph is devoted to an analysis of labor statistics. The authors cite extensive information regarding the size and level of utilization of labor resources, their structure by sex, age, professional branches and education, and also the pay involved for various types of labor. Of definite interest in the study of growth is also the indicator of the disposition of working time, based on data collected from a study of households.

One of the chapters in the monograph enables the reader to trace the growth rate of national wealth and, first of all, its most important element -- basic capital -- which represents an important factor of economic growth. This chapter analyzes also both the positive and the negative aspects of statistical parameters of basic funds and capital investments. For one thing, the monograph examines the flaws in the system of methodology of computing official evaluations of basic funds and capital investments in both the private and government sectors.

The theoretical concepts of American statistics are not always presented in the book in an adequately systematic manner. The book also lacks a synthesized conclusion, representing the final conclusions of the research, some parts of which are repetitious and overly descriptive. Nevertheless, it is quite obvious that the authors have carried out a big job in analyzing American statistics and have exposed the apologetic essence of the principal indicators of economic growth. Having carried out an important and needed investigation of the conceptual bases of statistics, they went through a large amount of literature by American and Soviet authors on this subject, analyzing some tendencies of state-monopoly policy, with extensive use of statistical-mathematical methodology.

5875
CSO: 1803

FOOD AS POLITICAL 'CARROT' AND 'STICK'

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 81-82

[Article by N. S. Beglova]

[Text] "Food Bungle in Bangladesh," an article printed in the Summer 1977 issue of FOREIGN POLICY,¹ discusses the food problem--an exceptionally acute problem for the developing countries since the beginning of the 1970's. The authors, D. McHenry (now deputy U.S. representative to the UN Security Council and, at the time when the article was written, head of a Carnegie Foundation research group) and K. Bird (a journalist who has visited Bangladesh three times), described the workings of Washington's policy on food assistance, which, as is made clear in the article, is not at all based on sympathy for the hungry.

The authors chose Bangladesh as the subject of their study because no other nation has received such huge quantities of American food in recent years. Between 1972 and 1977, the United States sent aid in the amount of 1.08 billion dollars to Bangladesh, and most of this aid was in the form of food. Nonetheless, according to the most conservative estimates, "more than 2 million persons have died precisely of malnutrition in Bangladesh since 1971."

According to McHenry and Bird, the chief flaw in the U.S. program is that "political rather than humanitarian considerations play the deciding role in the rendering of food assistance." The authors state that these considerations are based on a desire to make Bangladesh able to resist "Indian hegemony" and an attempt to "restore balance on the subcontinent."

The rendering of American food assistance to Bangladesh, which is based on "Public Law 480" and is called the "Food for Peace" program, has become one of the basic sources of cheap subsidized food products for the already comfortable--and, it must be added, influential--strata of the national population, as well as the police, the army and the bureaucracy. According to the authors' calculations, "less than 10 percent of the food is used to feed the hungry."

1. FOREIGN POLICY, No 27, Summer 1977, pp 73-86.

American food assistance generally takes two forms: the delivery of inexpensive (subsidized) products on credit (long-term loans with low interest rates are granted to cover their cost) and nonrefundable food assistance in "critical situations." As the authors of the article point out, the food delivered to Bangladesh on credit and the food delivered for free was sent to the Bangladesh Government with the special consent of the American Congress and was later sold, and was not distributed without cost to the needy, as stipulated in "PL 480." In the authors' words, this was done for the purpose of "supporting the national budget." As a result, "from 14 to 18 percent of budget revenues" in Bangladesh in recent years have consisted of sums derived from the sale of products in the domestic market that have been delivered to Bangladesh in the form of aid. McHenry and Bird remark that this has created the "budgetary dependence" of Bangladesh on the United States. All of this inhibits the construction of the Bangladesh economy and its escape from foreign, primarily American, dependence. In this way, the authors remark, "food assistance has become the 'carrot' used by the American Government in its 'carrot and stick' policy."

The way in which American food assistance to Bangladesh was used in the capacity of the "stick" was described in prominent Western economist Emma Rothschild's study entitled "Food Politics." In this study, which was first printed in FOREIGN AFFAIRS and then in abridged form in the NEW YORK TIMES, the author states that, as a result of Washington's dissatisfaction with the policies of Mujibur Rahman's government, which adhered to a socialist course, the United States stopped all food deliveries to Bangladesh in the beginning of 1974 and the nation was forced to purchase American food at the market price. By the summer of 1974, Bangladesh was unable to pay for the food it had ordered. Bangladesh representatives requested the Chase Manhattan Bank for a loan but their request was denied. The United States also stopped all of its free grain deliveries. The Bangladesh Government had to cancel its contracts for the acquisition of approximately a month's supply of imported grain. All of this caused great difficulties in the public food supply and complicated the political situation in the nation.

After the coup in August 1975, however, when the power in Bangladesh was seized by forces which proceeded to establish close contacts with the Western nations, especially the United States, American food deliveries to Bangladesh, as food assistance expert D. Morgan points out, were rapidly resumed. During the 1976 fiscal year (which ended on 30 September 1976), the United States delivered 400,000 tons of wheat, 150,000 tons of rice and 40,000 tons of cooking oil for a sum of 128.6 million dollars to Bangladesh within the framework of the Food for Peace Program.²

The conclusion drawn by D. McHenry and K. Bird, that American "food assistance and deliveries of weapons serve the same political and strategic goals," does not sound all that paradoxical in light of these facts.

8588

CSO: 1803

2. THE WASHINGTON POST, 24 November 1976.

BOSS RICHARD J. DALEY OF CHICAGO

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 83-92

[Conclusion of Russian translation of the book "Boss Richard J. Daley of
Chicago" by Mike Royko, New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1971]

[Not translated by JPRS]

CSO: 1803

NEW STAGE IN DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTROMOBILE

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 93-106

[Article by B. P. Gushcho-Malkov]

[Summary] The interest in the electromobile in American industry has been sustained by the constant rise in the pollution and noise levels of automotive transport and by recent achievements in the development of new sources of energy. Growing interest in this type of vehicle was particularly noticeable during the recent gas crisis, which was accompanied by a rise in gasoline prices and the lowering of the speed limit on the American highways. Electromobiles are used in two major areas in the United States: industrial transport and intraurban transport.

The American firms producing these vehicles have concentrated mainly on the development and practical use of small delivery and passenger electromobiles with traditional storage cell systems. These vehicles are used for the delivery of groceries, mail, medicine and other transport services with a fixed route and time schedule.

Government programs for the development of electromobiles are being carried out in France, the FRG, Japan and the United States. The American program is to be conducted in three stages. During the first stage, several hundred electromobiles are to be produced and the possibilities for the use of these vehicles on a large scale are to be investigated. During the second stage, at least 2,500 passenger and transport electromobiles are to be manufactured with improved battery systems. They are to have a maximum speed of at least 80 kilometers per hour and should not cost more than 5,000 dollars after their mass production has been instituted. Finally, the last stage of the program envisages the production of 5,000 electromobiles with their subsequent testing under the conditions of mass utilization by various government agencies and private enterprises.

At present, a two-seater of this type costs around 3,000 dollars. This is a relatively high price but the operational expenditures average around 9 dollars a month. American firms are now using electrobuses with 20-30 seats for intraurban transport. The initial cost of these buses is higher

than that of ordinary buses but the cost of their operation and technical maintenance is only half as high. These buses are used for passenger transport in several American cities, but not on the scale on which they are used in Japan and some European countries.

According to estimates, the sale of several hundred thousand electromobiles annually by American firms should begin in 1980, and by 1985-1990, there should be 70-93 million such vehicles in the United States. By the year 2000, electromobiles could account for up to 25 percent of all new automobiles produced in the nation.

8588

CSO: 1803

HARRIS POLLS

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 107-112

[Article by M. M. Petrovskaya]

[Summary] According to American experts, the survey methods used by the Harris and Gallup firms for the study of public opinion are the most scientific and the results of their polls are the most accurate. Louis Harris, the head of Louis Harris and Associates, began the study of public opinion and market research in 1947 when he was employed by the Roper firm. Since 1956, when Harris founded his own firm, he had conducted more than 1,500 surveys on issues in trade, industry, finance, government activities, etc., as well as several sociological and psychological research projects.

From 1956 through 1963, most of the surveys conducted by the Harris firm were contracted by political candidates. Harris was one of President Kennedy's few trusted confidants. In the election campaign of 1960, he advised the president on campaign issues and strategy. As a result of his work with the president, Harris acquired nationwide fame and his firm became one of the leading American centers for the study of public opinion.

In 1963, Harris signed a contract with the WASHINGTON POST and began to write a syndicated column for this newspaper. He also began to conduct polls for NEWSWEEK. The results of these surveys served as the basis for many works on the racial problem in the United States. Harris himself wrote two of these books. In 1969, the firm signed a contract with the Time-Life Corporation, giving this corporation the exclusive rights to the publication of the Harris polls.

In 1973, the Harris firm conducted a special survey in connection with the current "crisis of authority" in Washington--the first nationwide survey sanctioned by the American Congress. The results of this poll served as the basis for subsequent Senate hearings. The firm has been doing more work in the international sphere and has conducted surveys for tourist organizations, transnational corporations and international banking concerns.

Louis Harris and Associates consists of a headquarters in New York and 60 local branches. During 1970-1975, the firm's operational volume more than tripled and his gross income in 1972 exceeded 5 million dollars. Louis Harris still oversees the operations of his organization and personally conducts interviews several times each year so that he will not lose direct contact with the public.

The Harris firm uses the method of random sampling in its polls. This means that any citizen can be one of the persons interviewed and that his inclusion or exclusion from the sample group will depend only on chance. The polls are conducted in at least 100 different locations throughout the nation. Interviewers visit a specified number of homes, usually 16, in each location and, consequently, the nationwide Harris polls generally involve a minimum of 1,600 respondents. The sample group is carefully verified for the proper proportional distribution of individuals by age, sex, income and race. All interviews are conducted by well-trained pollsters in the home of the respondent.

8588

CSO: 1803

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF COMMUNIST PARTY USA

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 113-122

[Text] Sixty years ago, the Russian working class, under the guidance of the great party of Bolshevik communists, led the oppressed people and poverty-stricken peasants in a victorious attack on capitalism. Together, they raised a mighty fist to the decayed old order and smashed it to smithereens, because this was the only way of satisfying the urgent need of the people for "peace, land and bread." This was the beginning, as the brilliant Lenin predicted, of the deepest and uninterrupted worldwide revolutionary process in history. Its inevitable result can only be the eradication of the capitalist system and the establishment of peace, socialism and, ultimately, communism everywhere on our planet.

The Great October Socialist Revolution had an equal and unprecedented effect on its friends and on his enemies.

Americans and worldwide imperialist circles rudely "greeted" this epoch-making event with savage hysteria, support for counterrevolutionary forces and military intervention. But the entire host invading Russia was unable, due to its confusion and disorder, to "get together."

Six months after November 1917, the NEW YORK TIMES contemptuously remarked: "Russia is merely a geographic term and will never be anything else. Its ability to unite, organize and rebel has been lost forever." We have no doubt that this arrogant newspaper has learned something about the power of socialism during the last 60 years, but this has not saved it from new stupid remarks and errors, which are still numbered among its sins even today. As the foremost newspaper of the monopoly anti-Soviet press in the world, the NEW YORK TIMES is a perfect example of the dangerous and blind conceit that is inherent in each exploitative class condemned by history.

In contrast to this reaction, the working people of the world saw the events of 7 November as the true beginning of the realization of all their ambitions. They greeted these events with a loud "hooray." Socialist Russia was defended by an unprecedented wave of internationalism and demonstrations of solidarity by the working class.

The workers in the United States and the rest of the world gave Soviet Russia material assistance and organized demonstrations and strikes to protest the imperialist blockades and intervention. As early as 1906, the great thinker William Du Bois addressed an appeal to black Americans: "Brothers, be brave!... the fight for mankind has not been lost.... The Slav is rising in all his might." After the revolution, the feeling of joy and fighting spirit, with which all progressive workers in the United States were overcome, were reflected in the inspired words of Eugene Debs: "I am a Bolshevik from my head to my toes and I am proud of it."

For 60 years, the spokesmen of monopolistic capitalism--from hired politicians to servile scribblers--have reviled and are still reviling the worldwide transformational significance of the October Revolution. Their slanders have caused and are still causing great damage. But history has proved that it is just as difficult for them to conceal the truth as to extinguish the sun. Today multitudes of people, organizations and governments are celebrating the anniversary of the first socialist revolution as no other event in history has been commemorated. And each year the number grows, which attests to the unparalleled contribution made by all exploited and oppressed people to the construction of a new world, free from war and need.

One of the many things treasured by American workers is John Reed's classic work, "Ten Days That Shook the World." Lenin "wholeheartedly" recommended this book to the workers of all nations, because it "contains a true and exceptionally lively portrayal of the events that are so important to an understanding of what the proletarian revolution is." In 1977, this remarkable work is still being read by millions of workers in many of the world's languages. On 22 October 1977, we commemorated the 90th anniversary of the birth of John Reed, one of the founders of the Communist Party of the United States of America. To honor his memory and share his excitement, thousands of young workers in our country should read his book and, in these pages, experience with him the incredible enthusiasm and the heroic feats performed in those remarkable days that changed the world forever.

Revolutions, Marx wrote, are the great stimuli of social progress; they are complex and majestic dramas, full of glory and tragedy. All revolutions prior to October 1917 led to situations in which the working people, who bore the main burden of the battles and died in them, replace one group of exploiters with another. The first American revolution of 1776 and the second--the Civil War of 1861--accomplished many important democratic tasks. But, because they took place at an early stage, the people were not able to cast off the chains of capitalist exploitation.

In its nature, purpose and goals, the Great October Socialist Revolution differed from all previous revolutions. It established a new course for human society and provided unlimited opportunities for the development of man's creative ability. For the first time, power was assumed by a non-exploitative class--the working class, guided by the communist party. It lay the basis for the most progressive economic system the world had ever

seen--for socialism. Relying on progressive democrats for its worker and rural population, it constructed a totally new, socialist society. As famous American journalist Lincoln Steffens said when he returned from a trip to Russia in 1919: "I have seen the future and it works."

The revolution of 1917 considerably reinforced the democratic struggle of people on all continents. Inspired by this revolution, hundreds of millions of people of all oppressed classes and nationalities began to fight for their national and social liberation. The revolution demonstrated, as Lenin said, the fact that the working class is the vanguard of all oppressed people and the bearer and nucleus of the aspirations of all oppressed people for liberation. The 60 years of experience in socialist construction in the Soviet Union and all of the events that have taken place in the world under the influence of the revolution have repeatedly confirmed the fact that the working class is the main social force of our era. It is in the very foreground of history.

When the "Communist Manifesto" was published in 1848, the working class was only beginning to sense its power and was made up of no more than 10 million persons. Nonetheless, Marx and Engels called it the only growing, consistently revolutionary class in modern society, a class predestined to liberate mankind and lead it to the heights of communism. Today the working class numbers in the hundreds of millions and is still growing. Since the time of the October Revolution, the great labor and struggle of the working class have dissipated, one after another, all of the false theories denying its role as the leading class in social progress.

In recent years, the working class has headed broad popular movements which have overthrown fascism in Portugal, Greece and Spain. In Italy and France, the working class has led massive battles against the domination of monopolistic capital. And in the recently liberated developing states, as Agostinho Neto has said, "only the working class, in an alliance with the peasantry, is capable of uniting all revolutionaries and progressive people around it for the purpose of forging genuine national unity" in the struggle against imperialism and for radical social progress.

"The working class is moving ahead with increasing determination to take on the leading role relegated to it by history.... In accordance with the development of events in the United States, our working class is keeping in step with this historical process" (Gus Hall). And it is true that only our multiracial working class can unite and lead all of the various anti-monopoly feelings and actions being manifested throughout our nation. Only our working class and its organizations can draw up an independent and comprehensive program to save the entire nation from the morass of crises into which we have been submerged by the greedy monopolies and their two-party politicians in the race for profits.

The Great October Socialist Revolution severely undermined the myth of capitalism's immortality. It showed that capitalism, with all of its incurable ills and defects, was a system without a future and that its days were numbered. Ever since the October Revolution, capitalism has been in a state of general crisis, entangled in a web of economic recessions, wars and revolutions. Today the crises experienced by monopolistic capital threaten such countless disasters in human life that the transition to socialism has become vitally necessary. Indeed, the emergence of new socialist states in Europe, Asia, Africa and both American continents confirm the fact that the movement toward socialism, which was begun by the October Revolution, is a natural objective process. It can be slowed down or temporarily reversed, as in Chile, but it cannot be stopped. The communist genie has broken out of the bottle and no force on earth can send it back.

Living in peaceful conditions on earth is the most basic and precious human right.

The people of the world remember that only the leading capitalist power--the United States--dropped the atomic bomb on another people. In today's world of nuclear bombs and new weapons of mass destruction, the guarantee of disarmament and world peace is the major concern of all peoples.

The Soviet Union was born in the flames of the first imperialist world war as the standard bearer of peaceful coexistence. For 60 years, it has consistently demonstrated the fact that peaceful coexistence is the only alternative to predatory wars and the threat of nuclear annihilation, which have been engendered by monopolistic capitalism. For this reason, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, even at the most difficult moments, has always defended the higher interests of the international working class and the security of all peoples. No other nation in history has worked toward world peace so consistently and efficiently.

From Lenin's famous Decree on Peace, adopted on 8 November 1917, to the inspiring foreign policy programs of the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses; from the Rapallo Treaty and the treaties signed in Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam to the entire series of current European treaties; from the Genoa Conference of the 1920's to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, held in Helsinki--at all times, the offspring of the October Revolution has been the most determined, the most steadfast champion of peace, freedom and social progress for all peoples.

After all, during the last few years alone, the Soviet Union has submitted more than 70 proposals for examination by the world community on the consolidation of peaceful coexistence and cooperation by all states. "No nation has presented mankind with as broad, concrete and realistic a program, aimed at the reduction and, later, the complete elimination of the danger of a new war, as the Soviet Union," Leonid Brezhnev said earlier this year in Tula.

The 60 years of socialist experience in the Soviet Union have repeatedly proved that its struggle for peace is not--and has never been--a tactic or subterfuge for the purpose of deceiving its opponents and taking them unawares. To the contrary, peace for the good of all peoples without exception is an integral feature of the nature and requirements of socialism. The first socialist nation has no military-industrial complex thirsting for profits. The Soviet Union needs peace to make the life of its people even better and to continue the construction of the foundation for communism. For 60 years, the Soviet Union has propagandized, demonstrated and confirmed the fact that socialism and peace represent an indissoluble single entity. Not only does socialism need peace, but peace, if it is to develop and become stronger, needs socialism.

No one can deny that grand radical changes in the relations between states and in all forms of diplomacy have taken place in the world since the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Imperialism can no longer deceive the public with the aid of such means as secret treaties or clandestine preparations for war. The latest example of this can be seen in the steps taken by the Soviet Union to expose the "secret" preparations of the South African Government to test a nuclear bomb.

Besides this, the 60 years of Soviet rule have shown that socialism is the most open society in history. In this society, domestic policy is discussed as part of its five-year plans, which are published in series numbering in the multimillions and the results of which are regularly assessed and verified in sight of all the people of the world.

The capitalist nations, especially the United States, are periodically shaken by scandals connected with personal enrichment by means of the arms race, graft, military conspiracies and the use of mercenaries and extensive measures by the Central Intelligence Agency to rob the resources of other peoples and to weaken or halt their struggle for national independence.

The fact that mankind has been free of the danger of nuclear war, bringing death to every living thing, for the 32 years since the end of World War II is largely explained by the Soviet Union's gargantuan efforts to mobilize peaceful public opinion for the defense and consolidation of world peace.

Today world public opinion, which is reflected in the activities of broad mass organizations--one of which is the World Peace Council--has become a powerful social force, vigilant, firm and invincible in the struggle against the threat of world war and against any kind of imperialist aggression and local wars. Hundreds of millions of people "are participating in the safeguarding of peace and in the construction of a new life on earth and are waging a struggle to eradicate the suffering, hunger, poverty, exploitation and oppression which have been their lot for many centuries" (Romesh Chandra, secretary general of the World Peace Council).

In the last 60 years, the Soviet Union has grown into a tremendous force which cannot be deceived, frightened or blackmailed in the political, economic or military sense. This is why the plans of Carter, Brzezinski and Jackson, which have the purpose of "outwitting" the Soviet Union in the strategic arms limitation talks and in the talks on the Middle East, on trade and on many other matters, are destined to fail.

But the Soviet Union has never acted arrogant or haughty and has never threatened war. "On behalf of the party and the entire population, I declare that our nation will never take the course of aggression and will never raise a sword against other peoples," Leonid Brezhnev said.

In the Soviet Union, war propaganda has been declared illegal and is punished as a crime against socialism and all peoples. In the USSR, it is impossible to find charts, drawings or accounts which calculate how many millions of Americans will die and how many American cities will be destroyed if nuclear "Plan A" or "Plan B" will be put into action, as is frequently done in our nation in such a cynical and inhuman way with the aid of computers. No American, regardless of the capacity in which he has visited the Soviet Union, can swear to it that he has heard anything like war propaganda from government or party leaders or from any other Soviet citizen. The new Soviet Constitution embodies the peaceful policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government, including all 10 principles of the Final Act of the Helsinki conference.

In recent years, the progress of detente and the victories in the struggle against imperialism and for national liberation in Southeast Asia, Africa and Latin America have introduced considerable optimism and faith in the possibility of lasting peace into the international climate. The reduced danger of nuclear world war, however, does not mean that this danger no longer exists. A possibility does not constitute an iron-clad guarantee.

It has become obvious that the new American tactic of playing demagogic games with human rights is anti-Sovietism and an attempt to conceal the new round of the arms race begun by the Carter Administration. The events of the present confirm what has been apparent for 60 years--official anti-Sovietism is always and everywhere directed against peace. And the sincere advocates of peace, who allow themselves to roll in the gutter of anti-Sovietism, are consciously or unconsciously helping to introduce schism and to endanger the great cause they are trying to serve.

The decision to produce winged missiles and the threat of the stockpiling of neutron bombs in Europe are violating the Helsinki agreement and considerably increasing the danger of war. This is the true face of Carter's "humanism" and his moral "revival." These decisions, however, can be nullified and practical steps can be taken toward disarmament. "The militaristic hawks," Gus Hall said, "have always controlled the policies of the American Government in the absence of public reaction. But they are not supported by the general public. They do not express the feelings and will of the people of our nation. The actions of the masses can influence government policy and direct it toward peace and detente.... Extensive action on the part of the masses can lead to serious negotiations which will put an end to the race for nuclear arms."

Since the birth of American imperialism and the conquest of Cuba, the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, the Philippines and other territories at the end of the 19th century, no American administration has ever supported a single revolutionary event anywhere. And although it has suffered a defeat in Southeast Asia and has been forced to reconcile itself to the existence of a socialist Cuba, American capital is still the world's greatest exploiter and oppressor of people. For the sake of superprofits, it allies itself with cruel fascist regimes wherever these may exist.

In contrast, the Soviet Union, since the first days of the October Revolution, has invariably and sincerely supported any genuine struggle for liberation by oppressed peoples, regardless of the form of struggle they might choose. Its moral and material support for the militant actions of the popular masses throughout the world has played the deciding role in changing the balance of power in the confrontation with the common enemy--imperialism. This support has never been a tactical ruse aimed at immediate egotistical advantages. For the entire 60 years of its existence, the Soviet Union has always conducted an unselfish and unchanging policy, deriving from the very nature of socialism. The cornerstone of this policy is the unprecedented equality and unity of the 15 Soviet republics and the more than 100 nationalities of the USSR.

The progressive socialist society, in which the working class represents the vanguard of the struggle for communist ideals, has eradicated all antagonistic conflicts between classes, social groups, races and nationalities. The worldwide historic significance of this success cannot be overestimated. It is also of enormous significance for our multiracial, multinational society. Only a socialist United States can completely eradicate all of the class, racial, national, cultural and other forms of oppression and division fostered by the monopolies and ultimately establish a true democracy of equal nationalities in the nation.

At the price of unparalleled sacrifices, the Soviet people defeated the fascist striking forces of world imperialism 32 years ago and won an epoch-making victory. In this difficult trial, the Soviet people not only defended their own freedom, but also made the decisive contribution to the protection of all the world's people from fascist enslavement. The victory in the war and its consequences weakened imperialism and prepared the soil for a popular struggle for social and national liberation. A great socialist community of nations came into being, the policies and actions of which turned it into the most effective and influential force in international affairs.

At the same time, many millions of enslaved colonial people dealt powerful blows to imperialist domination, won political independence and paved the way for radical social reform. The eradication of the old imperialist colonial order was one of the greatest achievements in the history of the struggle for human rights.

In the developed capitalist countries, the inevitability of socialism is dictated by the unresolved contradictions between the powerful private producers and the system of distribution, contradictions which are partly the result of the colonial piracy spanning the lives of whole generations. In the recently liberated developing countries, the legacy of imperialism is such that only socialism can show them the way and provide them with concrete opportunities to put an end to their many centuries of economic and social backwardness. These common interests give rise to the natural and objective need for an alliance of the USSR, the community of socialist nations, the national liberation movement and the working class in the developed capitalist countries.

More than 5 decades ago, Lenin wrote that, in the coming deciding battles of the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the world's population, initially directed toward national liberation, would turn against capitalism and imperialism and play a much more revolutionary role than we expect.

The Soviet Union actively supports the struggle of all oppressed peoples against national and colonial domination. In 1960, the United Nations adopted the "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Nations and Peoples" and, in 1963, the "Declaration on the Eradication of All Forms of Racial Discrimination." Both of these declarations were adopted at the initiative of the Soviet Union. In 1973, at the suggestion of the socialist states and a group of countries in Africa and Asia, the UN General Assembly adopted a decision on the organization of "decades of action to combat racism and racial discrimination."

The Accountability Report to the 25th CPSU Congress, which became one of history's greatest forums of representatives of governments and communist and democratic parties, stressed the fact that it is essential "to consider one of our most important international objectives to be the complete eradication of all remaining traces of the system of colonial oppression and frustration of the equality and independence of peoples and all hotbeds of colonialism and racism."

The historic victories of the revolutionary people of Angola, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique, who were given moral, diplomatic and concrete material support by the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries, have elevated the alliance between socialism and the national liberation movement in Africa to a new height.

Vast regions of Africa are involved in this struggle. Deprived of the most elementary human rights, the people of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa, where the fascist system of apartheid is in effect, have begun an armed struggle to put an end to the racist regimes in Pretoria and Salisbury. "It is the fault of the racists and their imperialist protectors," L. I. Brezhnev wrote in his message to the World Conference for Action Against Apartheid, which was held in Lagos (Nigeria) in August of this year, "that the south

of Africa is one of the planet's hot spots." The government and people of the Soviet Union "decisively condemn the criminal policy being conducted by the racist regimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia and favor the isolation and boycott of these regimes and the complete eradication of apartheid."

Making use of all opportunities and forums, the Soviet Union has helped to elevate the struggle against racism, which represents one of the central objectives of the worldwide historic struggle for human rights, to unprecedented heights. This great struggle is having a profound influence on all class forces and all social strata in the United States.

American imperialism is resorting to desperate maneuvers in an attempt to postpone the downfall of its racist allies. The chief tactic of the Carter Administration consists in the creation of conditions which will safeguard the gains of the white capitalist minority and protect the interests of imperialism in Africa. It is insistently calling for a "peaceful settlement" and for the disarmament of the fighters for freedom. At the same time, it is augmenting the military strength of the racist oppressors who are terrorizing and murdering people and committing acts of armed aggression against neighboring sovereign states.

The people of southern Africa do not wish to accept the decisions of the "new leaders of the American South," white or black. They are demanding the immediate and complete elimination of the entire racist system of apartheid. They wish to decide their own fate. The firm support of the Soviet Union, the multiracial working population of the United States and millions of progressive people throughout the world--this is a guarantee that the agony of the oppressed people in southern Africa will come to an end and that their heroic struggle will be crowned by victory....

A hungry and ignorant peasant dressed in dirty rags--this is the image of old Russia in American folklore prior to 1917. The accuracy of this image was confirmed by the millions who came to our shores to escape poverty, backwardness and massacres and to seek a new life.

The Great October Socialist Revolution delivered the people of Russia from their age-old poverty, wretchedness, illiteracy and superstition. The life of the Soviet people was forever purged of the social ills that are still eating away at even the most developed capitalist countries--poverty, mass unemployment, which has become permanent for many, inflation, racism, ethnic oppression, wretched living conditions in the crisis-stricken cities, the unavailability of medical assistance, the alarming rise in the crime rate and general moral decline. As a result of 60 years of socialist construction, progress, unequalled in history, has been achieved in all areas of life in the Soviet Union. Here are some figures to illustrate this unparalleled progress.

Prior to the revolution, tsarist Russia accounted for 4 percent of total world production. Now the Soviet Union's share is more than 20 percent, and world production itself has increased immeasurably. The amount produced

in 2.5 days of 1977 equaled the total production volume for 1913, product quality is immeasurably higher and the assortment of products is much broader.

Almost all of the cities in the Soviet Union have been rebuilt. Many new modern cities have come into being, including cities in the vast expanses of Siberia. Residential construction is of colossal dimensions and the Soviet people now obtain more new living area each 2 years than existed in all Russian cities before the revolution. Rental fees, including fees for the use of communal services, do not exceed 4 percent of the Soviet citizen's income.

In prerevolutionary Russia, 75 percent of all adults were illiterate. Today the Soviet Union is a nation of universal literacy. More than 93 million individuals are enrolled in academic institutions of all types. One out of every four scientific workers in the world lives and works in the Soviet Union. In Uzbekistan alone, there are now more people with a higher education than there were in all of old Russia. And Tadzhikistan has a higher percentage of students in its population than Italy. Before the revolution, many ethnic groups were dying out, but now there are more physicians per 10,000 inhabitants in the Central Asian republics of the Soviet Union than in the United States. Each year, the Soviet Union publishes twice as many books than the United States, including the best works by old and new American writers, which are translated into the languages of the different peoples of the Soviet Union and printed in editions of many millions of copies. More than 25 million people work in government and in soviets on all levels. Tens of millions of party and non-party members of trade unions, kolkhoz members, students and members of the intelligentsia participate directly in the economic, social, cultural and political life of the nation.

The Soviet Union has been in existence for 60 years--on the scales of history this is a short period of time in comparison, for example, to the age of the United States, which is already 201 years old. But the unparalleled progress in the Soviet Union appears even more significant if we consider the fact that around 20 of these 60 years were spent in a struggle against invading armies and the subsequent healing of war wounds. Therefore, it has taken approximately 40 years for the Soviet people to construct a new economy and a new social life which far surpass everything that has been achieved or can be achieved by any capitalist nation.

Today, now that the American society, which is controlled by the monopolies, is in the grip of crises affecting every aspect of life, and now that the American economy is developing in spurts and economic upswings alternate with recessions, the Soviet economy, which is planned with consideration for the achievements of modern science and technology, has begun to carry out grand programs which will contribute to the further improvement of public life. The Soviet Union is already ahead of the United States in the production of oil, steel, iron, cement, diesel and electric locomotives, tractors, mineral fertilizers, cotton and several other commodities.

But the Soviet Union is not a superstate and the Soviet people are not supermen. These achievements are the result of hard work. But, as their 60 years of experience have shown, they have a "secret weapon"--namely, socialism, which could be called a supersystem.

The creative genius and talents of the American workers are known throughout the world, but their honest labor is being exploited by a handful of large monopolies--oil, steel, automotive and others. These gigantic concerns control the nation and reap astronomical profits while the standard of living of the urban and rural workers constantly grows worse. The masses are searching for an escape from the growing catastrophe and can find it in the inspiring achievements of genuine socialism. This is why the American monopolies daily slander the Soviet experience and socialism.

In the United States, just as everywhere else in the world, human rights cannot be guaranteed until the material and cultural demands of the workers, who make up the overwhelming majority of mankind, are satisfied. On this 60th anniversary of the Soviet Union's existence, it would be no exaggeration to say that the 60 years of Soviet socialist rule have been marked by the greatest progress of mankind's history in the establishment--both in theory and in practice--of human rights, and, as the material and cultural basis of communism is reinforced, these rights are developed more and more.

The Great October Socialist Revolution and the 60 years that have gone by since the triumph of this revolution have confirmed, through practice, the great historic truth of Marxism-Leninism and the worldwide significance of the basic scientific law of the socialist revolution and the construction of the new society. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, guided by Lenin's order to develop all branches of science, so as to keep in step with life, has made an exceptionally rich, creative and consistent contribution to the development of Marxism-Leninism.

Our era is the most revolutionary in history. Its stormy development has given rise to immense new, complex and difficult problems. In connection with this, the experience accumulated by various communist parties in the world has served as the basis for large quantities of Marxist-Leninist literature of a creative nature. This experience has corroborated the fact that all revolutionary parties of the working class must independently enrich Marxist-Leninist theory and apply it flexibly and optimistically to all matters, taking the specific conditions of the historical development of each particular nation and the specific nature of its revolutionary process into consideration. At the same time, it would be dangerously opportunistic to use these specific features as a basis for disregarding those premises of Marxism-Leninism that are of a universal nature. This frequently leads to an incorrect understanding of these specific features themselves and to serious misfortunes for the working class. The accuracy of the verified truths of Marxism-Leninism is of decisive importance to the triumph of the working class.

The Soviet Union, the vanguard of which is the CPSU, is steadfastly carrying the banner of Marxism-Leninism in the struggle against those who betray the working class--Maoists and Trotskyites. The Soviet Union has always been the prime mover of the world revolutionary movement. In contrast, Maoist policy, which is based on nationalism and aspirations to national hegemony, is following a counterrevolutionary course by becoming the servant of American imperialism and, in particular, assisting it in its attempts to perpetuate colonialism in South Africa and Chile in the hands of the fascist executioners Vorster and Pinochet.

No other doctrine can compare with Marxism-Leninism in terms of its popularity, influence and historic significance. Within a relatively short period of time, particularly after the victory of the October Revolution, Marxist-Leninist ideas spread through all continents and penetrated all corners of the world. A survey conducted by UNESCO in 1976 in 61 nations indicated that Lenin's works were in greater demand than any other books. There is not a single area of the social or natural sciences, literature and art which has not been affected by the principles of dialectical materialism and the methods of Marxism-Leninism.

Nonetheless, fearful reactionary bureaucrats in the United States still see Marxism-Leninism as an "imported, semilegal doctrine" and many teachers and workers have lost their jobs for propagandizing this universal liberating doctrine. In actuality, everything written by American bourgeois historians, philosophers and sociologists during the last 60 years, even though this is not openly admitted, has represented "arguments" against Marxism-Leninism.

But facts cannot be erased by a stubborn denial of the truth or by its forcible suppression. Lenin said: "Marx' teachings are all-powerful because they are all true." And history has confirmed this truth by the corresponding general developments in our world. This is why the great classic works of Marxism-Leninism are purchased and studied in our nation by many thousands of young workers and students as well as by communists. Increasing their number by tenfold, particularly the workers, is one of the difficult but necessary and important tasks facing American communists. Marxism-Leninism is, above all, a science concerning the liberation of the working class, and experience has shown that the workers can learn to use this invincible weapon in their daily struggle as well as for the establishment of socialism in the United States.

The Great October Socialist Revolution, which was headed by Lenin's new type of party, broke the backbone of many capitalist reformist parties and stimulated the birth and development of the revolutionary parties of the working class.

All types of Meanys and Shankers are spreading the venom of bourgeois and petty bourgeois opportunism in the ranks of the working class. They are pushing the common working man in the wrong direction, diminishing his

militant spirit and breaking up his organizations before the onslaught of capital. Marxism-Leninism is the strongest antidote against this poison. It is not simply one of many tools in the workers' arsenal, but a scientific summarization of all the experience accumulated by the worldwide working class and the major guide in the development of class consciousness, in the clarification of strategy and tactics and in the augmentation of combat potential in the daily battles against the class enemy on the job and in the home.

In the same way that no other doctrine can compare to Marxism-Leninism in terms of its influence and historic significance, no other political movement can compete with the international communist movement in terms of its size and strength. While in Marx' and Engels' lifetime there were only a few communists, now there are over 60 million in more than 90 nations and the number is quickly growing. They represent the only political movement that is a powerful force in all three currents of the worldwide revolutionary process--in the socialist community, in the working class of the industrially developed capitalist states and in the national liberation movement. The objective worldwide revolutionary process has accelerated beyond belief. The deciding subjective factor in these intensified historical developments is the rapid growth of the worldwide communist movement and its influence.

Slanderers in the service of imperialism have always tried to break up the unity of the worldwide communist movement, particularly its solidarity with the great Leninist Party of the Soviet Union. The anti-Soviet, anticommunist brain trusts in the United States and in the constantly diminishing monopolistic world are so numerous that we would not be mistaken in saying that they represent a new and unique "branch of industry" in which tens of thousands of ideological hirelings are employed.

The triumph of the October Revolution, the 60 years during which the prestige of the socialist state has grown and the invincible alliance of the three revolutionary forces of our era have given the ideological struggle between the two systems completely new features. Capitalism, which has historically occupied a defensive position, is now waging a fight to the death rather than a fight for life. Its time is running out. Now it is concentrating on breaking up and weakening the worldwide communist movement by appealing to nationalistic aspirations and resorting to flattery and other tricks.

But there is no problem in the relations between the various communist parties (which have mainly arisen from the differences in concrete historical circumstances) that cannot be solved constructively by means of friendly discussion and voluntary concerted action on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Proletarian internationalism is the most important principle of the worldwide communist movement. It is the steel backbone of each party, without which it might shift to the left or the right.

The CPSU, the Communist Party of the United States and all of the communist and workers parties in the world have come into being as an urgent objective necessity. They were not engendered by lofty cabinet phrases or by meaningless Madison Avenue gossip. They were engendered by the problems presented to mankind by history during the present era, at a time when a transition is being made in the world from capitalism to socialism; they were engendered for the purpose of performing a great and noble mission.

This is why the Communist Party of the United States "has been called upon to play a unique role. Only it sees the need for a broad massive movement by our people and the opportunities for the creation of this kind of movement. Only it understands the decisive role of the working class in the coming battle, despite the present situation in most of the workers movement. And it does not regard the present struggle as an end in itself, but as a means for improving the lot of the workers today and preparing for a nationwide movement which will be able to destroy the power of the monopolies, lead to the nationalization of big industry and pave the way for the socialist reorganization of society" (Henry Winston).

The Communist Party of the United States of America salutes the Soviet people, the Soviet Government and the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. History has assigned the multinational people of old Russia an exceptionally difficult task: To begin the first ascent to the heights of communism. They will carry out their historic mission excellently.

8588

CSO: 1803

CUMULATIVE INDEX FOR 1977

Moscow SSHA: EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA in Russian No 12, Dec 77
pp 123-127

[Text] In Commemoration of 60th Anniversary of Great October

Henry, Ernst, "Pygmies and Giants," No 5
Garlin, Sender, "John Swinton, Fighter for the Workers' Cause," No 6
Lapitskiy, M. I., "Bill Heywood: 'What We Dreamed of...'," No 7
Freeman, Harry, "American Eyewitnesses of October," No 8
Yakovlev, N. N., "Great October and U.S. Ruling Elite," No 9
Bogdanov, R. G., "October and the Present Day," No 10
Dangulov, A. S., "John Reed in Revolutionary Russia," No 10
Khozin, G. S., "First Soviet Sputnik," No 10
"Main Event of 20th Century," No 11
Kashtan, William, "October and Canada," No 11
Hall, Gus, "Most Important Event in Mankind's History," No 11
Stoleshnikov, A. V. and Tomilin, Yu. K., "Sixty Years of Struggle for
Disarmament," No 11
"Socialist Humanism and the Crisis of Bourgeois Democracy," No 11
Kremenyuk, V. A. and Lukin, V. P., "October, the National Liberation
Movement and U.S. Policy," No 11
"The Light of the Great October Revolution," No 12
"Statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party USA," No 12

New Constitution of the USSR

"A Historic Document," No 7
Mishin, A. A., "Two Constitutions," No 8
Bogdanov, R. G., "October and the Present Day," No 10
"Main Event of 20th Century," No 11

For Students in Party Educational System

Artem'yev, I. Ye. and Sheydina, I. L., "Scientific and Technical Relations:
The First Results," No 5

Berezhkov, V. M., "Basic Principles of Soviet-American Relations," No 4
Bestuzhev-Lada, I. V., "The Evolution of American Futurology," No 3
Zhurkin, V. V., "Detente and U.S. Policy in International Conflicts," No 2
Kokoshin, A. A., "'Interdependence': Realities, Theories and Policy," No 1
Oleshchuk, Yu. F., "Bankrupt Arguments of Opponents of Detente," No 10
Pavlyuchenko, V. I., "Energy Crisis: Causes, Meaning and Prospects," No 6
Pavlyuchenko, V. I., "Problems and Contradictions of Technological Revolution in United States," No 12
Rigin, Yu. I., "State-Monopolistic Regulation of Energy: Problems and Prospects," No 9

Communist and Workers Movement

Aleksandrova, V. A., "Labor Struggle in 1976," No 2
Garlin, Sender, "John Swinton, Fighter for the Workers' Cause," No 6
"Henry Winston--Honorary Doctorate," No 4
Dangulov, A. S., "John Reed in Revolutionary Russia," No 10
Lapitskiy, M. I., "Bill Heywood: 'What We Dreamed of...'," No 7
"Unknown Pages of American Journalistic Accounts of Karl Marx," No 5
Setunskiy, N. K., "New Journal of the U.S. Communist Party," No 4

Problems of Consolidating International Security

Berezhkov, V. M., "A Constructive Approach Is Needed," No 5
Berezhkov, V. M., "An Example of Egalitarian Cooperation," No 8
Berezhkov, V. M., "Detente Prospects and Soviet-American Relations," No 12
Bol'shakov, S. I., "The 'Historical Aspect' of the Detente Theme," No 1
"Entering 1977," No 1
Davydov, V. F., "Problem of Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons. American Approaches," No 5
Zhurkin, V. V., "Detente and U.S. Policy in International Conflicts," No 2
Zamoshkin, Yu. A. and Mel'vil', A. Yu., "'Morality' and Detente," No 11
"Canadians for Detente," No 10
Kislov, A. K., "Urgent Problems of Middle East Settlement," No 7
Login, V. V., "Urgent Tasks of Disarmament and 31st Session of UN General Assembly," No 2
Oleshchuk, Yu. F., "Bankrupt Arguments of Opponents of Detente," No 10
Petrovskaya, M. M., "Detente Through the Prism of Public Opinion," No 4
Stoleshnikov, A. V. and Tomilin, Yu. K., "Sixty Years of Struggle for Disarmament," No 11
Yur'yev, D. P., "Detente and the 'Human Rights' Campaign," No 8

Soviet-American Relations

Artem'yev, I. Ye. and Sheydina, I. L., "Scientific and Technical Relations: The First Results," No 5
Berezhkov, V. M., "Basic Principles of Soviet-American Relations," No 4
Berezhkov, V. M., "A Constructive Approach Is Needed," No 5
Berezhkov, V. M., "Detente Prospects and Soviet-American Relations," No 12

"Two Scientific Conferences," No 1
 Kassof, Allen H., "Our Work Serves Peace," No 9
 "Books and Contacts. Conversation with B. I. Stukalin, Chairman of USSR Goskomizdat," No 3
 Komarov, A. S., "The Chelyabinsk Tractor Works and the Caterpillar," No 11
 "Inter-University Ties," No 9
 "Comrade L. I. Brezhnev Responds to Questions of American Political Correspondent J. Kingsbury-Smith," No 2
 Khozin, G. S., "New Agreement on Space Exploration," No 8
 Shershnev, Ye. S., "Current Problems in Soviet-American Economic Relations," No 3

Meetings and Impressions

Komov, Yu. A., "American Film Institute," No 8
 Mendel'son, M. M., "With American Physicians," No 2
 Hagmejer, Marek, "With Our Polish Colleagues," No 4
 Shestakov, V. P., "Trip Through American Cinema," No 1

U.S. Foreign Policy and Military Strategy

Andreyev, Yu. A., "Zionism as a Form of Racism and Racial Discrimination," No 4
 Anichkin, O. N., "Southern Variant of NATO," No 1
 Arbatov, A. G., "'Trident'--Debates Over Strategic Program," No 3
 Baranovskiy, S. I., "Arms Race Budget," No 10
 Baranovskiy, S. I. and Bogachev, V. I., "Pentagon Plans in Northern Europe," No 12
 Bulay, I. B. and Grishin, V. P., "Pentagon's Plans and the Fate of Micronesia," No 8
 Vishnevskiy, M. L., "Washington's Maneuvers in Africa," No 8
 Goncharov, A. N. and Otreshko, S. A., "The 'Big Seven' in London," No 7
 Davydov, V. F., "Nuclear Threat in South Africa," No 12
 Zhurkin, V. V., "Detente and U.S. Policy in International Conflicts," No 2
 Kislov, A. K., "Urgent Problems in Middle East Settlement," No 7
 Kislov, A. K., "Following Soviet-American Statement on Middle East," No 12
 Kokoshin, A. A., "'Interdependence': Realities, Theories and Policy," No 1
 Litavrin, P. G., "United States-Panama Negotiations," No 7
 Lukin, V. P., "Difficult Break with the Past," No 2
 Lukin, V. P., "New Gestures Or a New Policy?" No 6
 Melikhov, S. V., "Factor Analysis in the Study of International Relations," No 4
 Oberemko, T. V., "'Special Partnership'--Illusions and Reality," No 9
 Petrovskiy, V. F., "Modern U.S. Foreign Policy Theories," No 8
 Portnyagin, A. D., "U.S. Policy in Persian Gulf Zone," No 6
 Romantsov, Yu. V., "Agreement Signed, But Problems Remain," No 11
 "Current Issues in U.S. Defense Policy" (chapters from book), ed by D. Johnson and B. Schneider, Nos 3-9; Foreword to publication by G. A. Trofimenko, No 3
 Turkatenko, N. D., "Washington's Calculations and Miscalculations in Southern Africa," No 2

Turkatenko, N. D., "Sources and Aims of 'Trilateral' Strategy," No 9
 Utkin, A. I., "New Developments in Inter-Atlantic Relations," No 4
 Filatov, A. I., "United States National Security Council," No 9
 Shapiro, A. I., "Centrifugal and Centripetal Tendencies in Inter-Imperialist Relations," No 2
 Shatilov, A. V., "Security of Indian Ocean: Two Approaches," No 1
 Shatilov, A. V., "Washington-Manila: No Deal," No 7
 Yur'yev, D. P., "Detente and the 'Human Rights' Campaign," No 8
 Yakovin, A. Ye., "On the Eve of Session of UN Conference on Law of the Sea," No 5

United States Economy

Beshelev, S. D., "Economics--Key Factor in Progress of Aviation," No 2
 Bobrakov, Yu. I., "Ford Messages and Carter Program," No 4
 Bushmarin, I. V., "Changes in Composition of Unskilled Labor Force," No 7
 Glukhov, V. I., "Tire Industry," No 12
 Goncharov, A. N., Otreshko, S. A., "The 'Big Seven' in London," No 7
 Danilov, A. A., "Reserves of Strategic and Scarce Materials in United States," No 2
 Demidova, L. S., "Characteristic Features of Investment Process in United States," No 10
 Zhukov, Ye. F., "Mid-Year Economic Situation," No 9
 Ivanov, I. D., "Place of Foreign Economic Ties in American Economy," No 1
 Ionova, Ye. P., "State Unemployment Insurance," No 8
 Katasonov, Yu. V., "Budget Reform, Its Economic and Political Meaning," No 4
 Klinov, V. G., "American Forecasts of U.S. Economic Development up to 1985," No 4
 Morozov, V. A., "Non-Agricultural Firms in Agrobusiness," No 6
 Mosin, I. N., "International Finance and Human Rights," No 10
 Osipov, A. I., "Evolution of American-Egyptian Economic Ties," No 8
 Pavlyuchenko, V. I., "Energy Crisis: Causes, Meaning and Prospects," No 6
 Rigin, Yu. I., "State-Monopoly Regulation in Energy--Problems and Prospects," No 9
 Sakharov, N. A., "American Business Associations," No 6
 Supyan, V. B., "Unemployment Trends of 1970's," No 3
 Fast, V. A., "Tapping Offshore Oil and Gas Resources," No 10
 Sheyman, I. M., "Medical Services for U.S. Population," No 3
 Yurygin, O. V., "Electricity in U.S. Economy in the Year 2000," No 9

Domestic Policy, Ideological and Social Problems

Anichkin, O. N., "The Republicans Heal Their Wounds," No 5
 Ashin, G. K. and Midler, A. P., "Paradoxes of 'Mass Culture,'" No 6
 Bestuzhev-Lada, I. V., "The Evolution of American Futurology," No 3
 "Vice-President Walter Frederick Mondale," No 1
 Voyna, V. A., "American Publishers at Moscow Book Fair," No 12
 Geyevskiy, I. A., "Washington and Human Rights," No 7
 Golyadkin, N. A., "Broadcasting in United States," No 9

Gorev, A. I. and Chervonnaya, S. A., "Racial and Political Oppression in the United States," No 6
 "Two Scientific Conferences," No 1
 Demaris, Ovid, "The Director: An Oral Biography of J. Edgar Hoover," Nos 1-2
 Zamoshkin, Yu. A. and Mel'vil', A. Yu., "'Morality' and Detente," No 11
 Kokarev, I. Ye., "The Year in Film," No 3
 Komov, Yu. A., "American Film Institute," No 8
 Konstantinov, A. A., "Anti-Semitism--A Reality of American Life," No 6
 Lebedeva, T. P., "Business, the State and Art," No 11
 Lyuberatskaya, B. N., "New Appointments," No 3
 "Malcolm Toon--U.S. Ambassador to USSR," No 3
 Mendel'son, M. M., "With American Physicians," No 2
 Migranyan, A. M., "United States Social Democrats: Whose Side Are They On?" No 3
 Moykin, N. P., "The American Indians Today," No 5
 Mulyarchik, A. S., "The Year in Literature," No 2
 Orlov, V. N., "White House Advisory Staff," No 7
 Perfilova, Ye. V., "Cable Television--Present and Future," No 7
 Petrovskaya, M. M., "The Harris Polls," No 12
 "President James Earl Carter," No 1
 "Presidents of the United States," No 9
 Royko, Mike, "Boss. Richard J. Daley of Chicago," Nos 10-12
 Savel'yev, V. A. and Silayeva, Ye. M., "Changes in U.S. Congress," No 3
 Savel'yev, V. A. and Silayeva, Ye. M., "New Leaders in Congressional Chambers," No 5
 Tarasova, N. N., "Status of Civil Servants," No 1
 Fedorov, V. I., "Who Paid for the 1976 Election," No 4
 Shestakov, V. P., "Trip Through American Cinema," No 1
 Shchelkin, A. G., "'Information Society'--Jubilant and Anxieties," No 10

On Capitol Hill

Savel'yev, V. A. and Silayeva, Ye. M., "Changes in U.S. Congress," No 3
 Savel'yev, V. A. and Silayeva, Ye. M., "New Leaders in Congressional Chambers," No 5

Politics and People

"Vice-President Walter Frederick Mondale," No 1
 Lyuberatskaya, V. N., "New Appointments," No 3
 "Malcolm Toon--U.S. Ambassador to USSR," No 3
 "President James Earl Carter," No 1

Scanning the Press

Beglova, N. S., "Food as Political 'Carrot' and 'Stick,'" No 12
 Bogachev, V. I., "The Latest Scandal in Washington," No 1
 Bol'shakov, S. I., "The 'Historical Aspect' of the Detente Theme," No 1
 Gevorgyan, S. V., "Prisoners of Fear," No 4
 Sitnikov, B. P., "United States-FRG: Variants of 'Special Partnership,'" No 4

Problems in Management

- Yevenko, L. I. and Voronkov, A. A., "New Trends in Federal Program Management," No 10
In'kov, Yu. I., "Transnational Monopolies: Cardinal Role of Management," No 8
Savinov, Yu. A., "Incorporation of Automated Control Systems in Technological Processes," No 1

Science and Technology

- Baranov, K. M., "Trends in Development of Construction and Road Machinery Engineering," No 4
Galimov, E. M., "Fiftieth Voyage of 'Glomar Challenger,'" No 7
Gontarev, B. A., "Which University Is Best?" No 3
Gushcho-Malkov, B. P., "New Stage in Development of Electromobile," No 12
Ikonnikov, I. B. and Lisov, G. P., "Oceanographic Studies in U.S. Universities," No 7
Kochetkov, G. B., "AT&T Brooks No Competition," No 6
Lebedeva, Ye. A., Nedotko, P. A. and Shakay, A. F., "Solar Energy Program," No 5
Myrtsyomov, A. F., "Steel: Some Problems in Metal Supply," No 1
Pavlyuchenko, V. I., "Problems and Contradictions of Technological Revolution in United States," No 12
Pisarev, V. D., "Canada: Conquest of World Ocean Resources," No 11
Sokolov, V. V., "Training of Engineering Personnel in United States," No 5
Sokolov, V. I., "Economics and Technology of Recycling of Waste Materials," No 9
Fadeyev, A. I., "Transporting Oil and Gas from American Arctic," No 6
Frolov, Yu. M., "United States Wildlife: Protection of Endangered Species," No 10

Translations and Digests

- Demaris, Ovid, "The Director: An Oral Biography of J. Edgar Hoover," Nos 1-2
Royko, Mike, "Boss. Richard J. Daley of Chicago," Nos 10-12
"Current Issues in U.S. Defense Policy" (chapters from book), ed by D. Johnson and B. Schneider, Nos 3-9; Foreword to publication by G. A. Trofimenko, No 3

Canadian Problems

- Olekhin, B. I., "Canada: The State and Scientific Progress," No 5
Bagramov, L. A. and Povolotskiy, B. V., "Cooperation with Canada: Potentialities and Prospects," No 12
Bantsekin, N. B., "Quebec: A Year After Elections," No 11
Danilov, S. Yu., "Canadian Liberals: Doctrine and Policy," No 1
"Canadian Provinces and Territories": "Nova Scotia," No 1; "New Brunswick," No 2; "Newfoundland," No 3; "Ontario," No 4; "Prince Edward Island," No 5; "Saskatchewan," No 6; "Northwest Territory," No 7; "Yukon," No 8
"Canadians for Detente," No 10

Kashtan, William, "October and Canada," No 11
Pisarev, V. D., "Canada: Development of World Ocean Resources," No 11
"Perception and Perspectives," (excerpts from I. Head's lecture at Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies of USSR Academy of Sciences), No 9
Tishkov, V. A., "Language and Policy," No 2

Book Reviews

Aleksimov, A. A., "From Positions of Realism" (Review of the book: A. Cox, "The Dynamics of Detente; How To End the Arms Race"), No 10
Bantsekin, N. B., "Quebec and Canadian-American Relations" (Review of the book "Quebec Nationalism at a Crossroads"), No 1
Belyavskaya, I. A., "Ethnological and Historical Analysis of the Rise of a Nation" (Review of the book: Sh. A. Bogina, "Immigrantskoye naseleniye SShA. 1865-1900 gg." [Immigrant Population of the United States, 1865-1900]), No 10
Bogacheva, N. V., "A Chronic Malady" (Review of the book: "Living Together. A Study of Regional Disparities"), No 12
Bokova, S. V., "Urban Crisis and the Crisis-Free City" (Review of the book: M. Davidow, "Cities Without Crisis"), No 5
Vladimirov, M. G., "Voice of Soviet Experts on U.S. History" (Review of the book: "Amerikanskiy yezhegodnik" [American Almanac]), No 1
Voyna, V. A., "The Price of Success" (Review of the book: Ya. Bereznitskiy, "Kak sozdat' samogo sebya. Zametki o lyudyakh i fil'makh amerikanskogo kino" [Self-Depiction. Comments on the Characters and Films of the American Cinema]), No 5
Voronkov, A. A., "In Search of Intelligent Public Decision-Making" (Review of the book: E. Quade, "Analysis for Public Decisions"), No 7
Gevorgyan, G. D., "Faithful Servant of Reaction" (Review of the book: G. Morris, "Social Democrats-USA: In the Service of Racism"), No 5
German, V. M., "Avenues of Power in the American City" (Review of the book: V. V. Smirnov, "SShA: politicheskii mekhanizm gorodskogo upravleniya. Kritika burzhuznykh kontseptsii" [The United States: The Political Machinery of Urban Management. Criticism of Bourgeois Theory]), No 3
German, V. M., "Who Is Buying Gulf Oil and Why" (Review of the book: J. McCloy, N. Pierson and V. Matthews, "Grand Exposure of Oil Secrets"), No 6
Glazov, V. V., "Geophysical War in Indochina" (Review of the book: "Ecological Consequences of the Second Indochina War"), No 7
Gorlach, N. I. and Ponomarenko, P. I., "Monopoly Competition and Marketing" (Review of the book: G. G. Abramishvili, V. A. Voyna and Yu. V. Trusov, "Operatsiya 'Marketing.' Strategiya i taktika konkurentnoy bor'by monopolii" [Operation "Marketing." The Strategy and Tactics of Monopoly Competition]), No 11
Guseva, V. S., "Good Will for Peace" (Review of the book: "Obshchestvennost' i problemy voyny i mira" [The Public and Problems of War and Peace]), No 1
Guseva, V. S., "The Fourth Estate" (Review of the book: V. Petrusenko, "Monopolisticheskaya pressa" [The Monopoly Press]), No 2
Guseva, V. S., "Contradictory Recommendations" (Review of the book: "Setting National Priorities. The Next Ten Years"), No 9
Davydov, V. F., "The Problem of the Nuclear Paradox and the Search for a Solution" (Review of the book: M. Guhin, "Nuclear Paradox"), No 7

Dalin, S. A., "News About State-Monopoly Capitalism" (Review of the book: "SShA: Gosudarstvo i ekonomika. Mekhanizm gosudarstvenno-monopolisticheskogo regulirovaniya ekonomiki" [The United States: Government and Economy. The Machinery of State-Monopoly Economic Regulation]), No 11

Dvoychenko-Markova, Ye. M., "Russia and the American War of Independence" (Review of the book: N. N. Bolkhovitinov, "Rossiya i voyna SShA za nezavisimost'. 1775-1783" [Russia and the American War of Independence, 1775-1783]), No 2

Deykin, A. I., "American Economists in Science and Politics" (Review of the book: I. V. Likhacheva, "SShA: ekonomicheskaya nauka i ekonomicheskaya politika" [The United States: Economic Science and Economic Policy]), No 4

Yegorova, A. V., "United States' Latin American Policy During World War II" (Review of the book: I. I. Yanchuk, "Politika SShA v Latinskoy Amerike. 1939-1945" [U.S. Policy in Latin America, 1939-1945]), No 4

Zhukov, Ye. F., "Analysis of U.S. Statistical Policy" (Review of the book: A. A. Poduzov, V. G. Klinov and A. V. Morozov, "SShA: Izmereniye ekonomicheskogo rosta" [The United States: Measuring Economic Growth]), No 12

Zhurkin, V. V., "The View from the Military-Industrial Complex" (Review of the book: E. Zumwalt, "On Watch"), No 1

Ivanov, I. D., "The Legal Aspects of Relations Between Science and the State" (Review of the book: R. Naryshkina, "SShA: gosudarstvo i chastnyy sektor. Grazhdansko-pravovyye otnosheniya" [The United States: The State and the Private Sector. Civil-Legal Relations]), No 8

Kagramanov, Yu. M., "Cultural Regions and Regionalism" (Review of the book: R. Gastil, "Cultural Regions of the United States"), No 2

Kassirova, Ye. P., "Various Approaches to a Problem" (Review of the book: A. D. Gusev, "Dva mira--dve sotsial'nyye politiki" [Two Worlds--Two Social Policies]), No 2

Kedrenovskaya, I. A., "Unsolved Problems" (Review of the book: "Women and the American Economy. A Look to the 1980's"), No 9

Keremetskiy, Ya. N., "Working Class and Bourgeois Ideology" (Review of the book: "Sovremennyy kapitalizm i rabochiy klass: kritika antimarksistskikh kontseptsiy" [Contemporary Capitalism and the Working Class: Criticism of Anti-Marxist Theory]), No 9

Klyuyev, A. B., "Multinationals: Their Strategy and Positions" (Review of the books: L. Nieckels, "Transfer Pricing in Multinational Firms"; R. Barnet and R. Muller, "Global Reach. The Power of the Multinational Corporations"), No 9

Korotkov, G. I., "The United States and South Korea" (Review of the book: R. Clough, "Deterrence and Defense in Korea"), No 11

Kochetkov, G. V., "Social Demagogy at the Service of IBM" (Review of the book: N. Foy, "The Sun Never Sets on IBM"), No 7

Kravchenko, I. N., "The Political Role of Trade Unions in the United States" (Review of the book: N. K. Setunskiy, "SShA: Profsoyuzy i politika" [The United States: Trade Unions and Politics]), No 11

Kremenyuk, V. A., "Anatomy of U.S. Foreign Policy Thought" (Review of the book: V. F. Petrovskiy, "Amerikanskaya vneshnepoliticheskaya mysl'" [American Foreign Policy Thought]), No 5

Kuznetsova, T. V., "U.S.-Southern Africa: Diehards Recommend" (Review of the book: W. Yarborough, "Trial in Agrica: The Failure of U.S. Policy"), No 12

Lebedeva, T. P., "Portrait of an Actor" (Review of the book: G. Dolmatovskaya, "Rod Stayger" [Rod Steiger]), No 8

Malysheva, D. B., "Africa in U.S. Strategic Plans" (Review of the book: "Southern Africa: The Escalation of a Conflict"), No 8

Mel'vil', A. Yu., "The Other Side of Bourgeois Individualism" (Review of the book: D. Bell, "The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism"), No 8

Mel'nikov, Yu. M., "Between Dogma and Reality" (Review of the book: G. A. Trofimenko, "SShA: Politika, voyna, ideologiya" [The United States: Policy, War and Ideology]), No 8

Moykin, N. P. and Dykhovichnaya, M. Yu., "The Monopolies and the Press" (Review of the books: E. Hynds, "American Newspapers in the 1970's"; P. Hawk, "The Newspaper Game"), No 6

Mosin, I. N., "Capitalism and the Scientific and Technical Revolution: Stimuli and Hindrances" (Review of the book: V. I. Gromeka, "Nauchno-tekhnicheskaya revolyutsiya i sovremennyy kapitalizm" [The Scientific and Technical Revolution and Contemporary Capitalism]), No 6

Nesterenko, G. N., "Bomber Force in U.S. Strategic Plans" (Review of the book: A. Quanbeck and A. Wood, "Modernizing the Strategic Bomber Force. Why and How"), No 10

Nikiforov, A. V., "Energy Crisis: Debatable Outlook" (Review of the book: "Vozrosshiye tseny na neft' i mirovaya ekonomika. Problema prisposobleniya" [Rising Oil Prices and the World Economy. The Problem of Adaptation]), No 5

Nikolaychik, V. M., "The Causes of Crime According to a Harvard Professor" (Review of the book: J. Wilson, "Thinking About Crime"), No 3

Osavlyuk, V. A., "Reality and Prospects of American Policy in Asia" (Review of the book: S. Simon, "Asian Neutralism and U.S. Policy"), No 6

Parkanskiy, A. B., "The Capitalist World and the Raw Material Problem" (Review of the book: Yu. A. Yershov, "Syr'ye, toplivo, politika. Toplivno-syr'yevaya politika imperializma" [Raw Materials, Fuel and Policy. The Fuel and Raw Material Policy of Imperialism]), No 2

Petrovskiy, V. F., "Detente and the Ideological Struggle" (Review of the book: V. Larin, "Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya i ideologicheskaya bor'ba" [International Relations and the Ideological Struggle]), No 9

Pokhlebin, V. V., "American Wines" (Review of the book: A. F. Shayturo and N. A. Mekhuzla, "Vinogradstvo i vinodeliye SShA" [Vineiculture and Wine-Making in the United States]), No 6

Serova, Ye. A., "Cooperation for Peace" (Review of the book: G. S. Khozin, "SSSR-SShA: orbity kosmicheskogo sotrudnichestva" [USSR-United States: Orbits of Cooperation in Space]), No 8

Sklarov, Ye. I., "Business, Science and Practice" (Review of the book: "SShA: promyshlennyye korporatsii i nauchnyye issledovaniya" [The United States: Industrial Corporations and Scientific Research]), No 2

Sogrin, V. V., "Third President of the United States" (Review of the book: G. N. Sevost'yanov and A. I. Utkin, "Tomas DzhEFFerson" [Thomas Jefferson]), No 12

Sokolov, V. I., "Highly Profitable Business" (Review of the book: I. G. Vasil'yev, "Gosudarstvo, kapital i rekreatsionnyye resursy" [The State, Capital and Recreational Facilities]), No 4

Starr, Frederik, "Serious and Unbiased Approach" (Review of the book: S. Kondrashov, "Svidaniye s Kaliforniyey" [Meeting with California]), No 4

Tarasova, N. N., "The Tactic of Bourgeois-Liberal Reformism" (Review of the book: V. A. Liven', "Profsoyuzy SShA i sotsial'naya politika pravitel'stva" [American Trade Unions and Government Social Policy]), No 4

Toporidze, V. V., "Blueprint for Modernizing the Presidency" (Review of the book: S. Hess, "Organizing the Presidency"), No 10

Utkin, A. I., "Another Attempt to Modify Atlantism" (Review of the book: P. Trezise, "The Atlantic Connection"), No 2

Khozin, G. S., "Different Approaches to 'Society-Nature' Problem" (Review of the book: G. S. Gudozhnik, "Nauchno-tekhnicheskaya revolyutsiya i ekologicheskiy krizis" [The Scientific and Technical Revolution and the Ecology Crisis]), No 3

Khozin, G. S., "Ecology and International Relations" (Review of the book: "Problema okruzhayushchey sredy v mirovoy ekonomike i mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy" [The Problem of the Environment in World Economics and International Relations]), No 9

Chervonnaya, S. A., "Virginia Teachers Fight for Civil Rights" (Review of the book: R. Pequot, "History of the Virginia State Teachers Association"), No 5

Shaskal'skiy, A. I., "Protest Against Class and Racial Oppression" (Review of the book: H. Winston, "Class, Race and Black Liberation"), No 11

Shvedkov, Yu. A., "Anatomy of U.S. Foreign Policy Machinery" (Review of the book: G. Allison and P. Szanton, "Remaking Foreign Policy. The Organizational Connection"), No 12

Shein, V. S., "Problems of Nuclear Disarmament" (Review of the book: A. Ye. Yefremov, "Yadernaya razoruzheniye" [Nuclear Disarmament]), No 12

Yaroshenko, N. B., "Nonalignment--Factor of Peace" (Review of the book: R. A. Tuzmukhamedov, "Neprisoyedineniye i razryadka mezhdunarodnoy napryazhennosti" [Nonalignment and International Detente]), No 2

Yashin, B. D., "The Marines. Recommendations and Practices" (Review of the book: M. Binkin and J. Record, "Where Does the Marine Corps Go from Here?"), No 7

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", "SShA: ekonomika, politika, ideologiya", 1977

8588

CSO: 1803

END