

Wednesday, August 15, 1984

ORI15VO-2341

3

THE PRESIDENT'S "NUCLEAR JOKE"

Yuri Zhukov, Pravda's  
Political Commentator

An incident that took place near President Reagan's Californian ranch last Saturday created a public uproar in the world. In a sound test before making his regular broadcast to the nation Mr. Reagan decided to "relax" and blabbed out a thing which was on his mind all the time but which he could not say out loud because of the pressures of the election campaign.

Taking a mike he said: "My fellow Americans, I am pleased to tell you we have signed legislation that would outlaw Russia forever. We begin bombing in five minutes."

The technicians who recorded the President's address to the nation were aghast but when the President smiled they realised that he was only making a "voice test" before reading the prepared text of his address to the nation which dealt with routine economic problems.

White House staff immediately rushed to prevent the President's slip-up from being made public. But, as the saying goes, a word uttered is past recalling.

News agencies and newspapers were set at work. The Gannett News Service was the first to confirm the rumour about the incident that was spreading in Washington. It said that the President did make such a remark. A representative of the CNN television network said next that his company had a tape recording of President Reagan's remark but would not make it public so as not to violate the "rules" regulating relations between the media and the White House.

Journalists rushed to the President's residence but the confused White House spokesman refused to comment on the report. He said that anything the President said before the start of the recording of his broadcast address was not intended for the press.

A great political scandal broke out. Although President



- 2 -

Reagan's men assured everyone that the President was only "joking", political circles in the United States and other countries interpreted it as a provocation.

"By his dubious joke about a possible war with the Soviet Union Reagan put himself in an embarrassing position on the eve of the election," Agence France Presse said on August 13 in a report datelined Los Angeles. "Senior White House officials who accompany the President in California and first tried to prevent the further spread of the leak of information were obviously worried about the effects of Reagan's remark on his chances for re-election."

The agency said that the "President's gaffe" which the White House officials tried to present as a "funny joke" would make more people regard President Reagan as a "warmonger ready to press the button and start a nuclear conflict".

As soon as news of Reagan's outrageous pronouncement spread, it touched off a wave of indignation everywhere in the USA and allied countries.

Reagan's remark, said the American Associated Press news agency, is unlikely to be forgotten soon, for it came at a time when . bad relations between Moscow and Washington became one of the issues of the presidential election campaign. Reagan's earlier outbursts against the Soviet Union, . including his words about the "empire of evil", have led to the President being accused of pursuing an open policy of confrontation with the USSR.

In the last six months, on promptings from his advisers, Reagan did his utmost to present matters as if he were now a peace champion. On February 11, he declared that he was committed to a "serious and intensive dialogue" with the Soviet Union, aimed at building a more constructive US-Soviet relationship... "We should," he said, "find ways to work together to meet the challenge of preserving peace." Later on he kept repeating



flowery words about his commitment to cooperation with the USSR and made assurances that he wanted cuts in and even total elimination of nuclear weapons. Now it is becoming clear to everyone that such words were uttered only as a blind. This makes all the sharper the reaction to the prank the US President allowed himself last Saturday.

Walter Mondale, Democratic presidential candidate, said: "I don't think it's very funny." He recalled that in 1981 and 1982 members of the administration speculated about "preventive nuclear blasts" and "victory in limited nuclear wars". Such speculation, said Mondale, created serious diplomatic problems and undermined the attempts at ensuring arms control.

Voigt, leader of the group of Social Democrats in the foreign affairs committee of the Bundestag, made a statement which reads: "Those who, like President Reagan, are guided by irrational concepts of the Soviet Union as an enemy are unable to work for joint security with the USSR in the interests of universal peace ... Reagan's maniacal anti-Sovietism is the moving spirit of the American arms race."

Winnick, Labour MP, urged Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to tell President Reagan that the British are not amused by his black humour.

West European leaders and the press, feeling indignation and alarm over Reagan's escapade, give the most biting comments on the US President's behaviour.

"The Hollywood actor and simultaneously President of the USA has taken the liberty of 'making a joke'. This 'joke' is all permeated with cynicism and man-hating. Usually, this is the way professional criminals or recidivist killers 'joke'. This 'joke' is a very vivid reflection of the convictions of the US President," I am quoting a commentary in the press bulletin of the Social Democratic Party of the FRG, "Parlamentarisch-Politischer Pressedienst".



Wednesday, August 15, 1984

3

- 4 -

"Reagan's political career and world outlook show him as a man who draws no distinction between real action and elements of a show. When he was talking of a decisive battle between the empire of evil and the empire of good it was no joke. Now he is contemplating an armed invasion of Nicaragua. And this becomes a reality in the light of his election campaign. He is an unpredictable person without any self-control..."

The mouthpiece of the Social Democratic Party of West Germany clearly reflects the moods caused by Reagan's words not only within that party but among millions of West Germans as well who are gravely concerned as they are over the fact that the present West German government, to quote Parlamentarisch-Politischer Pressedienst, has granted Reagan the supreme right to dispose of West German territory in his missile deployment plans.

One could cite many other equally critical and just evaluations of the latest prank by the American President.

The White House is dearly hoping now that this incident will soon be forgotten. In this connection it has undertaken monumental efforts to make sure that the press should keep silent about the incident that happened on Saturday August 11 at the President's ranch. The Associated Press and the United Press International report that the White House "keeps dead silent". It has been announced in Washington that a scheduled regular press conference will not take place since the President and all his staff are terribly busy. What are they busy with, one may wonder. It now turns out, according to a White House report, that they are preparing for the wedding of the President's daughter, which is scheduled for August 14.

It is very unlikely, however, that the White House will succeed in hushing up the latest political scandal soon enough.



Wednesday, August 15, 1984

3

- 5 -

It is beyond any doubt that the President's statement will be interpreted everywhere in the world as a confirmation that his hypocritical deliberations about his affected desire to normalize relations with the Soviet Union and to secure disarmament were nothing but a smoke-screen for the political course which he announced on arriving at the White House.

As noted by Comrade Konstantin Chernenko in his reply to a letter from the prominent Irish public figure, S. MacBride, printed on August 12, "there has been a good deal of words about peace and talks from the American side. All practical moves by the US Administration, however, are at variance with its proclaimed drive for talks and for improved relations". The Soviet leadership believes that only practical moves but not any words by the American Administration can clear the way to the normalization of our relations with the US.

While President Reagan stays at his ranch, the Pentagon is pushing ahead with the arms race. The Congress is discussing the biggest draft military budget in the history of the USA. Once in a while the Senators and House members cut on this or another item of that budget, but these cuts do not affect the huge arms programme advocated by the Pentagon and the President.

As for the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries, their stand on the issues pertaining to the prevention of war, ensuring peace and businesslike cooperation with all countries, including the United States, in resolving these tasks is known to all. They have outlined a large-scale realistic programme for action based on the principle of equality and equal security. This action would pave the way to mutually beneficial agreements.

The proposals of the USSR and the fraternal countries, which have been supported not only by the broad mass of the people, but also by the governments of the overwhelming majority of states, have been repeatedly put forward at all the most important international forums on these problems and also in the course of bilateral



Wednesday, August 15, 1984

- 6 -

3

Soviet-American talks. Our side has displayed a lot of goodwill. But each time the initiatives of the socialist community met with a tough "No" from the American side.

The attempts made by President Reagan over the past six months to present the facts in a distorted light and try to picture things as if it is not the United States but the Soviet Union which opposes an end to the arms race and development of peaceful international economic cooperation can deceive only those who want to be deceived.

People are not blind. They can see who declares for peace and who dreams of military solutions. Reagan's prank before a microphone of the American radio on August 11 is fresh evidence of the dangerous designs hatched by the United States administration.

In a bid to lull the vigilance of the peace forces, the American leaders often make statements alleging that the United States does not plan to put to use the mountains of weapons which it is accumulating, but only <sup>wants</sup> to use their availability as a "deterrence" against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. But these gentlemen would be well advised to wake up at long last to the fact that the Soviet Union and its allies will not be intimidated.

The Soviet Union and its allies have everything necessary to uphold their security and repel any aggression. The response the United States got to the deployment of its first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe is convincing evidence that nobody will ever be able to put on their knees the peoples, which won their freedom at a dear price and are resolved to defend themselves and uphold the cause of peace.

The incident at the presidential ranch on Saturday, August 11, is fresh proof of the need to preserve utmost vigilance in the face of the aggressive plans of the USA and NATO.

(Pravda, August 15. In full.)



Tuesday, August 14, 1984

ORIOVO-2331

5

REAGANOMICS: FOUR YEARS AFTER

The slogans and promises of the Republican administration in the economic field were not just banal election bluffing. They have proved to be an outrageous deception even by the standards of "American democracy" which has seen quite a lot during its history.

The noisy campaign about the imaginary successes of Reaganomics is designed to deceive simpletons who have a bad memory.

The apologists of Reaganomics are today particularly zealous to stress that over the first half of 1984 industrial output in the United States grew seven per cent. But if this indicator is compared with that of 1983, i.e. the time when the United States economy was hit by the deepest and most protracted economic crisis over the whole postwar period, and if one compares summer "record" figures with the pre-crisis year of 1979 a new picture will appear. It turns out that over a period of five years industrial output in the USA grew only 4.5 per cent. Such are the real fruit of Reaganomics.

Under the pretext of combating inflation both the governmental and business circles have launched a ruthless offensive against the living standards of the working people. As a result, the living standards of more than 35 million Americans are now below the official "poverty line". This has never happened in the United States since the times of the Great Depression of the 20s and 30s. This is, perhaps, the most perceptible real result of Reaganomics.

On the other hand Reagan overfulfills his promises to the monopolies of the military-industrial complex. In the



Tuesday, August 14, 1984

5

- 2 -

field of military spendings, the arms race and militarisation of the country, the current administration has done so much, that even not a single ardent proponent of a "revival" of the USA military might could have hoped for. Under the accompaniment of a frenzied anti-Soviet hysteria, the American ruling circles have initiated a militaristic campaign unprecedented in that country's history. Over the years of Reagan's presidency, the military appropriations of the United States have almost doubled.

As a result of the unrestrained build up of military spendings by the current administration, the budget deficit in the current fiscal year will reach 200,000 million dollars. And the aggregate national debt of the United States has reached the sum which is even hard to imagine - one trillion, 592 billion dollars.

The baneful impact of militarisation on the general state of the country's economy is seen from the decline in the competitiveness of a wide range of American products in the world market.

The United States balance of trade deficit is expected to top 100 billion dollars in 1984. This is more than a half of the total cost of the American commodity exports. This has never happened throughout the whole history of the United States.

Reaganomics is detrimental not only to the broad sections of population of the United States. Washington's cynical, selfish policy is increasingly in conflict with the interests of its own partners, to say nothing of millions of common people in the other capitalist countries.

Reaganomics is also heavily detrimental to the developing countries. The new protectionist barriers, which have been sharply raised in recent years by the USA and the other West-



Tuesday, August 14, 1984

5

- 3 -

ern countries, have sharply worsened the conditions of the sale of goods from the developing states. The point at issue is, as a matter of fact, shameless plunder of the newly free countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who were robbed by imperialism even without that.

The pledges and promises to improve the economy of the United States and of the whole capitalist world, which Reagan so generously gave four years ago have undoubtedly helped him to win the preceding presidential elections. But the past years of implementation of the Reaganomics policy are evidence that there is a vast distance between promises and realities.

(Izvestia, August 12. Summary.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARASTIRMA MERKEZİ  
TÜSTAV

PACTOMANIA

A. Cherepanov

The republican administration of General Eisenhower was dubbed in its time a team suffering from "pactmania." By the late 1950s, the U.S. bound 42 states with "military commitments." That policy fit perfectly into the main concept of the White House during the cold war, that of "rolling back communism." The Reagan administration which, incidentally, is also a Republican one is following in Eisenhower's footsteps.

In order to stifle the Grenadian revolution, the United States cobbled together a militarist alliance of East Caribbean states. There are grounds for asserting that the White House has not given up its attempts to form yet another bloc, the South Atlantic Treaty Organization (SATO). Jesus Iglesias Rouco, commentator of the Argentinian newspaper La Prensa, wrote recently about what representatives of the state department and the Pentagon prefer to talk about in secret. The journalist called on Argentina to adopt the strategic positions of Washington, which would ostensibly help it obtain from the United States technology, the lowering of customs barriers and even... support for Argentinian demands with respect to the Malvinas (Falkland) islands.

In Rouco's opinion, everything is very simple. Argentina would be included in the "military structure being fashioned by the West in the Southern zone, thanks to which the country would be able to ensure the security of its territories in the South of the continent and solidify its presence in the Antarctic."

If the Argentinian government fails to abandon its policy of non-alignment, the bloc in the making would not guarantee its "loyal" attitude to it. It is thus being proposed that



- 2 -

Argentina should forgo its sovereignty in return for American technology and mythical security.

The first steps to create SATO have already been made, the paper noted. With Washington's tacit consent and involvement Britain is drawing up the scheme of a "military-political alliance" with South Africa and Chile in the South Atlantic, patterned on NATO. The Pinochet clique and the Pretoria racists have long formed a warmest relationship based on some "common responsibility" for that part of the world.

The United States and its allies would like to make their militarist preparations in the South Atlantic appear as measures against "the penetration of communism" in that region. But SATO's tasks will be anything but "dovish." The threat of coming under imperialist diktat will come to hang over many countries. It is with good reason apparently that Argentina and Brazil refuse to participate in the contemplated alliance. And it is with good reason that the African countries in the South of their continent believe that if SATO is formed, the apartheid regime will become one hundred times more dangerous for their sovereignty and national security.

(Izvestia, August 17. Summary.)

Monday, August 20, 1984

1RI01-27133 GT

APN Informs and Comments

9

USA: A GLOBAL THREAT WHICH IS NO JOKE

Svyatoslav Kozlov,  
APN political commentator

The ghastly 'joke' by President Reagan remains in the focus of public attention, while his closer associates are trying to present the incident as an innocent gaffe and the President himself as an ardent peace-lover.

These efforts are mercilessly exposed by present-day realities. The other day the Pentagon proudly announced that it had carried out the first test of a Tomahawk cruise missile with what appears to be a conventional warhead. Judging by the tone of the announcement, the missile so far meets the expectations of its designers and owners as far as its numerous characteristics of a first-strike offensive weapon are concerned. The test launch was made from a submarine, although it is common knowledge that the missile can also be fired from surface ships. The US Navy has instantly reaffirmed its intention to buy at least 3,000 (3,000) Tomahawks with conventional and 750 (750) missiles with nuclear warheads. The missiles will be stationed on 175 ships. Those ships will keep on cruising about the seas and oceans all over the world, posing a mortal threat first of all to the littoral states.

The production and purchases of similar land- and air-based missiles continue for the US Army and Air Force, too. All in all, the Pentagon plans to buy 12,000 (12,000) cruise missiles. This means that these missiles will make up the bulk of the US nuclear potential.

This does away with all that 'peaceful' verbal camouflage, and the arms race enters a new material phase. The point is not only the imminent quantitative growth of the US offensive nuclear potential. There is a qualitative leap here, too, since the



characteristics of these new weapons will obviously demand a revision of the forms and methods of the present strategy. The arrival of cruise missiles substantially exacerbates the danger of an outbreak of nuclear war as a result of unpredictable circumstances. This explains the highly destabilizing character of these weapons.

On the other hand, cruise missiles appreciably complicate the possibility of coming to terms on the <sup>and disarmament</sup> problem of arms control. The point is that the potential enemy will be unable to distinguish between a missile carrying a conventional warhead and a missile with a nuclear one. This means that verifying the presence of nuclear warheads becomes very difficult if not altogether impossible. In this manner, the new spiral of the arms race launched by the US hits right at the efforts to avert an all-destructive nuclear catastrophe and to secure peace and disarmament. This makes any talks very difficult and practically groundless since there will be no opportunity for reliable verification of compliance.

This is what stands behind the President's 'inoffensive' joke.

And the problem is not confined to cruise missiles, of course. The US is launching the production of ever new types of weapons. The 'rearmament of America' proceeds at full pace, and the indisputable 'credit' for this goes to the Republican administration, which is working up the war danger.

The Pentagon is testing the MX intercontinental first-strike ballistic missile, making the final preparations for the production of single-warhead ICBMs and Trident-2 missiles for its submarines, and introducing new features into the design of the B-1B strategic bomber. There is also a big programme underway to modernize the weapons of all US arms and services. All this is being done to gain military superiority and eventually global supremacy.

Special emphasis is on the President's favourite idea of

building 'strategic missile defenses'.. Giving their full support to all of Reagan's militaristic undertakings, the Republicans are even praising the President in their election programme for his 'bold initiative'. They deliberately keep silent about the fact that the new missile defense system is designed to provide the aggressor with favourable conditions for starting nuclear war with the hope of complete impunity. It is vital to realise the illusory and dangerous character of such 'bold' idea. "It is obvious for every thinking person", said Konstantin Chernenko in his reply to the letter from the well-known Irish public figure, Sean MacBride, "that any further nuclear arms build-up and, worse still, the drive to extend the arms race even to space confront mankind with the threat of a global nuclear catastrophe!"

Before the arms race has become irreversible, there is still an opportunity to halt that dangerous process through negotiations. However, provocative 'jokes' by the President in no way indicate that he will display a serious attitude to this problem.

(APN, August 19. In full.)

THE END



Monday, August 20, 1984

6

PRAVDA: IRRESPONSIBLE ATTACK

Yu. Kuznetsov

There is an old popular saying that simplicity is worse than thievery. It means that damage from poorly thought out actions or statements, to put it mildly, sometimes is even worse than that from the actions of a commonplace, trivial offender. A recent example of this popular truth is now being discussed and criticized all over the world.

It is pointed out, however, that the now notorious remark of the U.S. President about his intention to 'bomb Russia' obviously belies his sinister designs, an echo of Reagan's ambitions which have never come true because of factors outside his control.

The response of the peoples to the malicious attack of the U.S. President is virtually unanimous: that attack is denounced as a manifestation of the extreme 'hawkish' and adventuristic ambitions which are unacceptable in international intercourse. That reaction confused many White House officials, who refused to explain or comment on the President's provocative 'admission', obviously trying to play down its importance.

But there is one snag: Reagan continues in the same vein! All that was like water off a duck's back. According to a recent visitor to the White House, the President was in a good mood. "Grinning, he said that he was in a hurry to the Cabinet meeting and that for this reason he undoubtedly would not bomb Russia in the next five minutes".

To all appearances the chief of the Washington administration likes very much his own cynical statements. But they stink -- for ordinary, normal people, and what is most important, they are hostile and irresponsible jamborees aimed against our country and the cause of universal peace."

(Pravda, August 18. In full.)



Tuesday, August 14, 1984

ORIOVO-2330

NEW PROPOSALS WITH THE OLD SLANT

Paul Volcker, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, a few days ago presented to the House Foreign Affairs Committee some "new proposals" of the Reagan administration for the solution of problems linked with the huge debts of developing countries. These "proposals" are commented on in the newspaper Pravda by Svetlana Timofeyeva, answering readers' questions. The concern of directors of the biggest American banks, who are having a series of meetings in New York these days, is actually concentrated on this problem, too.

Why do official Washington and bank tycoons alike show heightened concern over that question?

The economic position of many developing Asian, African and Latin American countries dramatically worsened in the recent years. The credit policy of the biggest capitalist states, above all the United States, which grant loans on fettering terms, plays in that a prima role.

The manipulations with the interest rate done by creditor banks, their raising discount rates, the growing dollar rate and cost of Western imports with the simultaneous reduction in prices of raw materials the export of which gives the main currency earnings to "Third World" countries lead to their snowballing debts.

It has been estimated, for instance, that a rise in the discount rate by US banks by one percent increases the debt of developing states by 4,000 million dollars, and this year alone this rate has increased by 2 percent. The debt of Asian, African and Latin American countries to the West runs into an astronomic 810,000 million dollars--four times more than in 1975. During the past year the "benefactores" have pumped into their vaults 150,000 million dollars, with interest rate payments amounting to almost half of that. Realising that aid turned to be outright plunder, many



Thursday, August 14, 1984

- 2 -

4

developing countries demand deferment of payment and fundamental revision of the existing relations.

Capitalist creditors, ignoring this rightful demand, resort to demagogy and all sorts of subterfuges so that the debtor countries should not succeed in relaxing the grip of the "dollar collar".

The "new proposals" of the White House are nothing but a set of long known methods that American imperialism has been using towards developing states. It is again recommended to increase the role of the International Monetary Fund, with US banks playing the key part in it. As was admitted also by Paul Volcker, the huge deficit of the US federal budget directly assists debt enslavement of developing states.

From the very beginning of its term in office the Reagan administration refused point blank to heed the proposals by developing countries of a new, fair international economic order, and till this day its policy towards those states pursues the only goal, that of perpetuating their unequal status so that to pump from them, unhindered, new billions of dollars, Svetlana Timofeyeva draws the conclusion.

(Pravda, August 13. In full.)



Subet 83

SURVEYS, INFORMATION AND MAIL  
=====

INDICTMENT OF IMPERIALISM

Survey Five

Two years ago (January 1981) WMR carried Survey Four of "Indictment of Imperialism". Since then humanity has witnessed a new escalation of imperialist crimes. The reckless, adventurist policy of the enemies of peace has greatly increased the war danger and confronted our planet with a real threat of nuclear annihilation. Imperialism responds to the oppressed peoples' aspiration for freedom and justice with massive terror and acts of genocide. The United States and other industrial powers of the old world are intensifying the neocolonial exploitation of developing countries. The capitalist system multiplies the hardships of the working people, dooming more and more of them to material and moral privations caused by unemployment. Subversion against countries of the socialist community on the part of bellicose imperialist forces has reached unprecedented proportions.

All this is the subject of Survey Five of "Indictment of Imperialism", prepared by the journal's Commission for Scientific Information and Documentation.

IMPERIALISM IS GUILTY OF THE DISRUPTION OF DETENTE,  
THE GROWING WAR DANGER AND THE CRIMINAL ESCALATION  
OF THE ARMS RACE

The crucial question and problem of problems of today's world is that of removing the threat of nuclear war, ending the insane arms race and renouncing force as a means of settling international differences and disputes. Recent years have repeatedly shown that imperialist policy, primarily that of the United States, is the main--indeed the



only--obstacle to this. Washington is obsessed by a truly maniacal desire to impose its will on other nations. This obsession materialises in an obstructionistic rejection of every initiative towards a sound, constructive solution of international problems, an aggressive foreign policy and a militarist frenzy that makes the country's rulers regard the attainment of military superiority over the Soviet Union as their chief priority.

Under the Reagan Administration the decisive role of the military-industrial complex, that alliance between a reactionary military establishment and arms manufacturers, in the framing of the foreign policy of the chief imperialist power has increased more than ever before. The interests of big military business and related interests are behind the negative stance of the United States on virtually every proposal for the promotion of international security.

This criminal negativism was manifest during the latest two sessions of the UN General Assembly (36th and 37th) and its Second Special Session on Disarmament as well as in the work of specialised UN agencies.

Nor does the USA show any desire to seek progress in the Soviet-US talks (begun in 1982) on strategic arms limitation and reduction, the talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe, or the talks on a mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe that have been going on for nearly ten years.

The imperialists certainly realise that millions of people would inevitably lose their lives in the very first hours of a nuclear war. Experts' calculations leave no room for doubt on this point. One megaton bomb dropped on a city of a million inhabitants would instantly wipe out from 300,000 to 350,000



people and doom another 200,000 to an inescapable and painful death. Yet it is plain that in the event of such a war more than one megaton charge would be used.

Putting a good face on their criminal gamble, US militarist maniacs have been promoting the idea of "limited" nuclear war. This is a fraud. Now that monopoly on arms of mass destruction has long been a thing of the past and existing arsenals can destroy all life on earth many times over, any "limitation" of a nuclear war by those who were to start it would be absolutely unrealistic. But even a "limited" war would reproduce the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki dozens and hundreds of times over and with far more terrible consequences. This being so, there is no need to spell out the effects of a "protracted" nuclear war, whose doctrine and strategic plan have been worked out by the Pentagon on Reagan's instructions.

The obstructionistic approach of the USA and its closest allies to measures intended to remove the nuclear threat, and Washington's steps towards planning a nuclear war are diametrically opposed to the vital interests of humanity and are a heinous crime against nations.

However, there is something more to the imperialists' recurrent torpedoing of the initiatives of peace forces. Their own "initiatives" are generally aggressive; they deteriorate the international situation, add to world tensions and undermine detente, whose beneficial effects became evident in the seventies. This applies above all to Europe. US policy towards Europe is, in effect, a great-power anti-European policy clearly militating against the interests of peace, security and mutually



beneficial cooperation on the continent. Its two main pivots are, first, the transformation of Western Europe into a potential theatre of hostilities involving the use of the latest medium-range nuclear systems as well as neutron and chemical weapons, with all ensuing disastrous consequences, and second, the disruption of European cooperation in various fields, primarily the economy, to the detriment of both socialist countries and the West European competitors of the USA.

It follows that Washington is out to destroy the sound foundations of international relations laid by the Helsinki Conference, whose Final Act was also signed by the US President. Washington is pushing Europe to confrontation between countries of different social systems, with growing political and military tension as a result. One indication of this is Washington's persistent effort to complicate the Madrid meeting of the CSCE states.

Lately the USA has proceeded with increasingly provocative arrogance as a world gendarme trying to check developments that do not suit Washington, in particular the upsurge in liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. To this end it has formed a "rapid deployment force" as a means of promptly "normalising" the situation where it takes a turn dangerous to present-day colonialists.

The force exceeds 230,000 in strength and may be substantially increased if necessary. It is, in fact, a powerful mobile contingent in addition to the more than 500,000 troops that have long been stationed on foreign soil. The USA has about 2,500 military bases and installations, including 400 major



ones, in as many as 114 countries; 380 of its bases are situated in the immediate proximity of the Soviet frontier and none but naive people could doubt their aggressive purpose. Roughly one-third of the US nuclear potential is sited outside the country. It comprises 12,000 warheads, including some 7,000 in Western Europe, 1,800 in Asia and from 2,500 to 2,800 on ships cruising in the ocean round the clock.

Imperialist policy is to blame for the rise of conflicts and "trouble spots" in the Middle East, Southern Africa and the African Horn, the South Atlantic, Central America and the Caribbean. The Middle East crisis, a product of the policy of aggression of Israel abetted by US imperialism, is the most protracted and painful one.

A typical expression of imperialist aggressiveness, of brazen disregard of the will of nations, is the imperialist powers' opposition to the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a peace zone as envisaged by UN resolutions. The growing US military presence in the region, which lies farthest of all from the American continent, poses a grave threat to the security of the littoral states. Over 25 military installations of the Pentagon are situated there today. The most important of them, the naval and air base at Diego Garcia, is equipped with nuclear and chemical weapons. These installations are manned by 140,000 troops, and the USA goes on building up its military infrastructure in the Indian Ocean. Press reports say that Washington has worked out a five-year programme under which \$30 billion is to be spent for the purpose.



To lend its global interventionism a semblance of legitimacy and tie its military and political allies to the same course, Washington is trying to extend the geographical bounds of the NATO sphere of action. The likelihood of this extension was formally recorded by the Military Planning Committee and a NATO Council meeting in May 1982 and June 1982 respectively.

These schemes amount to arbitrary action in regard to Asian, African and Latin American countries on the part of imperialist powers headed by the United States under the spurious pretext of defending their "vital interests". Nor does this only affect countries adhering to an explicitly anti-imperialist position. "Collective action" by NATO powers in support of Britain's aggression last year hit Argentina, whose military regime is markedly conservative. It is clear, therefore, that extension of the NATO sphere of action would expose the independence and sovereignty of all developing countries to imperialist blows.

The Reagan Administration's term in office has been marked by a further rapid increase in military spending. Budget appropriations for military purposes went up from nearly \$160 billion in 1981 to \$232 billion in 1983. A "five-year plan" has been launched to escalate the arms race. Real military expenditures in the 1983-1987 period, that is, expenditures allowing for inflation, are to increase by an annual 7 per cent against 5 per cent under the Carter team. The American press sets the cost of this militarist programme at somewhere between \$1.5 and \$2.25 trillion. Provisions have been made for the



construction and deployment of 100 ICBMs of the MX type, seen by the Pentagon as a first-strike weapon, 100 strategic B-1B bombers, Stealth bombers "undetectable by radar", atomic missile-carrying Trident submarines and several thousand cruise missiles. The US strategic nuclear arsenal is to be increased from the more than 15,000 warheads today to 20,000 by the early nineties.

The propaganda smokescreen for the militarists' plan is the battered lie about the "Soviet threat". The actual aim is to achieve military superiority for the USA and tip the present rough parity between the USA and NATO, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, on the other, in favour of the former group. A particularly dangerous aspect of this policy will be the NATO-decided deployment of new US intermediate-range nuclear missiles--nearly 600 Pershing-2 missiles and Tomahawk cruise missiles--in European countries. Preparations for their stationing are under way in the FRG, Britain and Italy.

Millions are allocated for the manufacture of chemical ammunition, above all binary gas, intended chiefly for cruise missiles. At this writing there are over three million items of chemical arms in US dumps situated in the United States, Europe, Japan and Johnston Island (Pacific Ocean), or enough to annihilate the world's population several times over, according to the Washington Post.



Washington is stepping up the development of new nuclear weapons systems. One indication of this is the increased number of test explosions: the first ten months of 1982 saw 17 such tests, or more than in any one of the previous twelve years. To untie its hands, Washington has broken off talks with the Soviet Union and Britain on a general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. Indeed, the present administration contemplates carrying out nuclear blasts exceeding 150 kilotons in power although the relevant Soviet-US treaty prohibits this.

Washington's militarist designs and activities are not restricted to the surface of our planet but extend to outer space. The Reagan Administration plans, according to the US press, to increase military spending on space "exploration" in the next five years at a rate surpassing the growth of military spending as a whole. It pins special hopes on spaceships of the Shuttle type. (Realisation of the intensive Shuttle programme--up to 52 flights a year--is fraught, among other things, with serious negative consequences for the earth's climate, as even US experts admit.)

A system for the destruction of man-made satellites is being developed at a fast pace. Work is under way on laser and other weapons. The US Air Force now includes a Space Command.

All this is irrefutable evidence of the imperialists' criminal policy of undermining detente, stepping up international tensions, reverting to the cold war and pushing humanity to self-destruction in a nuclear holocaust.



# IMPERIALISM DOOMS MORE AND MORE WORKING PEOPLE IN INDUSTRIAL CAPITALIST COUNTRIES TO SOCIAL HARDSHIPS AND PRIVATIONS

The arms race which imperialism has launched and continuously steps up swallows an increasing part of the material and financial resources of nations, reducing the possibilities of economic and social progress, of greater production for peaceful purposes. This criminal policy directly affects the everyday lives of the working people of industrial capitalist countries.

The capitalist world is going through its third economic crisis in ten years, a crisis comparable to only the Great Depression of the thirties. In these circumstances monopoly capital is trying harder than ever to remedy the ills of bourgeois society at the expense of the masses. The attack on their living standards is intensifying. Government spending on education, health, social security and housing is cut back everywhere. Wages and salaries are frozen or even reduced.

This policy is most pronounced in the United States. Under the 1982 Federal budget, appropriations for social needs were curtailed by more than \$35 billion. Cuts bit into 250 programmes, or the whole system of assistance won by the disinherited through long years of hard struggle. Here are some of the Reagan Administration's anti-social measures. It has

- abolished the vocational training programme for members of national minorities and unskilled workers;
- reduced the term of unemployment relief from 39 to 26 weeks;
- abolished food relief to 875,000 needy families;
- sharply reduced it in the case of five million Americans;



- curtailed appropriations for medical aid to low-income categories, old people and invalids--a measure affecting 29 million people;

- lowered the subsidy for rent in the case of 2.4 million families;

- considerably reduced allocations for public schools, with the result that 55,000 teachers lost their jobs in 1982.

The Federal budget for the 1983 fiscal year provides for a further curtailment of social spending by a total of \$25.9 billion. The axe of cutbacks has hit medical aid to poor and old people, food relief, vocational training and employment programmes, aid to large families, subsidies for schools, public transport and other services.

Spending for social needs is also under attack in many other countries. In 1981 the "red pencil" of reductions left many a mark on the social items of the budget of the FRG. Appropriations for unemployment relief were cut by 250 million marks and for education, by 100 million. This year "austerity" will bring down social spending by 14 billion marks.

In Britain the monopolies and ruling quarters are carrying on a "crusade" against the working people. The Thatcher cabinet has scaled down expenditures on education, the health service, social security and housing.

Overall social conditions are declining in Italy. In 1981 and 1982 the government suspended the building of schools. University tuition fees are up. In 1982 appropriations for public health were cut by five trillion lire.



A swing to "social conservatism" has come about in Canada. Taxes are going up, pensioning is being reduced and the government is taking certain other steps that will tell on the interests of large sections of the population.

The trend is similar in other capitalist countries, and this at a time when more and more people find themselves below the official poverty line, that is, are virtual paupers. In the United States their number in 1982 was nearly 32 million, or equalled 14 per cent of the population. In Italy there are eight million people living below the poverty line, according to an <sup>commission</sup> EEC/estimate. Data released by the International Labour Organisation show that in the 24 member states of the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) 60 million people, or 12 per cent of the population, have an income falling short of the subsistence minimum.

The working people are plundered on an unprecedented scale in the interests of monopoly. In the USA, income tax on companies and the wealthiest population groups has been substantially reduced. This enabled them to "save" an impressive \$50 billion in 1982. The CPUSA estimates that in the next six years corporate taxes will be cut by \$164 billion. In the FRG deductions from the working people's incomes in the first half of 1981 increased by 6.3 per cent while tax on employers' profits was cut by 6.2 per cent. There is a similar trend in a number of other countries.

We are thus in the presence of a large-scale offensive of the monopoly bourgeoisie against the social and economic rights of the masses. This anti-popular policy translates into a real tragedy for millions of ordinary people.



The current economic crisis in capitalist countries has led to a sharp upturn in unemployment. In the USA the right to work is denied to 12 million people, or about 11 per cent of the able-bodied population--a post-war high. A similar "record" was registered in the EEC countries, where the unemployed at the close of 1982 added up to 11.5 million, or 10.3 per cent of the work force. Britain is in the lead with more than 3.3 million. In Italy the jobless exceed two million and there are as many in France and Spain; in the FRG the unemployment rate is close to two million, in Canada it exceeds 1.5 million and in Japan it stands at 1.3 million. In all, 31 million people in 24 industrial capitalist countries are jobless. What is more, these are official bourgeois statistics, which are far from mirroring the real state of affairs. In the USA, for instance, there are 15 million unemployed and not 12 million, according to trade union sources, and most of them get no relief at all.

Unemployment is a scourge for all categories of working people. It hits women, youth and elderly people hardest of all. In the USA, over 20 per cent of white youth and nearly 50 per cent of black youth are jobless. Time magazine comments: "To be young and female is double jeopardy." People up to 25 years of age exceed 40 per cent of the unemployed in West European countries. In the early eighties women accounted for 51 per cent of the unemployed in the FRG, 53 per cent in France and 60 per cent in Belgium.

Typical of the situation on the capitalist labour market is structural unemployment, a consequence of the decline of "traditional" industries, which are concentrated, moreover, in



definite geographical areas. This virtually makes it impossible for an unemployed person to find a new job because numerous members of the same trades or professions and having the same qualifications are jobless already. And the barriers which under capitalism must be overcome by those who want to learn a new trade doom them to a protracted and often fruitless search for work. In Britain over 70 per cent of the unemployed in 1981 had been out of a job for more than 13 weeks and 26 per cent, for more than a year. In the USA unemployment lasting over 15 weeks affected about one-fourth of the jobless. In France 74 per cent of the unemployed had had no job for three months or a longer time and in the FRG their proportion was 66 per cent.

In addition to economic privations, mass unemployment in industrial capitalist countries is a source of severe nervous strain and a cause of mental and heart diseases. US experts estimate that a 1 per cent increase in unemployment in their country raises the incidence of deaths from heart failure to nearly 2 per cent; the number of mental patients goes up by 4.3 per cent among men and 2.3 per cent among women; suicides show a 4.1 per cent increase.

In France six or seven suicides a month are a direct consequence of unemployment. Cambridge University economists estimate that in Britain the Tories' current policies doom about 50,000 people to premature death from various strains due to unemployment and reduced social spending. They believe that for the same reason another 50,000 people will find themselves in hospitals or asylums by 1984.



Behind unemployment growth figures are the untold hardships, shattered hopes, disappointments, crippled destinies, distress and despair of millions who find themselves on the margin of the capitalist system, called the "welfare state" and the society of "equal opportunities" by bourgeois propaganda. It is an incontrovertible fact that the severe tragedies of these people are a direct outgrowth of socio-economic relations under the capitalist system.

#### IMPERIALISM AND ITS UNDERLINGS GO ON COMMITTING ATROCIOUS CRIMES AGAINST FREEDOM-LOVING PEOPLES

Recent years have witnessed acts of aggression and genocide committed with the direct complicity of imperialism and comparable in some cases to nazi crimes.

The world was horrified by the bloody aggression which US imperialism's "strategic ally", Israel, perpetrated in Lebanon. The result was 60,000 dead and wounded civilians, six cities reduced to ruins, over 30 villages burnt out, 14 refugee camps razed to the ground and about a million people left homeless. Specialised UN agencies have reported that from June 4 to August 15, 1982 it came to the killing or wounding of 11,840 children below 15 years of age, 8,688 women and 2,409 people above 60. The tragedy of Oradour, Khatyn, Lidice and Son My was repeated in the Palestinians' Sabra and Shatila camps, where 7,000 civilians, including old people, women and children, were victims of genocide.



US imperialism was an accomplice in these crimes. It gave the aggressor arms and inspired his criminal activities. In the first half of 1982, or shortly before the aggression, Washington rendered Israel massive military aid worth \$1.8 billion; 90 per cent of the guns which devastated Beirut with cluster shells came from the Pentagon's arsenals. As many as 457 of Israel's 567 combat aircraft have been supplied by the United States. Vacuum, phosphorus and pellet bombs of US make were dropped on the densely populated neighbourhoods of Lebanese cities--imperialism made Lebanon a testing ground for the most up-to-date weapons. Under Articles 39, 41 and 42 of the UN Charter, effective coercive measures should and could have been adopted to stop Israel's aggression. But due to the use of the right of veto by the USA as a Security Council member, which has prevented the UN from curbing Israel, the aggressor continues committing crime after crime with impunity.

Imperialism is extending its undeclared war against the people of Afghanistan. In 1982 the US Senate voted for increased military and financial aid to Afghan counter-revolutionaries, which in late years has reached \$217 million. Under the direction of US instructors, about 60 subversive centres in Pakistan train bands of mercenaries who are then sent into Afghan territory. Thousands of Afghan civilians have suffered at the hands of counter-revolutionary bands armed and inspired by imperialism; to date the bandits have destroyed 1,500 schools and hundreds of houses.



Imperialism is directly involved in the atrocious crimes of the military dictatorship of El Salvador, which is waging a war of extermination against its own people. US aid to the Salvadoran junta in the 1980-1982 period totalled \$400 million. In the same period, the number of victims of genocide in that country topped 40,000. Imperialism stands accused of the tragedy that occurred in Morazan Department, where murderers trained in the USA and using US arms killed 1,009 civilians, from newly-borns to the 95 year-old people, in the matter of few<sup>days</sup>/.

Imperialism is to blame for the fact that Guatemala is becoming a "second El Salvador". In 1981 alone, the USA granted Guatemala's rulers \$3.2 million in aid. In the same year the Guatemalan junta destroyed over 13,500 people, 80 per cent of whom were civilians. Another 2,600 people were killed from March to October 1982.

Extending its secret war against Nicaragua, US imperialism has set up 17 army camps in Honduras, from where more than 80 armed invasions leading to massacres among civilians were carried out between 1980 and 1982. Late in 1982 the US Administration authorised a new CIA action programme directed against the Sandinista government.

The USA-South Africa tandem has stepped up attempts to destabilise the situation in Angola, using the presence of Cuban troops there as an excuse. In 1981 and 1982 South African troops effected several large-scale invasions of Angola resulting in the destruction of towns and villages and in the death or wounding of hundreds of people.



The sabotage units that have been formed by the imperialists and racists and cause death and destruction in Mozambique are over 10,000 strong.

Imperialism keeps up its economic, military and diplomatic aid to South Africa, which is waging a colonial war against the patriotic forces of Namibia. In 1980 alone this war took a toll of 1,500 lives. Operating there is a "destruction force" patterned by the South African racists on Hitlers' Sonder-kommandos SS.

Imperialism and its hierlings resort to the criminal method of physically eliminating fighters against imperialism--politicians and other public figures, leaders of the working-class and liberation movement, Communists.

The list of those who lost their lives at the hands of butchers and hired assassins in recent years comprises Kemal Türkler, member of the World Peace Council, trade union leader (Turkey); Enrique Alvarez Cordoba, Chairman, Revolutionary Democratic Front (El Salvador); Nazir Abbassi, youth leader (Pakistan); Gerardo Cuesta, Secretary, National Convention of Workers, EC member, Communist Party of Uruguay; Magid Abu Sharar, noted Palestinian writer and journalist, CC member of Al-Fatah, a Palestinian organisation; Avelino Ul, leader of the Indian Rights Movement (Colombia); Pio La Torre, Leadership member, Italian Communist Party, Secretary, Regional Committee of the ICP, MP; Neil Aggett and Ruth First, leaders of the trade union and anti-racist movement (South Africa); and many other noted progressives.



The lives of many universally known fighters for freedom, democracy and social progress imprisoned by reactionary regimes are in danger. This is the case of Antonio Maidana, CC First Secretary, Paraguayan Communist Party, and Emilio Roa, General Secretary, Paraguayan Confederation of Workers; Rock Derosé, member of the Secretariat, United Party of Haitian Communists, and Sylvio Claude, leader, Christian Democratic Party of Haiti; Jaime Perez, CC Secretary, Communist Party of Uruguay, and Jose Luis Massera, CEC member, CPU, a prominent scholar; Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress of South Africa.

Imperialism is responsible for the increasingly arbitrary police methods used by regimes which it supports politically and financially. US allocations for the maintenance of their repressive machinery have increased to \$8.6 billion a year; new thousands of citizens are victims of persecution.

In Chile the brutal regime under Pinochet has over 30,000 people in detention. It continues torturing and killing innocent people.

In Turkey upwards of 200,000 people were arrested in 1981 and 1982; 50,000 of them are still in jail. The regime put 52 leaders of DISK (Confederation of Revolutionary Workers' Trade Unions) on trial; hundreds of persons charged with Communist Party membership were tortured to death in prison.

Paraguay has 20 concentration camps where thousands of patriots are being held without charge or trial.



The military regime of Pakistan has 15,000 political prisoners behind bars.

South Africa has 120,000 political prisoners, or the largest number compared with the population. It accounts for 90 per cent of the death sentences passed throughout the so-called "free world".

Massive repression persists in the Sudan, Haiti and South Korea.

More and more often, imperialist reaction openly uses force against the masses through various terroristic groups and neo-fascist organisations.

In the United States, the rate of heinous crimes committed by ultra-rightist organisations like the Ku Klux Klan, Omega-7, Alpha-66 or the Jewish Defence League increased more than five-fold in 1980 and 1981, according to official statistics.

In Italy 1,200 acts of terrorism were recorded in 1980 alone. They resulted in killing 123 and wounding 253 people, including old people, women and children.

In the FRG neofascist organisations and groups in 1981 committed about 2,000 criminal offences, or twice as many as in 1980.

In Spain political violence caused the death of 85 persons in 1981 and 1982. In a single October day of 1982, on the eve of a general election, the ultra-rightists exploded over 20 bombs during an anti-democratic action.

In Greece the neofascist National Renaissance Organisation carried out about 70 explosions in Athens in 1980 and 1981.



In South Africa the year 1980 saw 1,600 cases of officially registered shooting, arson and assassination which hit opponents of the apartheid regime.

Lately a wave of terror has swept France, Britain and some other capitalist countries.

The instigation of acts of genocide and aggression against freedom-loving peoples, the physical elimination of fighters for the working people's interests, and lavish political and financial support for anti-popular dictatorships are part and parcel of imperialist policy.

#### IMPERIALIST ACTIVITY AGGRAVATES URGENT PROBLEMS OF THE PEOPLES OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The marked socio-economic backwardness of many Asian, African and Latin American peoples is a legacy of the period of colonial empires. Today humanity is entitled to present imperialism with a new bill for the hardships and privations which it has caused to millions of people in developing countries over the recent period.

Every year sees about 50 million people starve to death in this region of the globe. Meanwhile the number of those who are starving goes on increasing, according to FAO statistics. Whereas there were 420 million of them in 1976, their number in 1981 came close to one billion. In Asia this concerns 27 per cent of the population of developing countries, in Africa, 22 per cent and in Latin America, 13 per cent.

The reason why people are starving is not that there is not enough food in the world, for the world's annual output of grain alone averages 330 kilograms per person. Malnutrition is



a result of the criminal system established by imperialist monopolies which control deliveries and prices of foodstuffs. The chief purpose of "food relief" from industrial capitalist to developing countries has never been to feed the hungry. The aim is to sell surplus foodstuffs with a profit, tie the countries concerned with fetters of dependence and impose imperialism's diktat.

From 700 to 800 million adults in the developing world are completely illiterate and 1.5 billion people lack elementary medical aid, according to UN sources. Child mortality there is six times as high as in industrial countries. Nearly 40 per cent of the population of Asian, African and Latin American countries live in "absolute poverty" and some 450 million have no hope of ever getting a job.

These and other pressing social problems could be solved all the more easily by acting on the socialist countries' proposal for the early reduction of military budgets to use part of the funds saved in this way for aid to peoples in need of it. But the imperialist powers, far from accepting this reasonable and humanist proposal, go on increasing their military budgets, as has been shown.

Taking advantage of the economic backwardness of developing countries, imperialism exploits their difficulties and extends outright plunder of newly-free peoples.

Over the past 30 years, imperialism is estimated to have pumped a larger amount of real values out of these countries than the one-time colonial powers pumped out of their colonies



in three centuries. Every year imperialist monopolies take out \$100 billion. Each new dollar invested in the economies of these countries earns foreign investors an average of \$2.40 in net profit. As for Asians, Africans and Latin Americans, they only get from 10 to 17 per cent of the real market value of their natural resources, since the rest goes to the bank accounts of monopolies.

Imperialist plunder aggravates economic backwardness. While per capita GDP in developing countries twenty years ago equalled 1/26 of the corresponding indicator of industrial capitalist powers, today it is only 1/44 of it. Meanwhile government "aid" from the latter has been steadily decreasing. In recent years 17 of the wealthiest capitalist countries have reduced it substantially (the USA by 26 per cent), according to the OECD. This goes hand in hand with rising rates of interest on loans to developing countries. In 1981 the World Bank raised them by 2 per cent. One per cent increase means that newly-independent states must spend an additional \$2 billion a year. Due to imperialism's predatory practices, the foreign debt of developing countries in 1982 skyrocketed to \$540 billion.

In escalating its political interference in the affairs of developing countries, imperialism has never scrupled to resort to plots or sabotage. This is attested by facts dating from 1981 and 1982 which have come out.

In India the authorities discovered a plot against Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. Behind it was home reaction closely collaborating with the CIA and other imperialist intelligence services.



In Mozambique US agents operating in the army and state apparatus and plotting to assassinate President Samora Machel and other leaders of the country were unmasked.

In Zambia US diplomats turned out to be involved in a conspiracy against the government of Kenneth Kaunda.

A secret US <sup>intelligence</sup> plan to physically destroy Muammar al-Gaddafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, became known.

In Ghana the authorities discovered an imperialist plan for a landing of mercenaries to overthrow the Rawlings government.

In Mauritius a CIA plot to assassinate <sup>Paul</sup> Berenger, leader of the opposition party, was revealed.

In the Seychelles mercenaries made a raid planned and financed by imperialist secret services and racist South Africa with the aim of carrying out a coup.

In Zimbabwe a major act of sabotage was committed at the Thornhill air base, with the CIA participating.

In Democratic Yemen the authorities arrested a group of saboteurs trained by US instructors in special centres on Saudi Arabian territory.

In Grenada the CIA and its agents made several attempts to carry out a counter-revolutionary coup and assassinate leaders of the country.

Imperialist activities in developing countries--whether exploitation of the troubles and suffering of millions, economic plunder or political intervention--can only be defined as crimes.



## IMPERIALISM IS STEPPING UP INTERFERENCE IN THE AFFAIRS OF SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Lately imperialism has launched large-scale actions in the way of sabotage and subversion against socialist countries.

The main target of these actions is socialist Poland. By June 1981, over 400 centres had been set up in NATO countries to conduct subversion against people's power in that country. Large quantities of printing equipment and radio transmitters were smuggled into Poland and put at the disposal of counter-revolutionary groups; also, thousands of balloons with subversive literature in containers were floated in. In 1981 the number of attempts by imperialist secret services to recruit Polish citizens for spying and subversive activities increased by nearly 40 per cent, according to the Polish Ministry of the Interior.

Instructions and whole scenarios for the organisation of riots were prepared and broadcast over CIA Radio "Free Europe". In January 1982 the US rulers staged an unprecedented act of subversion against Poland on television. In September 1982, a provocative raid inspired by imperialist secret services was made on the Polish Embassy in Switzerland.

Extensive economic "santions" were adopted against Poland, with the result that consumption of many food products, the production of medicines, and so on fell off noticeably. These practices are incompatible with the universally recognised norms of international law; they constitute gross interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state and can only be described as a crime against the Polish people.



Taking advantage of events in Poland as an excuse, the imperialists staged new acts of provocation against the Soviet Union. Late in 1981 the Reagan Administration announced the suspension of Aeroflot flights to the USA, the postponement of talks on sea shipping and grain trade, restrictions on Soviet-US scientific and technological contacts, and other measures. It imposed and in June 1982 substantially extended a ban on deliveries of oil and gas extracting and transporting equipment to the Soviet Union. Although these attempts at economic pressure miscarried, they considerably worsened the international situation nonetheless and injured cooperation and mutual understanding among peoples.

In recent years Cuba has remained an object of active imperialist subversion. The methods by which the US imperialists have been clearing the decks for new provocations against the Cuban people include a tightening of the economic blockade, sabre-rattling, stepped-up espionage and sabotage and threats of "punitive" actions. In 1981 it emerged that the Pentagon and CIA had prepared scenarios for a complete naval blockade of Cuba and even a landing on the Cuban coast.

Arms deliveries, dollar shots in the arm, political speculation and slander are all used by imperialism as means of galvanising the criminal Pol Pot bands entrenched in the jungle along Kampuchea's border. Imperialism picks up counter-revolutionary rabble to form various "coalitions", hoping to overthrow people's rule in that country with their aid and so to prevent the Kampucheans from laying the foundations for a



socialist society. Using the same device against the people of Laos, the imperialists in October 1982 announced the formation of a "Laotian government in exile".

Imperialism's psychological war against the socialist countries has gained sharply in scope.

The main foreign political propaganda agencies of the USA spent \$489 million for the purpose in 1982 and demanded over \$640 million for 1983. Operating against the Soviet Union today are about 400 propaganda centres and organisations of imperialist countries; 40 radio stations broadcast calumnies in 23 languages--a total in excess of 200 hours a day. Broadcasting to Poland are three times as many stations as exist in the country itself; on West German territory alone there are 326 transmitters and 38 relay stations. The amount of anti-Polish broadcasts has trebled of late.

In 1982 allocations for the CIA's Radio "Free Europe" were raised to \$100 million.

In the 1980-1982 period imperialism's propaganda media mounted vast falsification campaigns over alleged human rights violations in socialist countries, the so-called "Soviet military threat", Soviet "complicity" in international terrorism, and so on, the aim being to undermine the positions of socialism. Efforts intended to destabilise and "erode" the economic and social structures of socialist countries were stepped up. A revealing case in point was the series of seminars for US propaganda personnel organised in Washington in 1981. One of them concerned itself with misrepresenting the



prospects of Soviet economic development and another, with providing conditions for the "gradual evolution" of socialist countries in a capitalist direction.

An instance of ideological subversion fitting into the concept of the "crusade" against communism announced by President Reagan was the conference on the "democratisation of communist countries" held in Washington in the autumn of 1982. It involved CIA experts and high-ranking US propaganda personnel, who planned counter-revolutionary conspiracies in Hungary and Czechoslovakia years ago and in Poland recently.

Imperialist subversion against socialist countries is an open challenge to the universally accepted norms of international relations, the UN Charter and the Helsinki Final Act, all of which explicitly prohibit interference in the affairs of other states. It is criminal because it endangers peace, security and progress in cooperation among nations.

The increased militancy of imperialism is indicative of attempts to alter the course of world development, block the progress of peoples and regain lost positions. These attempts are as hopeless as they are desperate, and hence all the more dangerous for peace on earth and the destiny of humanity.

DETERMINED RESISTANCE TO IMPERIALISM IN EVERY SPHERE OF ITS REACTIONARY, CRIMINAL ACTIVITY IS NOW MORE IMPERATIVE THAN EVER.



WASHINGTON'S FINANCIAL WEAPON

O. Mozhaikov and Y. Myagkov, Masters of Science  
(Economics)

Growing monetary instability has been increasingly affecting the capitalist countries economically. This reveals itself in the unheard-of scale of hot money migration, the unprecedented fluctuations of the main capitalist currencies and interest rates , and the inability of the developing countries to pay their debt. Currency disturbances are leaving a negative impact on international economic relations, giving rise to a wave of bankruptcies and promoting crisis-rooted slumps.

Militarisation

The immediate causes behind the persisting crisis phenomena in the monetary field are America's exorbitant interest rates and artificially high dollar. Both are a result of the economic policy of the present US Administration which emphasizes intensified militarisation. This brings direct military strategic advantages and it was also believed that greater military production would stimulate investment and structural change nationwide. The two factors were to give America decisive strategic advantages economically and politically.

Under President Reagan , military appropriations have been growing rapidly. Constituting 107 billion dollars under President Carter in 1976, they reached 221 billion dollars in the 1984 fiscal year and will soar to 359 billion dollars by 1988. The rapid growth of military spending was accompanied by tax reductions, the bulk of which went to corporations and private money-bags. As a result, in Reagan's first four years, America's budget deficit totalled 547 billion dollars compared



with 112 billion dollars under Johnson and Nixon when Washington had been engaged in the dirty war in Vietnam.

Budget deficit is financed by increasing public debt which reached 1,576 billion dollars at the end of the 1984 fiscal year, an increase of 2.8 times for the past ten years.

The USA vividly shows that a growing public debt maims the economy. Financing public debt absorbs increasing funds which could be otherwise effectively used in the civilian sector. The greater proportion of public funds is used to finance military expenditures and debt servicing. In the 1984 fiscal year interest payments and military spending accounted for 40 per cent of the federal expenditures. It is estimated that by 1986 interest payments may total 154 billion dollars.

#### Financing at the Expense of Partners

Reagan would have not risked to increase military expenditures and simultaneously to reduce taxes if he had to rely only on domestic deficit financing sources. Great hopes were connected with conditions to ensure a massive influx of foreign money to the USA.

The collapse of the Bretton Woods monetary system of capitalism and the changeover to floating rates have, to all intents and purposes, relieved the USA of responsibility for the state of international finance, although the dollar remains its hub. The USA uses, without hindrances, the dollar to promote its selfish interests. Putting in circulation the capitalist world's main reserve and payment currency free from any curbs, except the regulations of the US Treasury and the Federal Reserve System, allows America to directly influence the monetary and economic situation in the developed capitalist nations and the Third World.

The chief aim of Washington's monetary and credit policy is to attract foreign money to America. For this purpose,



mechanism has been created which regulates, via the Federal Reserve System, the stock of money in circulation. Whereas earlier the Federal Reserve System strove to maintain stable interest rates, nowadays they depend on the FRS's manipulations with commercial bank reserves. As a result, the FRS has pushed interest rates skywards, attracting money from elsewhere.

The figures below illustrate the influx of foreign money to the USA. Official figures show that between 1981 and the second quarter of 1984 foreign fiscal assets in the USA grew by 240.2 billion dollars, and the purchases of US Treasury bonds by foreigners totalled 43.7 billion dollars. According to Fred Bergsten, who heads the Institute for International Economics in London, with the present situation persisting, by 1990 the USA would gulp down a third of the increment in savings and capital accumulation in the capitalist part of the world. Investments betraying other currencies in favour of the dollar is the main reason behind the growth of its rate which has doubled since the beginning of 1980. In the West people today speak about a "superdollar" and the USA's dollar diktat.

#### Other Side of the Coin

A "superdollar" has proved a two-edged and very dangerous weapon. Using it to entice foreign money, Washington has considerably damaged the civilian sector of the US economy. According to Western economists, the dollar persists some thirty per cent above its real value. This is like having America's exports taxed to increase their value and imports subsidised.

The result is an acute crisis of US foreign trade.

In 1984 US trade deficit reached the astronomical total of 123.3 billion dollars. Between 1981 and 1984 US exports of machinery and equipment went down by 14 per cent and those of farm produce by 20 per cent. Foreign competitors are pressing



US companies even in computers and aircraft technology. Estimates by US trade unions show that a billion dollars in trade deficit leads to the closure of 25,000 jobs.

Having hit the US economy, "superdollar" is also hitting the other capitalist countries. Reductions in the exchange rates of other capitalist currencies have facilitated, to a certain extent, an economic revival in Western Europe and Japan. However, the advantages thus derived by some export-oriented industries are dwarfed by the losses the capitalist countries suffer through the outflow of money to America.

"Superdollar" also undermines the world capitalist economy in other ways. A speculative fever has spread to monetary markets under the influence of Washington's policy. The rates of the main currencies now depend chiefly on the massive migration of hot money. Western economists say that of the 300 to 400 billion dollars changing hands at capitalist monetary markets a day, only 15 per cent serve traditional economic contacts with other nations. The rest is interbank operations, speculative deals for the most part.

Ups and downs in exchange rates have interfered with the normal progress of international economic relations. This is of detriment to all countries, especially to the developing nations. The worsening conditions of their trade (i.e., a less and less favourable export/import price ratio) brought about by currency fluctuations, adversely affect their financial stand undermined by the a huge foreign debt. The Reagan administration refuses to introduce any major changes into the capitalist world's monetary and financial system to retain America's dominating stand which is the main cause behind the instability of capitalist finance.

(Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta No. 25. Abridged.)



Sept 1982, BSS

THE PARTY  
=====

## ANTI-REAGAN FRONT PROGRAMME

James West

Political Bureau member, CC,  
Communist Party of the USA

There are more than 10 million unemployed; millions more underemployed or not registered as unemployed; 25-year-olds who have never worked at all; and mass unemployment among Black youth. The employed live in dread of layoffs. Hunger and homelessness are visibly evident. There are soup lines in the cities. Racism is rampant. Organised labor is on the defensive.

Such is the situation now in the USA, which is in the throes of the most devastating economic crisis since the 1930s, while continuing the biggest military buildup in history. In this situation the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USA decided to convene the second extraordinary national conference in the party's 63-year history.

The first was held in July 1933, likewise in a situation marked by deep crisis. It geared the party to fulfil its vanguard role in the mass movements of the working class and people in the struggles to achieve economic security and avert the world-wide menace of fascism.

The success of that conference can be measured by the lasting achievements indelibly etched into the history of our class. The party had a decisive part in the organisation of the basic industries into multi-million member industrial unions,



the CIO. It organized the Unemployed Councils, a national movement which wrested from Congress the Unemployment Compensation Act and the Social Security System. It raised the struggles against racism, discrimination, bigotry, and anti-Semitism to such new heights as to mark a new stage in the unification process of the multinational working class.

As a result, it became a mass party with mass influence. It lived up to the historic challenge placed by the sharp turn in the country's development. However, the effects of the ravages of the McCarthyite repression of the 1950s, on the one hand, and of Browder and Gates revisionism, on the other hand, sharply reduced the party's size and influence and created a generation gap from which it took a long time to recover. Under the leadership of Gus Hall and Henry Winston, the party's basic political health had been restored by the end of the 1960s.

The decision of the CPUSA Central Committee to call the second extraordinary conference was the result of a profound analysis of the new situation at the commencement of the 1980s.

It is as though the majority of our people live in a barren valley surrounded by a mountainous ring of armaments separating them from economic and social security and the accumulated profit of billions, which their labor has created. All the gains of the struggles of the 1930s are threatened by the Reagan axe. But there is far more to the picture. Militant movements of resistance, of fightback, are rising from coast to coast and border to border. Fresh winds of struggle are blowing through the trade unions, awakening them from the hibernation of class partnership.



The internal situation is affecting the world image of the USA, which has passed its zenith, its "Golden Age".

The USA's share of the capitalist world's production had fallen to 37.3 per cent in the late 1970s from 48.7 per cent in 1950, while its share of the capitalist world's exports had dropped from 18.1 to 11 per cent. As it came into the 1980s it found itself in seventh place in the capitalist world in GNP--no longer No. 1--and in tenth place in the standard of living. For almost a century it led the world in the production of steel, automobiles, and machine-tools. Today it stands third, second, and third respectively.

The law of uneven development has caught up with US imperialism. A big factor bringing this about has been the shift in economic and fiscal priorities from the civilian to the military sector. Stubbornly refusing to face this fact, and driven by class fear of victorious socialism and advancing national liberation, the Reagan Administration tries to recover US imperialism's lost positions by still more infusions of military spending.

This policy has a self-defeating mechanism built into it. It acts like a narcotic, which gives a temporary feeling of euphoria while further eroding the basic economic structure. All of this reacts on the international situation, further aggravating the crisis conditions.

The United States is approaching another great turning point, a time when a big change must be made. Great masses are already in motion. And this is why the 2nd Extraordinary National Conference was called.



A thousand representatives directly from the primary party organisations, the clubs, in shops and communities throughout the country assembled in the city of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, at the close of April. The Conference was opened by the National Chairman Henry Winston. After a welcoming address by Sandra Jones, Organiser of the Wisconsin party organisation, Gus Hall, General Secretary of the CPUSA, delivered the keynote report.

"Economically, in a very basic sense," he said, "the United States is in a boomless era of decline and contraction. All economic activities and processes are now operating qualitatively and quantitatively on a declining scale." The report made a penetrating analysis of the US economy today and drew the conclusion that "economic issues will continue to be the key links and all struggles will, in one way or another, relate to these economic issues."<sup>1</sup>

These extraordinary developments are having profound effects on class relations and the class struggle, compelling the working class to move to the front ranks in the forward line of march. This, in turn, refocuses the spotlight on the party's industrial concentration policy.<sup>2</sup> It is compelled to re-examine and re-structure its work so that industrial concentration becomes the

---

<sup>1</sup> Keynote Report to the Second Extraordinary Conference of the Communist Party, USA, by Gus Hall, General Secretary.  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, April 23-25, 1982, p. II-3.

<sup>2</sup> Industrial concentration has been a policy traditionally pursued by the CPUSA to organise party work in basic industries, notably, steel, automobile, coal, and electrical engineering.



focal point of this work, in a new way, scrapping all old attitudes and forms of routinism. "The policy of industrial concentration," Gus Hall noted, "has to be placed within the context of the new economic era and of helping the working class fulfill its role--a role it is significantly beginning to assume."<sup>3</sup>

Gus Hall's report was a comprehensive, rounded-out evaluation of the world situation and the crucial fight for peace, the Reagan Administration, the class and democratic movements and struggles, and the role of the party. "The peace movement," he said, "is literally busting out all over. June 12th will see the coming together of the great US peace majority in a demonstration at the United Nations Second Special Session on Disarmament."<sup>4</sup>

The no-nuke and nuclear freeze movements, the campaigns against Reagan's foreign policies, and the movement against intervention in El Salvador have all become a broad all-people's united movement which has recently moved on the offensive. Even Reagan felt compelled to respond defensively to the US peace majority. This mass peace movement will continue to become a tremendous obstacle to US policies of war and aggression.

---

<sup>3</sup> Keynote Report, p. II-8.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. V-7. More than a million people marched on June 12th 1982, from the United Nations building to Central Park, which was the largest demonstration for peace in US history. In addition, nearly 200,000 people demonstrated in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Denver, and other cities.



The Republican Administration's statements proclaiming they are for a nuclear freeze--after the US nuclear and military buildup--are unquestionably concessions to the popular and Congressional challenge. They are at least forced to talk about freeze and arms reduction negotiations. The movement to cut the military budget is also gaining momentum among the people and in Congress.

Discussing the problems of the resistance and fightback movement in the working class, Gus Hall said: "Within the defensive posture, the working class is developing movements and struggles that are preparing the ground for going on the offensive in the class struggle. We must always keep in mind that the concept of militant fightback struggles in the context of defence is not a contradiction."<sup>5</sup>

In such a period as this it is inevitable that the working-class counter-offensive will begin from a position of defending and protecting past gains. The objective conditions and the fightback forces are moving in the direction of struggles that will shift the working class to an offensive posture. In this respect, most promising are the steps being taken by some central labor bodies to reorganise and restructure the trade union centers in order to give the trade union movement more clout. The plans include setting up task forces of union activists in all fields and areas of activity--political, legislative, organisational, and educational. From the working-class viewpoint of moving from defensive to offensive struggles these

---

<sup>5</sup> Keynote Report, p. VI-6.



reorganising and restructuring drives can be instrumental. The working class cannot go on the offensive only in one shop, one city, or even in one industry. It must win the active support of the public and the trade unions.

The many-sided nature of this revitalisation drive is of great significance because it is difficult to move to an offensive in the economic sector without the support of the political sector. The changing scene must be taken into account. The new situation calls for the rank-and-file movement to work more closely within the broad sweep of the working-class fightback and less as an opposition force. In other words, wherever possible the rank-and-file groups should work as a force within the mainstream majority and less as an anti-establishment minority. As the fightback movement develops and the thinking and mood of the workers shift, this approach becomes both possible and necessary. Another prerequisite is the organisation of the fightback on the shop and department levels. In sum, it means working in a way that will build the base of unity, raise the sense of confidence and the level of class consciousness.

Turning to problems of unity of the multinational working class, Gus Hall said: "In the era of its decline, all the ugliest, most ruthless and criminal features of capitalism get uglier and more ruthless. Racism is deeply imbedded, all-pervasive, persistent and widespread in the US capitalist system--in its economy, its educational system, its government, its ideology, politics, and culture."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Keynote Report, p. VIII-1.



Racism is so all-pervasive that every crisis, every corporate offensive, every retreat by class collaborationist labor leaders, every restriction or retreat on democratic rights, trade-union, human and civil rights, every decline in the overall standard of living has a sharper and deeper racist cutting edge. Each month the gloomy economic statistics take their toll in human suffering. Each month the human suffering statistics go up. In March 1982, joblessness among Afro-Americans had reached a devastating 20 per cent and an unbelievable 60 per cent among Black youth.

A fightback movement that does not undertake special actions, struggles for special demands and programmes against racism cannot become a winning movement. A working-class movement that does not take principled, concrete stands against racism, racist practices, and national oppression cannot become a united, powerful fightback movement. There can be no real, stable shift to offensive struggles without a shift in the struggle against racism, for justice and equality.

As the fightback movement builds up, as the class struggle sharpens, the need for unity becomes more critical, and more obvious to new millions. Therefore, the struggle against racism and national oppression must be placed within this new context.

Drawing on the experiences of the many diverse movements reacting to the Reagan-monopoly offensive, Gus Hall called for the formation of an All-Peoples Front Against Reaganomics and Washington's militarist policies. His report projected the



tactic of developing the independent, class, anti-monopoly current within a massive anti-Reagan wave for the 1982 Congressional elections. The role of Communist candidates was elucidated within this context.

The discussion on the main report took place in a series of workshops: Labor in the Struggle Against the Reagan-Corporate Offensive; Organising the Struggles of the Unemployed; Organising the Grassroots Fightback in the Communities; Reagonomics and the Fight for Peace; Organising the Anti-Reagan Electoral Wave; Building the United Fightback for Afro-American Equality and Against Reaganite Racism and National Oppression; Building the Party and the Press, Essential Contribution to Smashing the Reagan-Corporate Offensive.

Another group of workshops dealt with specialised questions: Resisting Economic Ripoffs; Senior Citizens Fight for Survival; Helping to Build the Young Workers Liberation League and the All-Youth Front; Struggle of the Farming and Rural Communities; and Special Problems of Women in the Economic Fightback.

The discussion from the primary organisations reflected the widespread involvement of party members in the economic, peace, democratic, and anti-racist struggles of the working class and people, and in the peace movement. "The clubs had more input in the preparation of the main report and in the Conference itself than ever before in the 63-year history of the party," Gus Hall observed.

The discussion demonstrated solid support and deep confidence in the party's mass line and leadership. The Conference projected a status and enhanced role of the clubs in the



communities and workplaces, as well as within the party structure. Without a doubt, it gave a powerful impetus to the process of revitalising the party. It showed that the representatives from the clubs had a clear focus, know what had to be done and have a better grasp of how to do things. Certainly it was a historic conference, marking a turning point in the party's development.

Unanimously endorsing Gus Hall's report, the Conference voted to launch a new party and press building campaign. It adopted the principles for a New Economic Bill of Rights, which was presented to a public mass meeting following the close of the Conference. The mass meeting also approved the New Economic Bill of Rights, which calls for a basic, comprehensive economic programme to be enacted by the US Congress, including unemployment insurance to be provided from job application until receipt of the first pay check, federal construction projects to provide 15 million new jobs, and special measures in the struggle against racism and for actual equality.

The 1,000 representatives from the clubs mirrored a healthy, unified party with a fine corps of young and middle level club leaders determined to make the turn towards a mass party geared to the struggles of the working class and oppressed peoples for peace, economic security, equality, and democratic advance to a better future.



## REAGANOMICS: THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES

Victor Perlo

Chairman, Economic Commission;

CC member, CPUSA

"Reaganomics" is a term that has come to stay in the political lexicon. It is the economic policies of US imperialism carried out by a government representing, mainly, the most adventurous, aggressive, chauvinist and greedy sections of the financial oligarchy. This clique, riddled with corruption and inner conflicts, is fanatic in its fear of the international working class, in its hatred of the working masses of the United States, in its dread of socialism.

The "supply side"<sup>1</sup> economic theories associated with Reaganomics are but a doctrinal cover-up for a set of crude, direct, aggressive economic and political policies and practices. These may be summarised as:

- the unrestrained offensive of monopoly capital against the rights and interests of the working class, Afro-Americans and other oppressed minorities--extending increasingly to broader middle sectors;

---

<sup>1</sup> In contrast to the traditional Keynesian methods of state regulation of aggregate demand, supply side economics seeks to stimulate private-sector production activity through purposeful reduction of taxes, mainly by slashing corporate taxes and so to increase the supply of goods and services. The hope is that this will speed economic growth, make the economic mechanism more efficient and reduce inflation.--Ed.



- the very rapid militarisation of the economy; and
- the sharpened economic warfare against socialist countries, against the Third World, and against rival imperialist states.

Reaganomics has clearly worsened the economic situation in the United States and, indeed, in the entire capitalist world. The "back-to-back crises" of 1980 and 1981-1982 in the United States have done much to prolong the world capitalist crisis of overproduction into the most persistent and intractable period of stagnation, inflation, and unemployment, since the 1930s.

#### The Anti-People Offensive

The offensive against the working class takes place on both the industrial and the governmental levels.

Monopoly employers, emboldened by the existence of mass unemployment and by overt governmental assistance, are imposing worsened terms on unions--so-called "takeaways"; decertifying--i.e., ending all dealings with unions; and directly slashing wages and eliminating health and safety measures affecting also the majority of workers who do not have union contracts.

The huge modern conglomerates, with hundreds and even thousands of plants in tens of industries and with access to billions of dollars in capital, ever more frequently shift output from strong, unionised areas to low-wage sanctuaries in the United States and abroad. These giant corporations can sacrifice whole plants if necessary to maintain the upper hand against militant segments of workers, scarcely feeling the cost in their



total operations. They have even been helped by some trade union officials, who have capitulated to employer pressure despite rank-and-file readiness to fight back and win.

The racist edge of the employer offensive is apparent from the unrestrained application of the "first to be fired" rule against Afro-Americans, from the abandonment of all pretense of adopting corrective measures to compensate for past discrimination --that is, of "affirmative action".<sup>2</sup>

The budget of the Federal government assists the employer offensive by radically slashing the social spending that would uphold the condition of the workers and prevent any further increase in unemployment. The budgetary axe has fallen on spending for housing, education, and health services, unemployment benefits, food aid for the poor and for schoolchildren, public works and training programmes that could provide jobs and fulfil social needs. Now old age pensions are the remaining frontline target.

Never has there been such a shift of the tax burden away from the capitalists and their corporations to the labouring masses. Workers have higher social insurance deductions, higher state and local taxes to compensate for reductions in Federal aid, and, if the plans of big business and the Reaganites are

---

<sup>2</sup> "Affirmative action" is the policy and practice of taking special measures to overcome many decades of discrimination against Afro-Americans and other minorities, and also against women, to bring them up to the general level of the white majority in terms of work opportunities, advancement to higher skills, education and wage levels, etc.--Ed.



carried out, they will soon be saddled with additional Federal taxes.<sup>3</sup> The 1981 legislation included a very radical slash in taxes on the rich and their corporations.

Using the "getting the government off the backs of business" slogan, the Administration is eliminating health, safety and environmental regulations, and is reducing enforcement activities to insignificance. The Justice Department not only refuses to enforce civil rights and other democratic legislation but, in court, sides with violators. The Reagan cabal unsheathed its claws against organised labour when it smashed the Air Controllers union. It showed its racist venom in its brutal treatment of Haitian refugees and in the mass roundup of super-exploited undocumented workers.

At the same time, the Administration increases regulations demanded by the capitalists for their profit. Thus, it has set up price supports for domestically produced sugar to benefit a handful of large growers. This will cost consumers billions of dollars in higher prices. It has activated various systems of subsidy for exports, and restrictions on imports. And it has made available billions in subsidies to banks and other financial corporations to take over bankrupt savings and loan associations (mortgage banks destroyed by the crisis).

What is the cost of Reaganomics to the US workers?

---

<sup>3</sup> Such taxes were approved by the Congress in August 1982.



A reduction of 15 per cent in average real after-tax wages of employed workers since 1978. Such a decrease is unprecedented in the history of the United States.

Over 11 million workers officially counted as fully unemployed, with many millions more partly unemployed (6.6 million) or labeled "discouraged workers" (1.6 million), not counted because they no longer make the hopeless trek to employment offices.

More than 20 per cent officially unemployed--25 per cent actually--among Afro-Americans, and more than 50 per cent among black youth.

Double digit inflation, which started in 1979, as the main vehicle for driving down real wages and providing superprofits to many corporations in the face of a declining volume of business.

Massive evictions of workers, either because they are unable to keep up payment on their homes or, if they live in New York and other large cities, because landlords want to renovate their apartments to provide luxury housing for the rich--the "gentrification" programme.

Reappearance of charity "soup kitchens" for the unemployed who have used up their unemployment benefits and for others driven to the verge of starvation.

White-collar and professional workers, largely immune in previous post-war crises, are now also being laid off by the thousands. Small business bankruptcies are far above any previous post-war rate.



The basic measure of the exploitation of labour--the rate of surplus-value in manufacturing--has increased non-stop, from 148 per cent in 1953 to 195 per cent in 1960, 227 per cent in 1970, and to 290 per cent in 1980, the latest year for which these statistics are available. During recent years this rapid rise has been compounded by an increase in indirect exploitation--through extreme price differentials against workers as consumers and through the transfer of the tax burden from capital to labour. As a result there is a dramatic contrast between the absolute reduction in the living standards of the majority and the rapid rise in the incomes and conspicuous luxury consumption of the rich, even in the midst of economic crisis.

Corporate cash flow profits after taxes (reported profits plus adjusted depreciation allowances) jumped from \$102 billion in 1971 to \$207 billion in 1976 and to \$342 billion in 1981--the increase continuing in the crisis years 1980 and 1981. Over the last five years, the rate of profit on common stock equity of manufacturing corporations was at an all-time high for as far back as such records go (to just before the First World War). Dividend and interest payments increased 43 per cent during the last two crisis years and almost 300 per cent in the past ten years.

The executives who control the large corporations and take for themselves and their associates the dominant positions garner a bonanza from the ocean of surplus-value even before the remaining profits are reported. "Executives' Pay Goes Up, Up



and Away" was the headline on a US News and World Report article telling of a 13.4 per cent rise in top officials' salaries and bonuses in 1981.<sup>4</sup> Twenty-six of these men received more than a million dollars each and "What's more, the income of many executives is as much as 10 times larger than their salaries and bonuses. They get assorted extras such as stock options and stock-appreciation rights not counted in our survey", the article adds.<sup>5</sup> Incredible amounts are shared out with associated law firms, accounting firms, and advertising and promotion outfits. These perquisites, along with "inside" information, the ability to manipulate stock transactions, tax loopholes, expense accounts, etc., are all a part of "the profits of control".

Tax swindles added \$87 billion to the take of the capitalists in 1981, according to estimates of Roscoe L. Egger, Jr., the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, over and above the even larger legal loopholes at their disposal.

The multimillionaires on the high levels of the Reagan Administration imbue it with the stink of their corruption. The Secretary of Labour, Raymond Donovan, not long ago was under Grand Jury investigation for alleged payoffs to thugs and murderers who helped his construction company avoid union wages, the means by which he accumulated millions.<sup>6</sup> The Attorney General,

---

<sup>4</sup> US News and World Report, May 24, 1982, p. 59.

<sup>5</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>6</sup> A special investigator later cleared him of any charges for "lack of evidence".--Ed.



William French Smith, who is responsible for prosecuting tax swindlers, engaged in a particularly outrageous personal tax avoidance since he has been in office; and Vice President George Bush crudely used his position to thwart attempts to halt major tax evasions by drug companies in which he owns much stock and holds a directorship. And President Reagan himself was forced to pay \$20,000 for the phoney "business expenses" he claimed on his California ranch residence. The violation must have been blatant indeed to induce the Internal Revenue Service bureaucracy to dare publicise the President's cheat.

#### Militarisation and the Economic Situation

US imperialism's preparations for global aggression have an immediate, primary impact in an explosion of military spending unprecedented for peace-time. Successive escalations by Carter in 1980 and by Reagan in 1981, and again in 1982, have resulted in outlays headed for \$500 billion--half a trillion dollars yearly--by about the middle of the decade. And, it is barely four years since military spending first passed the \$100 billion mark.

This has important economic consequences. Conservative economist Michael E. Levy said: "The sheer magnitude of this triple escalation in national defense is staggering ... Total obligational authority ... is scheduled to rise by \$82 billion, or 46.5 per cent, over this two-year period (ending in 1983--V.P.); for defense procurement of weapons systems, the proposed two-year rise in obligational authority is nearly \$42 billion,



or 87.5 per cent... The Council of Economic Advisers noted with some concern, 'real purchases of defense durables ... will grow at an estimated rate of 16 per cent annually between 1981 and 1987. This exceeds the 14 per cent annual rate of increase that occurred during the 3 peak years of the Vietnam buildup.'<sup>7</sup>

At the same time, Murray Weidenbaum, head of the Council of Economic Advisers,<sup>8</sup> counts on military spending to spark recovery from the economic crisis. However, while providing a bacchanalia of revenue and profits for the arms contractors, it has provided very little in the way of additional employment. The inflationary consequences, the reduction in government spending for social needs that accompanies the military buildup, and the high interest rates to finance government borrowing for the arms race have all contributed significantly to the current crisis in the economy. Under these circumstances, very rapid spurts in armament orders, as in the second half of 1980, can provide only a temporary jog to economic activity. An even bigger spurt has been underway since the end of 1981, but statements of Administration and private economists indicate a lack of confidence that it can accomplish even as much as the 1980 episode, and they conjecture whether it will contribute to the prospect of repeated recessions and prolonged stagnation.

---

<sup>7</sup> Challenge, May/June 1982.

<sup>8</sup> Weidenbaum and other "supply side" economists have resigned from the Reagan Administration since this article was written.--Ed.



The military policy of US imperialism is one of the major destabilising elements of the world capitalist economy, and the harmful effects threaten to become much more acute unless a halt is called.

Under extreme US pressure, most NATO countries and Japan have also been rapidly increasing military outlays, worsening their economic and financial situation.

In each of the six leading imperialist countries, military spending accelerated during the 1970s.<sup>9</sup> In three of them (Italy, Great Britain and Japan), the rate of increase nearly trebled, and in each there was a corresponding, or even more rapid, acceleration in inflation. This correlation is, of course, far from accidental.

Armament sales to Third World countries, primarily by the United States and its NATO partners, multiplied five-fold during the decade. Reaching \$40-50 billion per year, this contributed heavily to the overindebtedness and superinflation of many of these developing nations.

Recognition that arms orders do not mean jobs is spreading in the ranks of the working class. The International Association of Machinists,<sup>10</sup> which leads in the number of workers employed in armament production, is the most active large trade union in the struggle for peace and for shifting from military to civilian production, which would provide more jobs for its members.

---

<sup>9</sup> Great Britain, Italy, the USA, the FRG, France and Japan.--Ed.

<sup>10</sup> Operates in the United States and Canada.--Ed.



It must be said that the US economy exhibits many of the features of a war economy, but without the large-scale mobilisation of manpower, production of ammunition and replacement of destroyed weapons which are a part of an actual war situation. Thus it lacks the drop in unemployment that is characteristic of an actual war status, but is afflicted by most of the negative economic and financial features of a war economy:

- from 1979 to 1981, inflation was at an annual rate of over 10 per cent, although it has temporarily slowed as commodity stockpiles attain maximum liquidation;

- massive budget deficits, now officially predicted to go as high as \$200 billion per year, are creating panic among economists and bankers, who demand more cuts in social spending and more increases in workers' taxes as a counterbalance;

- ailing housing and automobile industries, the two customary victims of war, are at the lowest sustained level, relative to population, since the Second World War.

#### Economic Warfare Against Socialist Countries

The Reagan Administration has sharply intensified its economic warfare against the Soviet Union, Poland and other socialist countries. In addition to the old excuse of preventing the Soviet Union from purchasing militarily useful items, Pentagon Chief Caspar Weinberger and his followers now openly state that their desire is to weaken the Soviet Union economically in every way possible so as to make it unable to keep up with the US arms race, leaving it helpless before Washington's aggressions.



This drive is doomed to failure, but it does add economic strains on the Soviet economy, while doing even greater damage to the well-being of American working people and to the stability of the US economy.

Washington restrictions have virtually banned sales of industrial goods to the USSR, have shut off normal air transport and markedly reduced business, cultural and scientific contacts. In the Western Hemisphere, despite proposals of many groups, including business interests, to resume relations with Cuba, the Administration has tightened the blockade on the socialist island.

The Reaganites are strongly pressuring their NATO allies to break off trade with the Soviet Union. They went all out to get West European countries to cancel the gas-pipe deal, the largest single set of contracts to date in East-West trade. The objective is not only to hurt the USSR, but also to prevent West European countries from strengthening their own economies and becoming more competitive through trade with the socialist countries. Then there is also the desire to open up new markets for the crisis-ridden US coal industry, and also to preserve markets for the US-owned international oil companies.

Reagan's pipeline campaign has proven to be one of the most clear-out fiascos in the history of US economic warfare. The US representatives were left to make maudlin pleas for a token gesture--which went unanswered. Gone, clearly, are the Marshall Plan days, when US imperialism could dictate economic



policies to weakened West European capitalism and exert direct police power over trade in West European centres.<sup>11</sup>

### Super-Monopoly Contradictions

The atmosphere of wide-open profiteering encouraged by the Administration has led to a frenzied process of centralising capital, to an orgy of speculation, to financial extremes among sections of capital--superprofits in some sectors, gigantic losses and billion dollar crashes in others.

With no significant anti-trust enforcements in effect, the most powerful monopolies are buying up weaker companies in mammoth transactions that cut across customary business lines. The biggest steel and chemical trusts--du Pont and US Steel, respectively--each spent billions to buy major oil companies, while oil giants are buying retail combines, coal and copper companies, and data processing concerns. Major banks are being bought out by even larger banks at twice their book value. To ease the way for these transactions, top officials and key shareholders of the companies taken over are given "golden parachutes"--in effect, millions in personal pay-offs.

---

<sup>11</sup> The West European governments concerned and also Japan refused to accept the Reagan Administration's unilateral ban on deliveries of equipment for the Siberia-Western Europe gas pipeline and rejected the US sanctions against companies honouring their contracts. As the conflict gained in acerbity, the White House was forced, on November 13, 1982, to announce the lifting of the ban.--Ed.



But some losers in the fierce struggle of the billionaire corporations are going to the wall. Braniff, one of the large airlines, recently went into bankruptcy. The very next day, a Wall Street house went under, unable to pay \$160 million in interest on the many billions it borrowed for bond speculation. International Harvester heads the list of prominent industrial corporations on the verge of failure. Brentano's, the venerable bookselling firm, went bankrupt. Small business firms and farmers are failing by the tens of thousands.

A special feature of the financial contradictions in the United States is the super-high rate of interest. Since the autumn of 1979, the "prime rate"<sup>12</sup> has been almost continually in the 15-20 per cent range, a situation unprecedented in the history of US capitalism. Long-term bond and mortgage rates are now in a similar range.

The inflated interest rates are partly a consequence of the huge demand for borrowed funds in order to finance the swelling federal deficit, to provide cash for corporations being pressed by creditors in the crisis, to supply funds to the oil companies for fresh investment and to manufacturing concerns for modernisation in the face of Japanese competition, to assure the billions needed for corporate takeovers and for stock-market speculation.

---

<sup>12</sup> The interest charged by commercial banks on loans to their "prime" customers.--Ed.



But that is not the whole story. For, according to statistical tabulations, a combination of domestic savings and the tens of billions in foreign funds becoming available should be able to meet this demand. A significant role is played by ultra-right economist Milton Friedman, whose monetarist policies are being followed by the Federal Reserve Board. These policies deliberately keep the money supply lower than the normal needs of an economy in a period of inflation. The purpose is to force a slowing down of industrial activity with the laying off of workers and the weakening of their unions, so as to provide a basis for slashing wages and increasing the rate of exploitation of labour. Undoubtedly monetarism has done much to prolong and deepen the economic crisis and has helped employers cut real wages.

However, the contradictory aspects of this cynical offensive have emerged as the profits of many big corporations finally started downward decisively in the first quarter of 1982. At the same time, there are many direct profiteers from the excessive interest rates. But by now more capitalists may be losing than gaining from the high interest rates. Virtually the entire \$800 billion mortgage banking industry (savings and loan associations and savings banks) have exhausted their capital, sustaining huge losses as the interest they pay on deposits exceeds the interest they receive on mortgages granted years ago at more moderate rates.



There is mounting pressure on the Federal Reserve System from US bankers, including Chase Manhattan, the former employer of FRS Chairman Volcker, sections of US industry, West European capitalists, and some trade unions to increase the money supply and bring down the rate of interest. It remains to be seen how much damage will be done by massive financial failures before the financial crisis reaches its climax and is overcome.<sup>13</sup>

### Cyclical Prospects

The weakening of the world capitalist economy is deep-going. It occurs in an era of overall decay and deterioration, part of the general crisis of capitalism which, as Lenin said, cannot be overcome except by socialism.

However, within this framework, cyclical development will continue. Capitalism does retain reserves. There will be a recovery from the present crisis of overproduction, but its expected timing has been repeatedly set back. Hopes of some revival in the second half of 1982 are based on a certain actual and pending improvement in mass consuming power, resulting from a temporary slowing of inflation and mid-year reductions in tax withholdings from workers' paychecks and increases in pension payments. Many saw the first noticeable upward movement in automobile sales in a year, and in the so-called "leading indicators".<sup>14</sup> These are as yet isolated and small signs that may

---

<sup>13</sup> Since the end of the summer of 1982, the FRS has lowered the interest rate on several occasions, and this was followed by cuts in commercial bank rates and a stock exchange boom. But many economists doubt that this could lead to a real economic revival.--Ed.

<sup>14</sup> An index designed to signal in advance the onset of the next phase of an economic cycle.--Ed.



prove to be no more than fluctuations in a continuing depression.

The complex knot of contradictions afflicting the US economy offers poor prospects for the extent and duration of any recovery. Even Treasury Secretary Donald T. Regan, who was chairman of Merrill Lynch, the largest stock exchange firm, fears that the recovery will be weak and will soon be followed by a renewed recession.

Deep pessimism is revealed in an interview with a half dozen US capitalists and their most loyal economists in April. For example, Herbert Stein, erstwhile chief economist for Richard Nixon, stressed the need to reduce the inflation rate: "It will take three years, probably, and the economy will be sluggish and unemployment high during that period. I see no way to avoid it." Charles L. Schultze, chief economist for Jimmy Carter, said: "Even under the best of policies, we have to expect a relatively painful period of at least three years while we pull down inflation."<sup>15</sup> All of the recommended "remedies" would put further burdens on the working people.

#### The Fight-Back by Millions

The political situation in the United States is explosive. Reagan has fallen in popularity more than any previous president in such a brief period. Workers and oppressed people are

---

<sup>15</sup> US News and World Report, April 6, 1982.



Monday, October 22, 1984

ORIOVO-3024

5

BENJAMIN SPOCK: DISARMAMENT NOW

What is needed today is urgent and concrete actions, the world-famous pediatrician Benjamin Spock has pointed out in a Pravda interview. It is necessary to give up the development and deployment of first-strike weapons, primarily the deployment of Pershing and Cruise Missiles in Western Europe, as well as various crazy doctrines about waging "limited" and "protracted" nuclear wars and the delirious ideas about a possibility of surviving in such wars, it is necessary to give up the militarisation of outer space. This is why peoples the world over are waiting for concrete steps aimed at the nuclear arms freeze and the complete termination of their tests. If we want to survive, we must give up the very idea of the first use of such weapons.

Today our two countries bear enormous responsibility for the preservation of peace on the Earth. However, their positions are diametrically opposed. R.Reagan and his team oppose any talks on the basis of equality.

These politicians have made up their minds to exhaust the USSR with the help of the accelerated arms race, to corner it and then put forward a nuclear ultimatum. Only after millions of my compatriots came out in support for the freeze idea and the termination of the arms race in outer space, the White House came to its senses and all of a sudden started talking about the need to hold "constructive negotiations". This is nothing but hypocrisy on its part!

In its turn, judging by the answers of Konstantin Chernenko to questions of <sup>the</sup> Washington Post, the Soviet Union again urges the U.S. side in a calm and reserved tone to



Monday, October 22, 1984

5

- 2 -

soberly assess the realities of the present-day situation and to achieve without delay understanding on these most burning problems. It is the thing that would enable us to get out of the "nuclear impasse" in which we find ourselves at the moment, Dr.Spock stressed in conclusion.

(Pravda, October 20. Summary.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI  
TÜSTAV



REVELATIONS IN DALLAS

Valentin Falin

Dallas is again in the focus of attention. More than twenty years ago President John Kennedy was assassinated in that city. Along with him the first serious attempt was killed to realistically reappraise the policies pursued by the United States in postwar world. And now neoconservatives have held a four-day sabbath in that same city. It all ended with the approval of the republican electoral platform which is perhaps the most cynical public claim of American imperialism to world domination, and the most categoric affront upon the policy of detente.

Fulfilling the boss's order, the authors of the draft platform rode the high horse until it bordered on indecency. Even the Department of State, which is known to be inhabited not by angels, deemed it necessary to announce that this document did not "shape the foreign policies of the United States." The concrete declarations which Washington addresses to the outside, call for extreme dodginess, every now and then, at least. Disheartened White House employees made heroic efforts to take the edge off the most tricky formulas there, cutting the most provocative expressions out of the Dallas revelations. But since philosophy can hardly be edited, the platform has been presented as a semi-finished product for domestic use. Because the elections will pass, you see, the chauvinistic dust raised by cowboys will settle down, and everything will turn out all right. So why bother ourselves?

We have heard such reasoning, and more than once at that. We heard it particularly frequently when mankind was sliding down to the Second World War. The Mein Kampf was also presented then as a set of personal views, and the platform of a single



- 2 -

obsessed person. At that time they also were trying hard to detect the boundary which allegedly divided theory from practice. What all of that boiled down to, is known to all today. The deeds of "supermen," rid of the pangs of conscience and never apologizing for anything they did, make blood freeze in one's veins even now.

All the evil in the world, yelled the participants in the Dallas Convention, comes from Communists and Moscow. The President urged cohesion in "the national crusade." In the election platform that bellicose challenge has assumed the form of guidelines for using force "for the sake of liberation." Grenada is vaunted as an example for the entire world. The keynote is to kindle the flame of freedom wherever it sparks in the darkness of Soviet oppression, to provoke conflicts within and between states unwilling to recognise American pre-eminence. That is the Washington variant of the code of a nuclear power's behaviour.

Minimum international cooperation, maximum confrontation. The compilers of the Republican Party's platform treat the United Nations Organisation and its special agencies with utmost impudence, insisting in the curtailment of American participation in their work. One of the recommendations is to do away with "UN interference" in the Antarctic and space exploration. The USA should pursue henceforth, it is declared, "the dynamic national policy being carried out by the Reagan Administration to counterbalance the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. Down with "international charitable programmes"! Economic aid to foreign states should be an effective instrument of American foreign policy, operations through international institutions not subject to US control should be abandoned.

The Republicans cited moral and strategic relationship with Israel as the model. We promise, they say in their programme, to help maintain Israel's qualitative military superiority over its opponents. That is, over Arabs. Will the United



- 3 -

States keep Israel from new acts of aggression and condemn the continued occupation of the Arab lands and outrages committed there, taking into account that the current fighting is a joint American-Israeli battle for turning the Middle East into a Washington domain where "aliens," including Palestinians, have no part to play?

It would be futile to seek in the platform a sympathy with the peoples languishing under the heel of the fascist dictatorships and oligarchies in Central and South America, Africa and Asia. This is unsurprising because the dictatorships were brought to power by the American monopolies, exist on American handouts and keep in power with the use of American bayonets.

The US bosses have no better friends than these, just as they have no better propagandists of the "American way of life."

The more frequent repetition of the words "democracy," "freedom" and "peace" compared with the election platform of 1980 also catches the eye. To all appearances, these words are bound to accentuate the genuine character of the "new beginning" in the struggle for "regaining by America of its greatness." But let us remove the husks from what has been written and said. What is the core? "No" to freezing nuclear arms. "No" to nuclear-free zones. "No" to measures for preventing militarisation of outer space. "No" to the earlier-signed agreements on arms control. "No" to everything that can in one way or another reduce the militaristic zeal of the United States and call in question its claim to be "power Number One." The definite course towards production of even more weapons, more military bases and greater determination in the practical use of the huge American military potential is being taken.

According to the platform, the USSR exists by mistake. True, in the final edition they do not label us as an "anomaly state." But they keep trumpeting that the maintenance of



Friday, August 31, 1984

4

- 4 -

"stable and peaceful relations with the Soviet Union" depends on "respect for American might and resolve," on the meeting by the Soviet Union of a heap of preconditions advanced by Washington (the principle of "linkage"). If you add to this the promise to "break the postwar political framework in Europe" you will receive an answer to the question which has troubled the world in the past few weeks. This question is whether Reagan made a slip of the tongue by saying that he will outlaw Russia for ever or only adjusted the notion of "anomaly state" for his own purposes. If this state is viewed not as a partner in building international security but only as a "threat to freedom and peace on all continents" and if one can deal with it only by means of "impressive might" then slander and abuse are certainly not enough. The thought of slanderers will willy-nilly return to "demonstration explosions," threats to launch a nuclear attack in several minutes, though in the context of the deployment of the first-strike Pershing-2s with their flight time of six minutes such verbal menaces can become a prologue for a real holocaust.

Any attempt to reverse the course of history is adventuristic. Nobody has ever succeeded in this. Chances are slimmer to remake the social laws now when history is created not by money-bags but by peoples. And the cost of adventures increases with each passing year.

(Izvestia, August 30. Abridged.)



Friday, September 14, 1984

ORIOVO-2667

5

HITTING OUT AT UN

US Defies World Community

Professor G. Morozov, Vice-Chairman  
of the Soviet United Nations Association

Replying to questions from Pravda, Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, has pointed out: "The men in Washington are cynically parading their great-power ambitions and hyperbolic notions of America's role and place in the modern world. They lay claim to a right to be stronger than anybody else, to decide the fate of nations, and to tell their bidding to everybody everywhere. In short, they are now talking of a 'crusade' not only against socialism but virtually against the whole world".

The Republican Party's election platform has shown this assessment to be well grounded. It has openly declared the intention of the White House to build up its aggressive and expansionist ambitions not only in respect of the countries of the socialist community but against the entire community of nations. One can see this demonstrated by a special chapter of the programme on the US attitude to international organisations. Washington has long been known to be seeking either to turn these organisations into adjuncts of the State Department or to blow them up just like anything else that bars the White House from conducting an aggressive policy.

The Republican platform is extremely contemptuous about international organisations, first of all, about the UN. That is particularly indicative because this document appeared within days of the 39th Session of the UN General Assembly. Playing up their allegations of a harmful Soviet influence in international organisations, the authors of the programme declared with irritation that many of these organisations acted contrary to American interests. The framers of the programme stinted no dirty words



to vilify international organisations. They threatened "determined" and "dynamic" subversive action against them and warned that the US would further cut its contributions to their budgets and withhold its "aid" from the nations that would vote against American interests. Let me note that an appropriate Act has already been passed in the US on Senator Robert Kasten's initiative, and financial "sanctions" have already been applied against Madagascar and Zimbabwe for having supported resolutions denouncing US aggressive policies.

US attacks are spearheaded against the UN, which has been chosen as a target of most unbridled invectives and preposterous charges from the Republican Party platform. It is the UN that has been threatened, first and foremost, by action of every kind, including the US withdrawal from it and an undisguised struggle to get it abolished.

It will be no exaggeration to say that the US has been attacking the UN throughout its existence. However, at the early stages, when the US had an obedient "voting machinery" at its service in the General Assembly, the prime object of those attacks was the unanimity rule in the Security Council where the Soviet veto had served as an insurmountable obstacle to American expansionism.

But times have changed. The collapse of the colonial system has more than trebled the UN membership with the admission of emergent nations and that demolished the American "voting machinery". The US and its allies have been finding themselves more and more often in a negligible minority at the time of decision-making in the General Assembly. That is what has fuelled the irritation of American reactionaries who have been loathing the UN ever since the opening days of its existence. This has been particularly palpable during the Reagan Administration's term of office. The US has totally crossed out the indisputable positive performance of the UN in the past and has been treating this most representative international organisation as an "arena of pointless disputes", a "tyranny of an irresponsible majority", etc.



The Republican Party's election platform has brought this policy directed against the world community as a whole to its peak.

International organisations, like, above all, the UN, as a central vehicle of multilateral diplomacy and cooperation, have naturally been called into being in a complex and motley world of today which has, for the first time in history, been confronted with the necessity of resolving global problems, first of all, those of preventing nuclear disaster, as well as the problems of food supply, health, and environmental protection requiring the common efforts of all nations and peoples. The UN record is there to prove that whenever most of its members have acted in agreement, the potentialities residing in its Charter have been turned to good account in spite of opposition from reactionary forces.

For the UN potential to be realized, naturally, honest cooperation of the states which are members of this organization and faithful implementation of its Charter are required.

Such is exactly the attitude of the USSR, and this is recognized by all objective people. The firm support by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the efforts of the United Nations for the safeguarding of peace, security, justice and progress, UN Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar wrote recently, is decisive for this organization, in the founding of which the Soviet Union played a basic role.

In the present extremely complicated situation the USSR continues to uphold the principles, the letter and the spirit of the UN Charter and to work for the most effective use of the UN for the purposes of making the political climate healthier.

Completely opposed to this constructive stand is the position of the USA. The issue of the latest publication of the reactionary research organization Heritage Foundation, called "A World Without the UN," has been timed for the forthcoming elections in the United States. Its foreword is written by former US Deputy Ambassador to the UN Charles Lichenstein, which speaks a lot about



the nature of this booklet. It is he who in September 1983 declared in the UN Committee on Relations with the Host Country that members of the UN dissatisfied with the attitude to them in the USA "must get away from its territory."

"A World Without the UN" is an apology for the hegemony-seeking ambitions of the USA and its extreme displeasure with the United Nations. The authors are indignant at the lack of support for American policy in the UN General Assembly. But the fact is that the UN is not to blame for this, but American policy. Really, there is something to think about if in the vote on a resolution on the "prevention of an arms race in outer space" at the last, 38th session of the General Assembly the USA was the only country to vote against it and if 108 UN members supported the resolution that condemned the US aggression in Grenada.

But Washington, oblivious of common sense, fulminates against the UN for the latter's "becoming an anti-American, anti-Western organization hostile to the system of private enterprise" and for the fact that its activity is getting ever more "politicized."

Lichenstein and his co-authors are made furious by the attempts of peaceloving countries to use the UN for the advancement of disarmament, for the establishment of a new international economic order, for the solution of global problems, etc. The criticism in the UN of Israel, Chile and South Africa, which are accomplices in the aggressive policy of the USA, causes their open ire. They are also angered by the United Nations' outspoken support for nationalization of the economies of developing countries and the consolidation of the state sector in them. The authors literally anathematize the UN for its having granted official status to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) - organizations which represent peoples fighting for their freedom and the right to an independent state. Racism and chauvinism imbues the American approach to the developing countries upholding their rights in the UN.



The authors of the book mentioned above demand an end to "the politization" of the United Nations and insist on other reforms that would subordinate the UN to America's interests. If this is <sup>not</sup> done, they say, the United States and its partners would examine the possibility of leaving the United Nations which would certainly lead to the disbandment of the organisation.

This is, in a nutshell, the position of the United States which has challenged the international community. The United Nations is the main, but not the only organisation exposed to US attacks.

In 1977 President Carter announced that the United States was leaving the ILO. That time too, the pretext was the alleged "politization" of the organisation. In reality, Washington was outraged with ILO decisions condemning imperialist and terrorist regimes. However, the American blackmail had failed to produce the desired effect. Having found itself in isolation, the United States returned to the ILO three years later.

In 1982 President Reagan started an offensive on the IAEA. Referring to the organisation's decision to expel Israel from its membership for the bombardment of the Iraqi nuclear research centre, Washington stopped paying money to the IAEA and stated that it would leave the Agency. However, the US State Department had again failed to reach the target. In the spring of 1983, having admitted its political bankruptcy once again, the United States resumed paying membership dues to the Agency.

At the same time, America levelled sharp criticisms against the WHO which supported the idea of a new international economic order. After that fire was opened on FAO and UNICEF.

The next blow was dealt to UNESCO, with America having stated that unless UNESCO accepted 150 US "recommendations" as regards changes in its activities, it would withdraw from the organisation on January 1, 1985. As the ground for its decision Washington again alleged "the politization" of UNESCO, which expressed itself



in discussing disarmament and a new international order in information and communication, and also in the condemnation by UNESCO members of Israel, Chile and South Africa.

American accusations to the effect that international organisations go political do not hold water, as is evidenced by UNESCO's example. Today crucial international issues become increasingly interwoven. The main of them, the preservation of peace, cannot be separated from politics. In this sense "politization" may outrage only those who pursue aggressive aims.

The world is not indifferent to the attacks which the United States and its NATO partners are waging against the United Nations. A draft resolution submitted by the Coordination Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement to the 39th Session of the UN General Assembly, rejects attempts to belittle the importance of the UN and expresses the hope that the organisation will contribute to the efforts of the peoples for world peace and security, for disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, for comprehensive international cooperation.

America's stand with respect to international organisations reflects the hegemonism of the reactionary forces shaping Washington's foreign policy. However, mankind will not permit them to implement their hegemonistic designs. People of progressive views throughout the world are joining efforts to frustrate the aggressive plans hatched by the Washington crusaders. They continue to believe in the United Nations. They are sure that the organisation will implement the hopes and aspirations of the nations that established it.

(Izvestia, September 13. In full.)



THESE "QUIET" AMERICANS

F. Sergeyev

The Intelligence Activities of the US Military-  
Diplomatic Staff in Moscow

To reveal the military-economic potential of the Soviet Union and of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries, the United States, along with other methods of spying, makes lavish use of the so-called "visual intelligence". What is it? It means collecting information through personal observations. In American expert opinion, it is the most wide-spread method in the intelligence practice of the USA.

Trying hard to collect comprehensive information, the US intelligence bodies give great attention to visual intelligence on the territory of the USSR. What people are used to this end? First, the staff of the US Embassy in Moscow, primarily the personnel of the military, naval and air-force attaches -- the main force of the traditional apparatus of legal espionage. Second, the American newsmen accredited in the USSR, who, in the view of the CIA top officials, have much vaster opportunities than some officials of the central intelligence apparatus. Third, tourists and members of the delegations from the USA and other NATO countries. Fourth, businessmen from the capitalist countries, and lastly the American specialists, under-graduate and post-graduate students and sailors.

According to some estimates, the intelligence service of the Department of State gets from the reports of the US Embassies from 40 to 60 per cent of the material it needs. This material is based on the personal observations of the diplomats -- intelligence officers, which are carried out, as a rule, in combination with the analysis of the press.



- 2 -

The facts of the past few decades point to the continually increasing role of the American military attaches in carrying out visual intelligence in the USSR.

The US ruling quarters are aware of the fact that the conditions for espionage in the socialist countries are much more difficult than in the capitalist ones. This explains the thoroughness and carefulness which the chiefs of the American intelligence service display in selecting the staff for the "Soviet direction". Along with high professional skill, reliability is viewed as top priority.

The military institute of foreign languages in Monterey, California, is a major centre for training agents. Its special faculty has the Russian, Ukrainian, Polish, Korean and German departments. The Russian department, at which the number of trainees reaches 1,500, is one of the largest. The teachers of the Russian language alone number over 100. The curriculum which, as a rule, provides for 6-20 months of training envisages also one or two visits of the trainees to the Soviet Union as diplomatic couriers or members of tourist groups. For instance, 18 officers of the American army intelligence service -- trainees of the intelligence school at Oberammergau (West Germany) stayed in the USSR as tourists for 40 days. Another time 16 trainees of this school came to the Soviet Union as tourists and stayed here for about a month. The wives of the military attaches are also trained in using intelligence methods -- they must attend lectures and see special films at the strategic intelligence school of the American army. Special stress is laid on the importance of the knowledge of the language of the country of sojourn by the wives of the military attaches.

In different years, there have been some 20-25 intelligence officers at average in the US military, naval and air missions in Moscow. Many of them have more than once visited the USSR or specialised in "the Soviets' affairs" and, therefore, freely find their bearings in the conditions of Soviet realities and know



- 3 -

well certain areas of our country. The overwhelming majority of them are specialists in the various sectors of the economy, technology and military affairs. Some time ago, information has leaked out to the US press on the results of observations by the US military attaches, who attended a military parade in Moscow. This is how the report in question ran: Shown during the parade today were three new missile systems, compact in size and very mobile on the ground so as to avoid detection by air and space reconnaissance... The demonstration of equipment, which took a mere eight minutes, made it possible to draw the conclusion that the USSR had developed a guidance system for the nuclear warhead on a rocket put into near-Earth orbit in advance for targetting it on an Earth-based object.

In keeping with the plans approved by the centre, staff workers of the office of the military attaches systematically visit all areas of the USSR open to foreigners. Moreover, they pay repeated visits during a year's time to points where installations being sought by them are located so as to know all, if possible, about changes taking place there.

Intelligence officers are in charge of definite areas of the USSR. Regular visits to those areas, according to some of them, provide real opportunities for detecting the appearance of new defensive installations.

Travelling by rail, intelligence officers are striving to get a separate compartment to themselves so as to be able to freely take notes, mark what is needed on the map and photograph objects that interest them. As a rule, such trips are made by groups of 3-4 intelligence officers, which enables them to conduct observations round the clock on both sides of the track. When travelling by air, they study take-off and landing runways, make charts of airfields and fuel depots and sketches of airport installations. Touring the country, military intelligence officers prefer travelling in private cars of Soviet makes so as not to



- 4 -

attract the attention of local residents and to be able to use reconnaissance equipment.

Visual reconnaissance by the US military and diplomatic missions in the USSR assumed, according to American sources, extensive proportions even in the very first post-war years. General Walter Bedell Smith, a professional intelligence officer, who was appointed to the post of US Ambassador in Moscow in 1946 and who later became head of the CIA, set up at the Embassy a joint intelligence committee for coordinating the intelligence activities of military attaches and staff members of the bureau of intelligence of the Department of State. In point of fact, the entire staff of the Embassy, including its junior members, were drawn into collecting intelligence.

In the territory of the Soviet Union, several dozen military-diplomatic officials, up to attaches themselves, have been caught spying. Many of them have been expelled from the USSR. For instance, staff members of the office of the air attache of the US Embassy, Andersen and Cramer, driving a Volga car, stole to a training and testing airfield. Hiding themselves in a sand-pit on the edge of the forest, they observed the functioning of the airfield and photographed aircraft there. Workers of a neighbouring enterprise who happened to be passing by detained the Americans. Found on them were three cameras, field glasses, a writing-pad for intelligence data, and the map with the location of important defensive installations marked on it. The films confiscated and developed contained pictures of aircraft performing test flights, while the writing-pad had marks showing the schedule of flights and the types of the aircraft.

Large numbers of tourists come to this country. They visit Soviet government institutions, research establishments, factories and offices, and meet Soviet citizens. The US intelligence service is doing its utmost to use these opportunities by having its own agents included in the delegations and groups of tourists going to the Soviet Union.



- 5 -

...Two of them have been found once travelling in a second-hand Renault car. It was driven by a 30-year-old ship mechanic of Amsterdam, Ewert Rejdon, accompanied by a 25-year-old Dutch long voyage navigator Lou de Jaher. They looked like tourists at first glance, following what is normally an ordinary tourist itinerary: Uzhgorod--Kiev--Kharkov--Zaporozhie--Yalta--Odessa--Kiev--Lvov--Uzhgorod. What didn't was that Rejdon and Jaher showed the least interest in ancient monuments and landscape. Nor were they particularly keen on having heart-to-heart chats by a bonfire, sightseeing or meeting people. They kept straying off the route. The men in the second-hand Renault had their own reasons for that. They were expected back home by American intelligence residents who had equipped them for the voyage. Long before their journey to the USSR, Rejdon and Jaher had made what was something like a "training" auto tour. Ewert Rejdon said so during the questioning after his arrest.

R. Christner, who presented himself in the form he filled in as a clerk of the US Congressional Library and a post-graduate student of Georgetown University, also came to the USSR as a tourist. But he was gathering information in the Ukrainian Republic about the state of railway, transport, photographed railway stations, airfields, and major industrial projects, noted down the plans of some localities indicating bridges, radio aeri~~als~~ and high-voltage power transmission lines. In Lvov, Christner turned up in the vicinity of a military installation and in Baku he was seen photographing the harbour with warships in it.

When detained, Christner was found to possess notes, film and drawings relating to intelligence. He hid all that in a special belt. It was established that Christner, a railway equipment expert, had been on a mission to the USSR which the US intelligence service had regarded as quite important.



- 6 -

One Kolling was among the foreign experts who had come to the Volga Country to help put up some imported equipment. During his first few weeks over there, he was quite active in meeting Soviet workers and posing as our country's friend. But a little later, he began to show interest in those who had served with the Soviet Armed Forces and to inquire where their respective military units were stationed, etc. Kolling even offered two workers to make a trip with him to a suburb of a regional centre where an important defence installation was located. They were to have passed him off for their friend who had come over from Latvia. Acting in disguise, the spy attempted some film shooting and picture taking.

To complement what they get from visual intelligence, the officials responsible for this job in the United States interrogate American citizens on their return from the USSR. The CIA Director R. Helms confessed once that ever since the Second World War, every American, back home from a foreign trip for any purpose, had been interrogated by military and naval intelligence service, the State Department and other government offices. With the CIA established, the questioning of Americans travelling abroad had been concentrated in this office alone. ... Suppose a president of a steel company in New York had travelled around the Soviet Union to see some steel plants over there, and we found it important to know their output capacity, the kind of items they produced and so on and so forth. So, CIA officials would ask him about everything he might have seen....

But all the attempts to look through the peep-hole have been foiled and will certainly be foiled. This is how it has been and that is how it will be.

(Sovetskaya Rossia, Aug. 12. In full.)

THE END



THE "BIBLE OF LATTER-DAY CRUSADERS"

Washington, August 16 (TASS). The "Bible of Latter-Day Crusaders" is the only description one can give to the draft pre-election platform of the Republican Party of the USA, which has been circulated here.

+ + +

The draft platform is to be approved at the National Convention of the Republicans to be held in Dallas, Texas, over August 20-23, at which Reagan will be officially announced as a Presidential nominee in the forthcoming elections.

The platform extols the militaristic policy of the incumbent Administration and announces the intention to continue pursuing it in the future, too, taking guidance from the appeals of the present head of the White House for a "crusade" against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, against the national liberation movements.

Just as Reagan's provocative gaffe--"we begin bombing (the Soviet Union) in five minutes", which betrays the true thoughts of the US President, this document convincingly shows the worth of the "peaceable" rhetoric of the Republican Administration, to which it started resorting for the purpose of promoting its election aims. Hypocritically declaring a "readiness" for talks with the USSR on arms control, the authors of the document, which has been compiled with the direct participation of leading officials of the incumbent Administration, insist then and there on the need to counter a Soviet threat. They reach the lengths of alleging that the Soviet Union is danger Number One to the American "democratic institutions", though it is well known that none other than the Administration itself has mounted an all-out attack on those institutions.

Strategists of the Republican Party laud the unprecedented arms build-up started by Reagan and assure one and all that in the



event of his re-election as President, the arms build-up will be continued both on Earth and in space. The document praises to the skies Reagan's "new and bold strategic defence initiative" for putting arms in space. Its authors openly speak about the United States' intention to increase military presence in all regions of the world, to get its allies in NATO, and also Japan, still more deeply involved in the pursuance of the hegemonistic geo-political strategy of the USA and to draw the PRC into it. The Republicans are doing their utmost to justify the deployment of the new US nuclear weapons in Western Europe.

Fully approving of the Reagan Administration's policy of state-sponsored terrorism, the authors of the platform announce the intention to continue intensifying and enlarging the scale of the CIA's activities. They openly threaten the peoples of Cuba, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Vietnam, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Syria and the Palestine Liberation Organisation and extol the United States' "strategic cooperation" with Israel directed against the interests of the Arab countries. The Republican "ideologists" promise to expand the subversive activities of the false radio voices and the US Information Agency and to go ahead with acts of ideological subversion against the USSR and other countries.

(Pravda, August 17. In full.)



KISSINGER

Monday, August 13, 1984

OVP15VO-2316

2

WHAT IF NOT PEACE?

Academician G. Arbatov

Not so long ago The Washington Post carried an article by Henry Kissinger, former US Secretary of State, entitled "Peace Is Not the Only Goal". The idea expressed in the title is reiterated with boring monotony throughout the article: if peace becomes the only foreign policy goal, blackmail will prevail in diplomacy; peace must not be made into a slogan, otherwise it will have a demoralising effect; and so on and so forth.

An inexperienced reader might be baffled by such phrases. Isn't Mr. Kissinger asserting the obvious, he may wonder. Who, of all people, can suspect the US present administration of ever having peace as an aim, especially the only aim, of its policy?

It is not against the White House, however, that Kissinger is shooting his critical arrows. He is troubled by quite a different thing - isn't peace becoming a major if not the major goal of foreign policy for the American public? If so, then the issue of war and peace will be the central one in the election race. Yet it is in the foreign policy field that the stand of President Reagan looks particularly shaky.

And the former Secretary of State, forgetting his grievances, stretches him a magnanimous hand of assistance. No, he says, the USA is not to blame for the heightening of tensions and the mounting of nuclear war threat. If, however, it may be involved in that, then only slightly, just a little bit.

It may be remarked parenthetically that Kissinger admits this "tiny dose" of responsibility not only for verisimilitude: indeed, who will really believe attempts to depict the US current administration as a snow-white dove with an olive twig in its beak? We see



Monday, August 13, 1984

- 2 -

2

here a very distinct desire to remind the administration once more that any President who fails to lend an ear to his advice takes great risks and incurs heavy expenses.

But let us not read too much fervour in his critical pathos. He rather softly reproves the administration, ever so kindly and gently. He blames it only for the strident anti-Soviet rhetoric and lack of system in policy planning, and solely in the early stages. And not to be misunderstood, God forbid, by anyone, he explains right away that the fault for aggravating the situation and escalating the threat of a nuclear holocaust lies not with the chaotic early stages of the Reagan administration. It is the misbehaving Russians who are the villain.

Here you are: a wish to accommodate Reagan and those behind him leads to a direct untruth which even seasoned experts would do well to avoid if they set any store by their reputation.

The untruth is above all in saying that American policy can be blamed only for excesses of anti-Soviet rhetoric and lack of system. The system, the anti-Soviet system, was in the Reagan administration's actions all along. And its policy was not confined to verbal incontinence and unconsidered expressions. No, the fact is that the United States set course towards achieving military superiority over the USSR, towards whipping up the arms race as much as possible and creating a potential which it hoped would help to wage a nuclear war, survive and even win it.

This political course is certainly based on a flimsy foundation of illusions. But it is not rhetoric, not words, but a well-defined system of concrete, real and quite tangible steps: record-breaking military budgets, new weapon systems, new strategic concepts, and the disruption of arms limitation talks so natural under the circumstances. It is not words, but aggressive acts committed by the USA in recent years: Marines sent to Lebanon, intervention in Grenada, the undeclared war against Nicaragua, military interference



Monday, August 13, 1984

2

- 3 -

in El Salvador. Nor will anyone fit into the framework of rhetoric and lack of system the economic policy of the USA: boycotts, sanctions, discrimination, and nearly an economic war against the USSR and the other socialist nations. Moreover, can one reduce to mere words the causes of deterioration in political relations? The political dialogue has for all practical intents and purposes ceased. Cooperation in economics, science and many other spheres has been cut down to a minimum, if not zero. It was not waterfalls of words but also lots of actions (bad actions) that eroded that modest stock of mutual understanding and trust which had taken so much effort to establish.

The anti-Soviet rhetoric within the framework of such policy was, as a matter of fact, not only and not so much an expression of wooden anti-communist mentality. Rather, it was an indispensable ingredient of that policy, a sort of psychological logistics. It is only in an atmosphere of fear and hatred that a nation can be made to divert tremendous funds and resources from its elementary needs and to brush aside the unprecedented risk of self-destruction.

The second untruth is that this entire course so dangerous for peace was not limited only to the early phase of the Reagan administration's term of office. As compared with its first years in the saddle, only one thing has in the main changed - the administration ceased to be so outspoken as it used to be when its key documents and statements made no bones about winning military supremacy over the USSR, building up a potential sufficient for waging any kind of nuclear war, including a "protracted" one, and winning it, when US leaders publicly discussed their plans for a "limited" nuclear war in Europe, proclaimed a "crusade" against the USSR and threatened to throw that "empire of the evil" onto the ash heap of history.

Now such statements are avoided in public utterances and sometimes a wish is voiced to improve relations with the USSR and conduct negotiations for peace and disarmament. But deeds and policies have remained unchanged. Military budgets continue to



grow. The administration has abandoned none of its military programmes. And even at talks to which the USA was pressed back by public opinion, it has done its utmost to prevent agreement. Besides, it was not with us that such talks have been carried out in recent years. With anyone but us - with its own Congress, allies, and the opposition. All US proposals at talks were in advance framed so as to be unacceptable to the Soviet Union. And at the same time to create illusions among American Congressmen or US allies. In that way, talks to limit nuclear arms have bit by bit turned into an additional leverage for the intensification of the arms race.

And now Kissinger fulminates against the Soviet "lack of desire" to return to that apology for talks.

Kissinger's deliberations on this subject of talks and Soviet participation in those talks are particularly incoherent and contradictory. On the one hand, having walked out of the talks (the talks, one may add, which were disrupted by the Americans with their deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe) the USSR supposedly committed a mortal sin and came to bear the blame for the latest deterioration of the situation. But on the other hand, the US must not allow the talks and the Soviet position at such talks to interfere with the "implementation of the vital American programme of arms purchases". What should be the subject of such talks then if all the previous programmes of arms purchases are declared taboo? What's more, the author's final conclusion is that arms control talks are not the best forum for securing a cardinal turning point.

Why not put it straight and say that America does not need talks but wants the arms race instead? But Kissinger will surely not repeat the "mistake" of excessive openness which was committed by the present Administration at the "early stages" of its rule and which now threatens with serious political repercussions. He is not such a simpleton. His plan is to protect the present US policy from attacks and at the same time to get rid of the anxious public at the lowest possible cost and to direct the whole pre-election discussion



into a safe channel for Reagan.

With this goal in view he puts forward a fairly solid suggestion that the most crucial things today are political negotiations and the achievement of political mutual understanding. Who will ever dispute this? Political mutual understanding and improvement of the general situation are admittedly very important. But the really essential point is how to secure them. The Soviet position is that the thing required today to ameliorate the political situation is not words but deeds. Konstantin Chernenko has specifically named these deeds and pointed to the steps which not only could improve mutual understanding but also set the stage for a genuine turnaround in Soviet-American relations and in the whole international situation as well.

These steps do not demand any unilateral concessions from the US and do not in the least impair its national security. These steps include ratifying the treaties on limiting underground tests of nuclear weapons and on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, signed with the USSR nearly ten years ago; finalizing the development of an agreement on a complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests; readiness to work in good faith for an agreement on preventing the militarization of space; concluding an agreement banning the use, development and production of chemical weapons and prescribing the destruction of their existing stocks; and finally, consent to a mutual freeze on American and Soviet nuclear armaments. Whose security could be threatened by this latter point when even Kissinger himself writes in his article that the current stocks are so large that even an 80 per cent cut on the existing arsenals will leave enough warheads to wipe out the whole mankind.

The USSR has never received an answer to these proposals. Nor does Henry Kissinger offer such an answer. But then what's the point of listening to the other side when the obvious objective is not an agreement but a devious political manoeuvre essentially designed to convince people that something important is being done



Monday, August 13, 1984

- 6 -

2

whereas in fact nothing is going on. Specifically, the proposal by the former Secretary of State consists in starting "confidential" probing as to the "goals in the field of East-West relations".

An amazing proposal indeed! Especially given the fact that it is made by an experienced person who was once directly involved in fairly important affairs and, notably, in Soviet-American relations. Could he, of all people, have possibly forgotten that these are not the early 30s when there were no diplomatic relations between the USSR and the US and when such confidential probing could be justified, and not the 50s when the first steps to break out of the icy grip of the Cold War were being made?

These are the 80s which were preceded by the 70s when fruitful talks were conducted, important agreements/concluded (some of which still remain in effect by the way) and hope-inspiring cooperation was promoted. And now, after all these years, we are invited to return to "confidential probing", and on vague, unclear and evasive issues at that.

Who can possibly be inspired by this plan? Certainly no one. This is probably the most vulnerable point about Kissinger's deliberations.

His objective, though, is clear. It is to remove from the electoral agenda in the US the issues which are disquieting and even dangerous for the Reagan administration: the issues of peace, disarmament, talks and relations with the USSR. In fact, Kissinger blurts it out himself by demanding that Washington should make it clear that "Moscow cannot become a factor affecting the outcome of our elections."

Now the instrument which he has chosen for influencing the course of the pre-election discussion: confidential probing of no one knows what, is too ineffective. This is more like rumours about other rumours, which will hardly convince the alarmed American public or make it forget the importance of peace as a political goal.

Monday, August 13, 1984

- 7 -

2

As for the "Moscow factor" in the US presidential elections, this is a vain attempt by Kissinger to exploit the Americans' national feelings. The Soviet Union certainly does not intend to interfere in the internal affairs of America and, notably, in its presidential elections. In fact, it is not Moscow but the American policy with respect to the USSR that has been and will remain a strong factor in those elections. There is nothing insulting or unfair about this point. This is because the US policy towards the Soviet Union has direct bearing on the problems of war and peace and, consequently, on the future of the American (and, naturally, any other) nation. There is nothing to be done here, for people are always most of all concerned about their own vital and basic interests.

Yes, Americans do begin to realize the danger to these interests which is inherent in the present Washington policy. For its own part, the US administration begins to realize that Americans are coming to this awareness. This is precisely the novelty that distinguishes the present stage in the rule of the Reagan Administration from the "early stages". There is no new Reagan - that is a myth, but the situation in the world and in America itself is changing indeed. This is exactly why today the White House prefers not to advertise its militarist anti-Soviet line as it did in 1980 but to conceal it, and here is where the troubled Henry Kissinger offers the present administration a fig leaf of his own design.

(Pravda, August 13. In full.)



Thursday, August 16, 1984

ORI15VO-2349

1

TASS STATEMENT

American radio networks which recently were taping US President Ronald Reagan's regular election-year statement recorded his words which he had said prior to reading out the text of his statement and which had not been intended for the public.

As has become known, Reagan said literally the following: "My fellow Americans, I am pleased to tell you we have signed legislation that would outlaw Russia forever. We begin bombing in five minutes."

In the White House they are now trying to make it appear that the head of the US administration just indulged in "cracking a joke".

Reagan indeed has not signed any such legislation, and no orders to bomb have been given this time either. But it is not fortuitous that the President's words have been received with serious concern both in the United States and elsewhere.

The episode has been justly seen as a manifestation of the selfsame frames of mind which have already been formulated officially before in calls for a "crusade", the doctrines of limited and protracted nuclear wars and the military-political plans of securing world dominance to the United States. In the US administration they now prefer to keep silent about all this, but its practical actions are speaking for themselves. The crash effort to build up nuclear, chemical and conventional arms is continuing, and a new class of weaponry - space strike systems - is being developed.

Use is being made of all ways and means, including a policy of state terrorism and direct applications of armed force against independent countries whose home and foreign policies do not suit Washington.

Simultaneously, the process of the limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments and other talks aimed at ending the arms race and achieving disarmament are being blocked.

The unwillingness of the USA to work for peace and stronger international security again made itself manifest in Washington's refusal to seek agreement on preventing the militarisation of space.

The policy of the incumbent US administration runs counter to the vital interests of the peoples. It is futile and at the same time extremely dangerous. This calls for high vigilance of all those who cherish peace.

No pseudo-peace rhetoric which from time to time is used in Washington for election-year purposes should mislead anyone. The fact that this rhetoric is not matched by real actions is obvious. If anyone has any doubts on this score, the latest "outspokenness" of President Reagan should be an eye-opener for them as well.

TASS is authorised to state that the Soviet Union deploras the US President's invective, unprecedentedly hostile towards the USSR and dangerous to the cause of peace.

This conduct is incompatible with the high responsibility borne by leaders of states, particularly nuclear powers, for the destinies of their own peoples and for the destinies of mankind.

Proceeding from this responsibility, the Soviet Union has been doing and will continue to do everything it can to safeguard world peace. The peoples expect that the leaders of the United States as well will at long last start acting with awareness of their responsibility.

(Pravda, August 16. In full.)



ORI 3VO-3180

ELECTIONS OVER, WHAT NEXT?

Washington, November 7. (TASS.) The November 6 elections in the United States resulted in Republican nominee Ronald Reagan's re-election as US President.

It is indicative that whereas in 1980 he waged his election campaign under openly chauvinistic, militarist and anti-Soviet slogans, during this year's campaign, especially at its closing stage, Reagan was busy assuring Americans of his desire to work for stronger peace and better relations with the Soviet Union. This tactic served as a forced response to the sentiments of millions of Americans who express mounting anxiety over the growing threat of nuclear war as a result of the Washington administration's policy.

The latest public opinion polls showed that 89 per cent of the Americans are convinced that there could be no winner in a nuclear war, while 96 per cent believe that allowing a further exacerbation of relations with the Soviet Union would be a most dangerous adventure. Taking these sentiments into account, Reagan promised to devote his efforts during his second term in office to limiting and reducing nuclear arms.

The Republicans also managed in a certain measure to play down the acuteness and potential catastrophic danger of the problems connected with the Reagan administration's escalation of the arms race. This race, now being planned to spread also to outer space, was presented as concern for US security and even as being an "indispensable condition" of successful talks with the Soviet Union on limiting and reducing arms. Judging by the elections' outcome, that rhetoric was believed by a significant number of Americans.

The generously funded promotion of the Republican Party's candidates on national and local television, in the press and at campaign rallies also helped to convince



- 2 -

a significant part of the voters that Reagan and his "team" not only stand for a "strong America" but also give priority in their home and foreign policies to the really vital interests of almost "all sections" of the US population.

Reagan's promise not to allow tax increases and to "continue steering a course" to ensure the country's "economic and spiritual renewal" played a no small role. The Republicans shamelessly gave themselves the credit for the certain cyclic upswing which came by a natural way after the economic upheavals of the late 1970s and the early 1980s and resulted in slower inflation.

The demagogical rhetoric on this theme helped to draw attention away from such burning economic and social problems as the enormous federal budget deficit which is nearing 200 billion dollars, the almost two-trillion-dollar federal debt, the persisting high rate of unemployment and the growth of the number of Americans living below the "poverty line" to 35 million. All these problems, naturally, remained.

The leadership of the Republican Party and President Reagan himself have immediately started to publicize his re-election as a manifestation of a nation-wide support for the domestic and foreign policy which the administration has pursued in the past four years. Republican leaders utter statements to the effect that a nation-wide mandate has been received for finishing the work started by the administration. However, there are obviously neither a nation-wide support nor a mandate. Just like at the 1980 elections, a minority of Americans who have the right to vote voted for Reagan. According to official data, there are 174 million such citizens in the United States whereas the number of voters who registered during the present election campaign was only about 115 million. Thus, it was clear long before the polling day that almost 60 million voters would not participate in the polling. There are many reasons for that.



- 3 -

These include apathy because the voters do not see much difference between the candidates and programs of the two major bourgeois parties. These also include such obstacles which are insurmountable for many members of the national minorities and in general for the poorest sections of population as juridical or general illiteracy or simply the lack of knowledge of English.

More than 20 per cent of the registered voters did not turn out for these and many other objective reasons. They never decided for whom they should vote -- for the Republican candidate or for the Democratic one. First of all, their hopes that the Democratic Party candidate would be able to offer any concrete and comprehensive alternative to the policy of the Republican administration were not justified.

And although a truly realistic alternative to the course of the administration and leadership of the Republican Party, the alternative which was contained in the election campaign of the Communist Party of the USA, was put forward during the elections, the advocates of the alternative could not, of course, even dream of tens and hundreds of millions of dollars needed in US conditions to get their platform to broad masses of voters. For example, the Communists' candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency, Gus. Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party, and Angela Davis, member of the Party's Central Committee, did not have an opportunity to appear on television. Each minute of a televised appearance cost a quarter of a million of dollars in those days. Nevertheless the Communists succeeded in achieving a considerable success. The names of their candidates were included in ballot papers of 23 states and in the federal district of Columbia where the capital of the USA is situated.

The main question which is now being asked by many political observers is whether the new administration will act in keeping with its own promises. Will it back them up by deeds?



The near future will show. As for the sphere of foreign policy, an agenda which has been suggested by the Soviet Union and giving an opportunity to look for joint realistic approaches to matters of war and peace and requiring an urgent solution is literally on the table before the new administration. The agenda states the need to contribute to lessening the threat of a nuclear war, in the first place. Nothing precludes Washington from assuming an obligation, as has already been done by the Soviet Union, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and to abandon the most dangerous of ventures -- the endeavour to upset the military-strategic balance and the counting on military superiority.

Nothing precludes the new administration from meeting the Soviet initiative which is aimed at preventing militarization of outer space and from freezing nuclear arsenals on a mutual basis. Would not it be reasonable for Washington to abandon altogether the attempts to pursue a hegemonist policy in the international arena, and to abandon the interference in the internal affairs of other countries and the policy of states terrorism. That would promote a real stability in the world, stability which Washington takes so much care of in words.

There are many problems and they are complex. However, experience shows that if there is a positive, constructive approach to them, their solution is quite possible on the basis of equality and equal security, the more so as such a solution would equally accord not only with the interests of the USSR and the USA but with those of the whole world as well. It would also accord with the interests of the Reagan administration itself. As Joseph Kraft, columnist of the Washington Post newspaper, has pointed out, the Americans' attitude to their government will in a large degree depend on whether President Reagan will manage to establish constructive relations with the Soviet Union.

(Izvestia, November 7. In full.)



47.87

## AGAINST THE MADNESS OF ANOTHER "CRUSADE"

### A Look at the American Journal Foreign Affairs

In the USA the election race is in full swing. The President has now joined it. His first step was to issue-- needless to say, not from himself personally but as a White House project--a public relations brochure claiming that in three years he had achieved more than any of his predecessors in a four-year term. Where he has been really successful is that by his policy he has brought international tension to an inordinately dangerous level, seriously impaired US-Soviet relations, and unleashed an arms race of unprecedented proportions in US history. The conversion of Western Europe into a launching pad for US nuclear missiles targeted on the USSR and its allies, the start of the militarisation of outer space, the massive stockpiling of chemical weapons, the lawlessness in Lebanon, the occupation of Grenada, and the undeclared war against Nicaragua are only a negligible part of the record of the present leaders in Washington. Driven by their hegemonistic ambitions and rabid anti-communism, they are cynically disregarding the interests of the peoples, including those of the American people, and gambling with the future of the entire human race.

Naturally, this gives the question of war and peace top priority in the nation's socio-political life. "Never before in US history has such a great number of Americans expressed



opposition to a government war policy,"<sup>1</sup> said Gus Hall at the 23rd National Convention of the Communist Party of the USA in November 1983. The mounting anti-war feeling in the USA and the growing anxiety that Reagan's policies are a straight road to thermonuclear catastrophe are influencing the attitudes also of a section of the ruling class. An indication of this is the sharp ongoing debate in the US bourgeois media, particularly in the journal Foreign Affairs.

This quarterly of 240-250 pages enjoys the reputation of being a focus of foreign policy thinking in the USA and in the West as a whole. In addition to contributions from prominent Americans it has often printed articles by Valerie Giscard d'Estaing, Helmut Schmidt, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, and other leaders of the capitalist world. It is published in New York by the Council on Foreign Relations, an influential non-governmental body with close links to monopoly capital groups.

What are the contributors to Foreign Affairs writing about the US Administration's foreign policy? Let us straightaway note that there is a wide spectrum of attitudes. Those contributors who represent the most bellicose imperialist circles unreservedly back this policy. But the majority of contributors articulate the growing realisation that the Reagan approach to international problems, to relations with the Soviet Union in the first place, is unacceptable in the epoch of nuclear missiles. This group urges a less adventurist and dangerous (in terms of consequences) strategy, which, they feel, would be more in keep

---

<sup>1</sup> Gus Hall, Main Report to the 23rd National Convention, Cleveland, Ohio, November 10-13, 1983, III, The World in Crisis, p. 4.



with the aim of stabilising and consolidating the positions of US imperialism in the world.

What aspects of the Reagan Administration's foreign policy are criticised by those ideological spokesmen of monopoly capital who are to some extent inclined to reckon with international realities? What causes the split in the American ruling class on questions of global strategy?

The divisions between the Administration and its opponents in the bourgeois camp begin with the philosophy behind the Reagan foreign policy, namely, bellicose anti-communism, which not only prescribes all official White House propaganda but also sets the line across the board for US foreign policy.

"The present Administration represents a mighty comeback of the messianic approach to foreign policy," writes Arthur Schlesinger Jr., historian and professor at the City University of New York, in the journal's issue for the fall of 1983. The US leaders are so obsessed with ideological prejudices, he says, that they urge "a jihad, a crusade of extermination against the infidel". However, a "holy war" is "singularly unpromising in the epoch of nuclear weapons,"<sup>2</sup> Schlesinger concludes.

The bourgeois politicians, academics, and analysts writing for Foreign Affairs have no liking for existing socialism, but they feel that it would be much too hazardous for the USA to gamble on nuclear weapons in a confrontation with the USSR. And it is nuclear weapons that are assigned pride of place in the Reagan "crusade". The White House chief has proclaimed his

---

<sup>2</sup> Arthur Schlesinger Jr., "Foreign Policy and the American Character", Foreign Affairs, Fall 1983, pp. 5,7.



Administration's determination to fight "evil", his term for socialism, with all the might available to the USA. The Pentagon is building up the material base for the first-strike doctrine at a quickening pace. The Defence Department's directive for military policy for 1984-1988 leaves no doubt on this score, saying that the USA would like to have a nuclear potential to enable it to "prevail even under the condition of a prolonged war".<sup>3</sup>

Many of the contributors to Foreign Affairs are also worried by the fact that the Administration's "instinctive anti-communism", which is now the "talk of the town", precludes the very possibility of stable coexistence with the USSR, let alone promoting relations. They want an anti-communism of a different order, "rational" and flexible, which would not entail the risk of nuclear disaster to the USA and yet allow it to attain its aims in more subtle ways.

This is the tenor, in particular, of an article headed "Habitual Hatred--Unsound Policy" in which member of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee Senator Charles Mathias Jr. offers a detailed critique of the Administration's guideline. The Senator is worried not only by the increased likelihood of a military conflict between the two nations but also by the fact that the USA has narrowed contacts with the USSR to the extent that it has lost the "levers" (negotiations, trade, credits, and so on) that might have allowed it to benefit by the "serious

---

<sup>3</sup> International Herald Tribune, August 25, 1982.



difficulties" that he believes are characteristic of the "communist system". But Reagan's stance towards the USSR, Mathias says, rules out every other approach save "sustained confrontation".<sup>4</sup>

The basic elements of this confrontation are now the reckless arms race, chiefly, the nuclear arms race, and the conduct of an all-out economic and psychological war against the USSR. In this way the Washington crusaders count on achieving strategic superiority in order to compel the Soviet Union to make political concessions, "wearing it down" economically, and forcing the Soviet leadership to abandon its active foreign policy and solidarity with the world's forces of peace, democracy, progress, and national liberation.<sup>5</sup> This, writes the French political analyst Michel Tatu in Foreign Affairs, amounts to "applying global and strategic pressure intended to destabilize the entire Soviet system".<sup>6</sup>

This aspect of the Reagan "crusade" also comes under scrutiny in Foreign Affairs. The journal is concerned chiefly with whether the strategy of "total confrontation" with the USSR is justified from the standpoint of the ultimate objective of consolidating to the hilt the USA's position in the world. Will it, as the White House believes, undermine existing socialism, cause the world communist movement to disintegrate, erode the

---

<sup>4</sup> Charles Mathias, Jr., "Habitual Hatred--Unsound Policy", Foreign Affairs, Summer 1983, p. 1020.

<sup>5</sup> International Herald Tribune, May 23, 1982; March 11, 1983.

<sup>6</sup> Michel Tatu, "US-Soviet Relations: A Turning Point?", Foreign Affairs, Winter 1983/1984, p. 600.



progressive regimes in developing countries, and clear the way for US world supremacy? Or is Washington, by going all out to inflame tension, taking an unnecessary risk, setting itself unattainable objectives, and throwing huge sums of money to the wind and thereby undercutting its own economic potential and international positions?

The most distinct division in the US ruling class is seen over the question of the role of nuclear weapons in military-political strategy. The basic premise of the Pentagon's present doctrine is that after the needed "first-strike" capability has been created (it includes MX, Pershing-2, and cruise missiles, and the Trident-2 submarine) the USA will be in a position to "prevail" in a nuclear war. The Pentagon strategists maintain that with the element of surprise and with nuclear warheads of a heightened accuracy a single crushing strike will destroy Soviet strategic systems and control centres and, for all practical purposes, deny the USSR the capability for retaliation. Many contributors to Foreign Affairs challenge these calculations.

Spurgeon M. Keeny and Wolfgang K.H. Panofsky debunk the "perception that the outcomes and scale of a nuclear conflict could be controlled by the doctrine or the types of nuclear weapons employed". They write: "The principal danger of doctrines that are directed at limiting nuclear conflicts is that they might ... form the basis for action without appreciation of the physical facts and uncertainties of nuclear conflict."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr., and Wolfgang K.H. Panofsky, "Mad Versus Nuts: The Mutual Hostage Relationship of the Superpowers", Foreign Affairs, Winter 1981/1982, p. 287. Keeny was Assistant



The innumerable scenarios produced in the USA in recent years indicate that practically any conflict involving the use of nuclear weapons will erupt into an all-out nuclear exchange.<sup>8</sup> This is the firm view of American academic and even military circles not linked directly to the Reagan Administration. "Little seems to me more dangerous," says Arthur Schlesinger Jr., "than the current fantasy of controlled and graduated nuclear war, with generals calibrating nuclear escalation like grand masters at the chessboard. Let us not be bamboozled by models. Once the nuclear threshold is breached, the game is over."<sup>9</sup>

Under nuclear parity, leading military experts and academics point out, the use of nuclear weapons by the USA would inevitably spell out its own destruction. "The USSR," writes the former Secretary of Defence Robert S. McNamara, "is obviously prepared to respond if NATO chooses to initiate nuclear war."<sup>10</sup> Amplifying these words in an interview with Newsweek, he said: "...If NATO initiated the use of nuclear weapons, it would almost surely lead to the destruction of Western civilisation."<sup>11</sup>

---

Cont'd footnote 7 (p. 6)

Director of the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency from 1977 to 1981; Panofsky served for a number of years as White House consultant on science and disarmament.

<sup>8</sup> Foreign Affairs, Winter 1983/1984, p. 261.

<sup>9</sup> Albert Schlesinger Jr., op.cit., p. 11.

<sup>10</sup> Robert S. McNamara, "The Military Role of Nuclear Weapons: Perceptions and Misperceptions", Foreign Affairs, Fall 1983, p.67.

<sup>11</sup> Newsweek, December 5, 1983, p. 17.



Scientific data is piling up to show that a nuclear war would result not only in colossal loss of life and destruction but also in a climatic catastrophe imperilling the conditions for biological life on earth. This was the conclusion drawn at the Post-Nuclear-War World Conference held in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in April 1983. It attracted nearly 100 people from the US academic world. Because of this conference's wide ramifications, Foreign Affairs invited the eminent astrophysicist Carl Sagan to comment on these ramifications. In this comment Sagan stresses that a massive nuclear strike would be tantamount to suicide for the attacker even if he were not subjected to a retaliatory strike: the irreversible changes in the climate, the biosphere, and the environment would not let him survive.<sup>12</sup>

A strong impression was made in and outside the USA by an article written for Foreign Affairs jointly by four persons who have held high posts in the US government--McGeorge Bundy, George F. Kennan, Robert S. McNamara, and Gerard Smith. In this article, which incurred the cold displeasure of Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger, they demonstrated the unacceptability of the first-strike doctrine and urged the government to undertake a "no-first-use" commitment.<sup>13</sup>

While they are opposed to the Reagan Administration putting its stake mainly on nuclear weapons, McNamara and like-minded

---

<sup>12</sup> Carl Sagan, "Nuclear War and Climatic Catastrophe: Some Policy Implications", Foreign Affairs, Winter 1983/1984, pp. 276, 292.

<sup>13</sup> McGeorge Bundy, George F. Kennan, Robert S. McNamara, Gerard Smith, "Nuclear Weapons and the Atlantic Alliance", Foreign Affairs, Spring 1982.



people urge a substantial buildup of conventional weapons. What they want is not so much a reduction as a redistribution of the military budget. Further, these critics of the Administration are suggesting not the renunciation of nuclear weapons as such but the renunciation of the approach to them as a means of warfare.<sup>14</sup> They contrast the Pentagon's present military doctrine to the doctrines of previous Administrations. There is a big difference between them, of course. But it should also be realised that the doctrine of a first strike and a winnable nuclear war did not appear overnight. It is the product of the USA's undeviating post-war line towards improving mass destruction, chiefly nuclear, weapons. It is well known that US imperialism had counted on using them under certain conditions. Professor George F. Kennan, who is one of the most experienced foreign policy experts in the USA, said: "But we must remember that it has been we Americans who, at almost every step of the road, have taken the lead in the development of this sort of weaponry. It was we who first produced and tested such a device; we who were the first to raise its destructiveness to a new level with the hydrogen bomb; we who introduced the multiple warhead; we who have declined every proposal for the renunciation of the principle of 'first use'; and we alone ... who have used the weapon in anger against others."<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Robert S. McNamara, op.cit., p. 272.

<sup>15</sup> George F. Kennan, The Nuclear Delusion. Soviet-American Relations in the Atomic Age, New York, 1982, pp. 177-178.



What, in the long run, has this policy brought its initiators? More security, as Reagan argues? No way. Besides, considerations of security have not guided those who ever since the nuclear weapon was developed have used it as the principal lever for blackmailing and pressuring the Soviet Union, planned the nuclear bombardment of Soviet cities, and are now once again running around with the lunatic idea of "prevailing" over socialism. But instead of "decisive superiority" over the socialist community all they have achieved is a higher level of strategic confrontation. By beginning the deployment of first-strike weapons in West European countries and forcing the USSR and its allies to take counter-measures, the Reagan Administration has brought the world--and the United States itself--dramatically closer to the deadly threshold.

The USA's present policy is a model of what policy should not be like in the nuclear age. International tension inflamed by the USA has now brought into sharper focus than ever before the need for realism and common sense in the approach to American-Soviet relations and the importance of cooperation between the USA and the USSR to prevent another world war.

Elements of such realism are to be found in some of the articles in Foreign Affairs. Republican Senator Charles Mathias Jr., whom I have already mentioned, urges the US Administration to stop its attempts to deal with the USSR by means of "megaphone diplomacy" (i.e., intimidation and threats) and lay the foundations for understanding in areas where this is possible. He feels that the USA bears the responsibility for the tension in its relations



with the Soviet Union. He writes that "the particular barriers we would have to lower are largely ones that we raised ourselves... Thus, the first gestures would have to be unilateral American ones."<sup>16</sup>

Professor of the University of Ohio John L. Gaddis, who has written several books on foreign policy, notes that it is in the interests of the USA to achieve constructive results in disarmament and that it should ratify SALT-2, resume the talks on a total ban on nuclear tests, and begin reducing both <sup>medium-range</sup> / and tactical nuclear <sup>weapons</sup> / in Europe.<sup>17</sup>

Also indicative is that in calling for a restructuring of relations with the USSR, spokesmen of circles opposed to Reagan hold that it is necessary to refute his "Soviet threat" myth-- the attribution to the Soviet Union of an aspiration for strategic superiority and an intention to start a war against the USA. Robert H. Johnson, Resident Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, writes that these are purely American inventions used to justify the rapid buildup of the USA's military capability. By reducing the Soviet aims to an imagined drive for military superiority, he says, the White House and the forces behind it "project upon the Russians a way of thinking that is characteristic of American foreign policy" since it is the Americans who "tend to equate power with military capabilities".<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Charles Mathias Jr., op.cit., p. 1025.

<sup>17</sup> John L. Gaddis, "The Rise, Fall and Future of Detente", Foreign Affairs, Winter 1983/1984, p. 370.

<sup>18</sup> Robert H. Johnson, "Periods of Peril. The Window of Vulnerability and Other Myths", Foreign Affairs, Spring 1983, pp. 950, 968.



Of course, those contributors who castigate the outrageous distortions of Soviet aims and intentions are likewise far from any radical reconsideration of the "Soviet threat" myth. What they want is the abandonment of no more than the extreme form of the Sovietophobia that is used as the ideological basis for the Reagan Administration's course towards confrontation with the USSR.

American messianism, the USA's pretensions to unchallenged leadership, the simplistic vision of the world where the Soviet Union is seen as the enemy in everything and in all cases, and the proclamation of military response as the most effective way of resolving foreign policy problems irritate and vex even those ruling circles of NATO countries that on the whole follow in the wake of the Reagan line. Stanley Hoffman, Chairman of Harvard University's Centre for European Studies, writes in this connection: "Europeans ... worry about the US tendency to give everywhere priority to the Soviet threat... They worry about the Administration's apparent belief that no dialogue with Moscow is possible unless the Soviets accept American notions of restraint... They worry about what they see as an American nostalgia for the 1950s, for the era of American nuclear superiority ... and unquestioned American leadership."<sup>19</sup>

Reagan's "crusade" against socialism is founded on total misconceptions about the Soviet Union's economic potential and the

---

<sup>19</sup> Stanley Hoffman, "NATO and Nuclear Weapons: Reason and Unreason", Foreign Affairs, Winter 1981/1982, p. 342.



trends of its socio-political development. This view is being accepted by a growing body of American foreign policy experts, including leading Sovietologists.

The feeling of many of them is summed up in an article headed "Reagan and Russia" contributed by Seweryn Bialer, Director of Columbia University's Research Institute on International Change, and Professor Joan Afferica. They write that the US Administration's principal objectives "to effect a gradual transformation or a collapse of the Soviet system of government" and change the direction of Soviet foreign policy are fallacious, "maximalist, and unrealistic". The Soviet Union, they point out, has enormous unused reserves of political and social stability that suffice to endure the deepest difficulties".<sup>20</sup>

A similar view is offered by John L. Gaddis. After three years of Reagan's tenure in the White House, he writes, "there seems to prevail in the higher circles of this Administration the belief that if only we 'stay the course' on defence spending, we can ultimately force the Russians to bankrupt their economy in the effort to keep up. If the historical record is any guide, we should be wary of this vulture-like argument: predictions of a Soviet economic collapse have been circulating since 1917 and it has not happened yet."<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Seweryn Bialer, Joan Afferica, "Reagan and Russia", Foreign Affairs, Winter 1982/1983, pp. 262-263.

<sup>21</sup> John L. Gaddis, op.cit., p. 368.



The US Administration's prognostications are debunked also by a large group of American experts, who compiled a two-volume survey of the Soviet economy for the beginning of the 1980s on assignment from the Congressional Joint Economic Committee.<sup>22</sup>

What is the point of departure of the US leaders in their course towards "exhausting" the Soviet Union? Actually, the stereotypes of anti-Soviet propaganda that fit into the ideological prejudices of Reagan and his aides, but these do not stand the test of reality. A compelling illustration of this is the failure of Reagan's sanctions relative to the trans-European gas pipeline. In the summer of 1983 the Office of Technology Assessment of the US Congress presented a special report stating that the White House's interdictions and restrictions on trade with the USSR had not significantly affected its economic and technological development. It confirmed the opinion of those who had from the outset believed that the "economic war" would rather foster a deterioration of relations between the USA and its West European allies than a debilitation of the Soviet system.

This look at the journal Foreign Affairs shows that a large body of opinion within the US Establishment is worried about the foreign policy currently pursued by Washington. This anxiety is seen in the sharp criticism of the Administration in the media, in the growth of opposition in the Senate and House of

---

<sup>22</sup> Soviet Economy in the 1980s: Problems and Prospects,  
US Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1982.



Representatives to the gigantic military budget, and in the nuclear freeze movement that involves very large sections of American society.

True, official Washington propaganda has lately been trying to create the impression that Reagan has moderated his tone, that he has reconsidered some of his attitudes, and is prepared to move towards normalising relations with the USSR. However, if a judgment is made on the basis of what the White House does rather than of what it says, it is that Reagan's "peaceableness" and his statements about wanting peace are nothing more than a political, situation ploy designed to calm American public opinion in an election year. The USA continues to inflame international tension, refuses to modify its unrealistic approach to arms limitation and reduction, and goes on with its preparations for war.

The White House and the Pentagon are doing everything to speed up the mammoth strategic programme for the 1980s. MX inter-continental ballistic missiles, designed to destroy Soviet strategic installations, are to be deployed in a number of states beginning in 1986. It is planned to allocate an astronomical sum of nearly 27 billion dollars in 1985-1989 for the development of an anti-missile system in outer space to safeguard the USA against a retaliatory strike in a nuclear war.<sup>23</sup> The development of a "third generation of weapons" is in full swing at the Pentagon's research centres: these are based on the release of

---

<sup>23</sup> International Herald Tribune, October 19, 1983.



directed energy rays. The physicist Edward Teller, called the "father" of the US hydrogen bomb, says that by comparison the present armaments would be mere toys. The Administration has already intimated that if Reagan is returned as President 2,000 billion dollars would be spent on the USA's further military buildup in the period up to the end of the current decade.<sup>24</sup>

Thus, all the signs are that imperialism's most bellicose circles have no intention whatever of surrendering their positions. But it is also true that at every turn the Reagan policies are coming into conflict with the realities of international life. The critique of the present Washington strategy in Foreign Affairs is a further illustration of the untenability and futility of a policy based on bellicose anti-Sovietism, an unbridled arms race, and confrontation with existing socialism.

Alex Ason

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., February 4-5, 1984.



Wednesday, November 14, 1984

ORIO70-3233

4

HYPOCRISY OF US JUSTICE

S. Vishnevsky

In a commentary on the hounding of activists and supporters of the anti-war movement in the United States, this writer says: While Washington keeps up its protestations of peace, the limbs of the law are seizing peaceful demonstrators not very far from the White House and dumping them into police vans. They arrested about two hundred in October alone. Such acts of violence against those involved in anti-war activities take place almost every day in various states.

For quite a long time peace activists in the US have been labelled as "Reds" and "agents of Moscow". That witchhunt did not work. Nor did the authorities manage to tag this kind of label on famous scientists, doctors, lawyers, catholic clergymen and bourgeois public figures. That was when the machinery of repression was set in motion.

Thousands of members of the anti-war movement have been subjected to cruel repression. Whole groups of peace activists have been sentenced to imprisonment. The Orlando Eight, who dared to participate in a peace demonstration, will have to serve three years in a Florida jail.

Soven anti-war protestors in Syracuse, New York, have been put behind the bars for two or three years, the commentator goes on to say. Four members of the "Friends of Peace Without Violence", who had carried anti-militarist slogans near the Grand Forks air base, North Dakota, are also in jail, as are three citizens of the State of Washington who have said "No" to the arms build-up. The news of the hour: 26 demonstrators have been put in the dock at Berlington, Vermont.



Wednesday, November 14, 1984

- 2 -

4

American justice is acting with the hypocrisy that is typical of it. US legislation has no provision about "action for peace being punishable under the Penal Code." So it rubberstamps sentences on false charges of a "breach of order", "encroachment on property" and even ... "terrorism". It is FBI informers and stooges that often appear as perjurers.

Many American citizens, the commentator writes in conclusion, are outraged at the resurgence of McCarthyism. Preparations are under way for a week of action from December 8 to 15 against the ruthless suppression of human rights by the US authorities. An outcry is resounding everywhere: Freedom for America's Political Prisoners!

(Pravda, November 14. Summary.)



AFTER THE ELECTIONS IN THE USA

In his analysis of the returns of the elections in the USA Andrei Tolkunov, a correspondent of the newspaper Pravda in New York, writes among other things:

As local observers point out, one of the things that brought about the Reagan-Bush victory is the fact that the Republicans have from the very outset appeared united and monolithic in their struggle against the Democrats. As far as the Democrats are concerned, in the course of several months of the primary elections before the convention in San Francisco in July, Walter Mondale was not the only one to run for the Presidency from the Democratic Party. The Presidential hopefuls from among the Democratic Party included also Gary Hart, a senator from Colorado, and Jesse Jackson, a black American public figure, and at the first stage there were several more Presidential candidates. The Republicans were delighted to see the squabbling between these candidates, and then quite often mentioned the statements by the same Hart and Jackson who had described Mondale as a weak leader incapable of settling the problems the country is faced with.

"Indisputably, the fact that Ronald Reagan, who 'looked well' from the television screen, was conducting his election campaign on the wave of jingoism, on speculating on the subject of 'economic recovery' (credit for which belongs, as a matter of fact, not to 'reaganomics', but to the cyclic character of capitalist production), also contributed to his victory. Presenting himself as a President with a firm and determined stance on international issues, Reagan succeeded in winning the support of many "average" Americans. If one takes into account the millions of dollars granted for the Reagan-Bush Presidential race by the major monopolies, arms manufacturing and aerospace concerns things become clear as day.

A factor of no small significance for the victory of the Republicans in the Presidential elections has also been the fact that, having realised how America was intimidated by the Washington



THE USSR STANDS FOR BETTER SOVIET-AMERICAN  
RELATIONS

Vladimir Katin, APN political analyst

The election of Ronald Reagan as US President for the second term puts to the fore the problem of the prospects for Soviet-American relations and the improvement of the international situation at large. Shortly before the presidential elections in the United States Soviet leader Konstantin Chernenko stated: "We stand for good relations with the USA, and experience shows that they can be such."

This statement sets forth Moscow's principled programme. Yes, the Soviet Union will continue to strive for the rectification of its relations with the United States. Yes, Moscow thinks that a turn for the better in Soviet-American relations is possible. Washington should understand that a mutual wish to build inter-state relations on an equal footing is necessary for this, and not the chimerical desire to gain a military superiority over the Soviet Union.

The American electors who voted for Reagan gave him a mandate for conducting a foreign policy, for dealing with the Soviet Union. The sentiments of the American people, the statements by political figures, businessmen, scientists and clergymen in the course of the election campaign convincingly show that the overwhelming majority of American voters are against the continuation of the dangerous militarist course of their administration, against the preservation of tensions in Soviet-American relations. Most of Americans voted, proceeding from the statements in favour of peace, from the promises to start negotiations with the Soviet Union on arms control accords,



primarily, nuclear arms control agreements. Such statements and promises were made by Ronald Reagan at the concluding stage of the election campaign.

It is important now that the President and his closest colleagues should satisfy the main demand of Americans and all people on the Earth -- to work for the removal of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, for arms control.

Moscow believes that it is high time to pass over from words to deeds. Words about preparedness for talks, if they are not buttressed by actions, remain only words.

Speaking in the Kremlin on November 7, Soviet leader Konstantin Chernenko noted that the international situation sparks off justifiable alarm and that world tensions are not abated. He said: "Today it is not easy to eliminate this alarm and to relax these tensions. Verbal expressions of peaceful intentions are not enough. Real actions are needed." I think that this appeal is addressed, in the first place, to the United States. The attainment of agreements on a wide range of problems -- from the limitation and reduction of armaments to the prevention of the militarization of outer space -- would mean real change which could improve the international atmosphere on the whole and remove people's concern over this tense situation.

The telegram of greetings sent by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet to Ronald Reagan in connection with his re-election says: "It is to be hoped that the years to come will see a turn for the better in relations between our countries. This would be in the interests of our peoples and in the interests of the cause of peace throughout the world." For its part the Soviet Union is ready to work jointly for the rectification of Soviet-American relations on the basis of equality and respect for the legitimate interests of both countries, for the removal of the threat of war and for the radical improvement



of the world situation.

The Soviet people are convinced that there are no reasonable alternative to the constructive development of Soviet-American relations. We do take into account that the USSR and the USA have different social systems. In our nuclear age these differences do not rule out efforts for achieving mutual understanding. Moreover, they call for this. Such is Moscow's approach to Soviet-American relations.

(APN, November 9. In full.)

THE END

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ



Friday, November 2, 1984

ORI3VO-3151

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL

Valentin Falin, political analyst

US voters are yet to cast their ballots. The presidential and vice-presidential candidates, as well as those who run for the Federal Congress and state governorships and for the offices of sheriffs and judges, are locked in the final round of their electoral tug-of-war. One result is already known, however: the 1984 elections will be the dearest in the nation's history, with a total bill coming up to 1,800 million dollars, or half as much again as four years ago. It is outpaced only by military appropriations, arms prices, and the public debt.

There have been some Acts passed since the Watergate scandal to put a ceiling to the swelling financial ammunition of those competing in the presidential race. Republicans and Democrats are allowed to spend a total of 47.3 million dollars for this race. But is there any law under capitalism that could not be circumvented, naturally, in the name of free enterprise and "true democracy"?

Reagan's re-election campaign opened, as a matter of fact, with four days of festivities just after he had been sworn in as the 40th President of the United States. That feast in Washington cost 88 million dollars. The refurbishing of the White House to suit a "better taste" and exorcize the spirit of Jimmy Carter devoured nearly a million. And so it went on, show after show. Campaign literature was printed in millions of copies. Every week the countless private television and broadcasting stations treated the Americans to presidential speeches which cost some handsome money,



Friday, November 2, 1984

- 2 -

3

too, for one may have to pay up to 250,000 dollars for a minute of appearance in a national ABC programme, for instance. That is to say that the presidential "build-up" is worth millions for all the discounts that the Conservatives award to each other. That is something without precedent as well.

The Democrats have been straining every nerve to keep pace with their rivals, but all of no avail. In the 1982 mid-term elections, the Democratic Party had just a little over one-sixth the money that the Republicans had (29.6 million dollars against 167 million), and today they can hardly boast of faring any better.

With this flood of money in play, one can hardly escape the impression that the hunt for votes, so strenuously carried on by the Republican and Democratic election teams, will be most effective. But that is a deceptive impression, to judge by the previous campaigns. The number of Americans voting with their feet, rather than with their hands, has been rising all through the last decade. The turnout dropped from over 60 per cent in the 1960s to 55.5 per cent in 1972, 54.3 per cent in 1976 and 53.9 per cent in 1980. There were 76 million stay-at-homes in the last presidential elections. Reagan gained office with a plurality of only 42.9 million from the potentially 160.6 million-strong electorate.

One of the reasons behind the "inactivity", above all, of the population groups with the lowest educational standards and income rates is the absence of any actual alternative the rival parties have to offer in dealing with the nation's major social and economic problems since both the Republicans and the Democrats stand for the interests of Big Business. Yet another factor of no minor importance is the artful system of "compulsory registration" of potential voters requiring them, as usual, to take time off from work on Election Day at their own expense, which 80 million Americans living below the "adequate level" find hard to afford. Whether Reagan's anti-people policy will spur the mass of have-nots to action this time or apathy, despair and social depression will prevail, will be clear next weekend.

(Izvestia, November 1. Abridged.)



THE 'MANDATE' OF BIG BUSINESS

The newspaper Sovetskaya Rossia under the headline "The 'Mandate' of Big Business" November 10 carries an article by Gennady Shishkin from New York about the presidential elections in the United States. If one gets to the heart of what actually occurred on November 6, a conclusion can be only one: the triumph was won as is usually the case in America, by big money, and the 'mandate' to Reagan was given not by people but by the selfsame big business.

And it cannot be otherwise under U.S. "democracy", the article says. In order to be elected a congressman, senator or governor, to say nothing of the President, one should spend tremendous sums of money, which few can afford. This year about 2,000 million dollars were spent for the entire election campaign of the President, a third of the Senate, the entire House of Representatives, governors, and Legislatures of a number of states as well as some local government bodies. It is clear that only very rich people and big corporations which are interested in having their own people in the positions of the President, governors, senators and congressmen can afford spending such huge funds, the author points out.

It is for this purpose that the so-called political action committees have been set up in America. They finance the election campaigns of candidates for various state posts. Reagan received 225.4 million dollars from the funds collected by them while Mondale got only 57.3 million dollars.

In other words, Gennady Shishkin sums up, the positions of the President, senators, and congressmen are virtually bought.



The America of the propertied voted for Reagan, the author goes on, whereas Mondale was not supported by the America of the unfortunate to whom he appealed during his election campaign. He was not supported because, even with the most close scrutiny of the election programmes of the two leading bourgeois parties, it is practically impossible for an ordinary person who is burdened with his every-day concerns which are far from being light to find any difference between them. Reagan advocated a "strong America" and so did Mondale. Mondale attacked Reagan for his administration's failing to achieve anything in the arms control field and for spoiling relations with the Soviet Union. And Reagan, too, spoke of a thirst for peace and striving for talks.

No, of course, Reagan did not become a "dove". He simply had to take into account the fact that, according to the latest public opinion polls, 89 per cent of Americans consider that there can be no victor in a nuclear war and 96 per cent of Americans are of the opinion that to go to a further aggravation of relations with the Soviet Union is a dangerous venture.

The peaceable rhetoric earned Reagan votes but did not diminish problems for his future administration. The Americans, in the final analysis, will judge its service record by deeds, not by words. And it is obvious so far that Reagan's White House has no tangible achievements in the field of foreign policy.

In conclusion Gennady Shishkin writes: the power in the country still remains in the hands of the ultrarightist grouping which ignores the interests of millions of ordinary people and has seriously aggravated the international situation. But the Washington administration has brought on a good deal of most acute problems for itself, too, problems connected with the crisis of U.S. capitalism and its imperialist policy. And if they in Washington do not draw lessons from that, the problems will bear heavily on the future administration.

(Sovetskaya Rossia, November 10. Summary.)



# MONOPOLIES BATTEN AT LABOUR'S EXPENSE

Victor Perlo

CC member,  
Chairman, National Economic Commission,  
CPUSA

The US economy is afflicted with three kinds of interacting economic and politico-economic crises: the general crisis of capitalism, the structural crisis and the cyclical crisis of overproduction.

The most important and pervasive is the general crisis of capitalism, the irreversible, mortal crisis of capitalism. This is manifested, most decisively, by the social revolutions that take place in one country after another, where the people take power to eliminate man's exploitation of man and build socialism, a more progressive, just and democratic system. There is also a spread of movements for national liberation.

The most decisive economic feature of the general crisis of capitalism is the systematic gains of socialism in competition with capitalism. Politically the most reactionary centres of world imperialism try to reverse the course of history by destroying, militarily, socialist and other progressive states and movements wherever they emerge--Vietnam, Angola, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Grenada, and Lebanon, among others. The imperialists now threaten to end human life on this planet in a war whose prevention is the most urgent task facing all people everywhere.



### Incurable Disorders

Like the whole capitalist system, the United States is in the grip of a comparatively recent structural crisis, which is a feature of the deepening general crisis and contributes to its severity. The basic components of the structural crisis may never be resolved while capitalism lasts.

Specific features of the structural crisis include a slowdown of overall economic growth in the main centres of world capitalism; the persistence of permanent high-level unemployment through all stages of the business cycle; the drastic weakening of steel, important branches of heavy machine-building and transportation equipment--the very foundation of industrial power--in the United States and most other imperialist countries. This is accompanied by a noticeable deterioration of the infrastructure. There is also a military distortion of the economy. Huge government budget deficits have developed in all the major capitalist countries, and even more extreme deficits in many developing countries. A downward trend in real wages and mass living standards appears to be long term.

Along with this, a veritable explosion of monopoly profits, partly masked through a variety of devices, has occurred in the United States. There is a permanent and rapid growth of inflation and usurious interest rates. A parasitic superstructure of finance, advertising, speculation, gambling, drugs and crime, corporate bureaucracies, wealthy coupon clippers, and an uncontrolled "underground economy" have been proliferating.

Uneven economic development of various countries, and expansion in international economic relations have run in ways



that intensify instability. The surging growth of transnational financial, industrial, corporate and billionaire power, which is beyond the control of governments or international agencies, results in even greater instability and unpredictability of prices, currency values, trade. Currency transactions at the New York banks reach a trillion dollars (i.e., a million million dollars) a week, dwarfing real economic transactions. We are witnessing the end of any stable system of international currency exchanges; the emergence of systematic huge trade and payment imbalances; and massive, unpayable debts of Third World countries to the imperialist money centres, banks and governments. There is an accelerating transfer of major lines of production from the United States and other developed countries to Third World countries, mainly to those that are occupied by the United States or are under US military domination. This is exerted directly by the transnationals, and by compradore, locally-owned companies. As a result, the runaway industries benefit by a 90 per cent or more reduction in wages, a differential outside of all manageable bounds that has a grossly destabilising and often catastrophic impact on the working class of imperialist countries, and leads to repression of the new proletariat of the developing countries.

Some of these features have been in evidence during particular structural crises in earlier periods. However, this structural crisis is unique in its complexity and severity.



### From Crisis to Crisis

World capitalism is in the process of an uneven and uncertain recovery from the latest cyclical crisis of overproduction. The recovery is definite in the United States and Japan, but production is still depressed in Western Europe, while large parts of Latin America and some Asian countries remain in the very depths of depression.

This latest crisis of overproduction, lasting in the United States for three years--from 1980 to 1982--was the most serious since World War II. As with the previous cycle of the mid-1970s, it was roughly coincident throughout the capitalist world in its crisis and depression phases. During this last crisis, the separate contradictions came together in acute forms, marking the emergence of the long-term structural crisis.

The dynamics of the business cycle are indeed complicated. But we must not forget this fundamental, summary formulation of Marx's: "The ultimate reason for all real crises always remains the poverty and restricted consumption of the masses as opposed to the drive of capitalist production to develop the productive forces as though only the absolute consuming power of society constituted their limit."<sup>1</sup> Thus, in the United States, the doubled rate of exploitation of labour in the last three decades and the increased deprivation of the working class tend to make successive crises more frequent and severe, and recoveries and economic growth more restricted in time and extent.

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. III, New York, 1967, p. 484.



During the 1950s and 1960s, bourgeois economists largely dismissed from consideration crises of overproduction that were less serious. They even developed the theory that the business cycle had essentially been solved through state and inter-monopoly regulation, to be replaced with minor fluctuations, "recessions"--a term they still use, but without its former optimistic flavour.

The capitalist class has lost confidence in the stability of its economic system. Its economists debate not whether there will be another crisis, but when it will come, and whether it may not be even more serious than the last. Their consensus is that the next crisis will break out in late 1985, that is, long before many capitalist countries will have completely recovered from the last crisis, so that the working class in the United States and most other capitalist countries would be in a worse situation than at the outbreak of the 1980-1982 crisis.

But capitalist anarchy--the influence of powerful political events, such as wars and revolutions, and/or far-reaching financial catastrophes--can greatly influence the course of cyclical developments, advancing or delaying the onset of any particular crisis.

#### Offensive Against the Working Class

The past dozen years have seen the most prolonged, far-reaching deterioration in conditions of the US working class in its long history. The fundamental basis for this is the extremely rapid, unprecedented increase in the rate of exploitation of labour, or surplus-value, in US manufacturing over the past three decades.



In 1953, the 148 per cent rate of surplus-value,<sup>2</sup> while considerably higher than it was in Marx's time, was at about the average level for the period since World War I. Thereafter it "took off", increasing virtually year by year to reach the rate of 290 per cent for 1980. From other data, however, there is little doubt that the rate of surplus-value has increased further, and rather rapidly, in the years since 1981. Labour's share in the values created, which was more than two-fifths in 1953, is now down to an exceptionally low one-fourth.

For some time, due to the rapid increase in labour productivity, the rise in the rate of exploitation of labour was accompanied by a modest rise in average real wages. The peak in officially calculated real wages was in 1972. By 1983, average real wages of production workers in the private economy had declined by about 14 per cent.

However, due to the increase in unemployment, the overall condition of the working class has deteriorated by more than the decline in real wages of employed workers, especially under the Reagan Administration. The average rate of unemployment increased from 3.9 per cent in 1966-1970 to 6.1 per cent in 1971-1975, 6.8 per cent in 1976-1980, and 9.0 per cent in 1981-1983. According to US Labour Department estimates, about 50 per cent can be added to the number of unemployed to allow for so-called "discouraged workers"<sup>3</sup> and some of the workers involuntarily put

<sup>2</sup> Rate of surplus-value equals  $100 \times \text{surplus-value} \div \text{wages}$ .

<sup>3</sup> Those who lost their jobs long ago and are vainly trying to find one, but are no longer on the official register.--Ed.



on part time. Thus, allowing for this minimum undercounting, there were approximately 16 million workers, comprising 14 per cent of the working class, who were actually unemployed in 1983.

The cyclical recovery has reduced officially counted unemployment by only about 3 million, leaving it higher than in most post-war crisis and depression periods. The surge of unemployment in Western Europe was even sharper in this last crisis, and has remained at its peak.

How the hard-won gains of the US working class are being lost is dramatically revealed by the rapid elimination of unemployment insurance protection. While 54 per cent of unemployed workers received unemployment insurance in the crisis year of 1958, 43 per cent so benefited in the crisis year of 1975, and the proportion dropped to 33 per cent in 1982 and 27 per cent in 1983, falling further to 23 per cent in the fourth quarter of last year. And those workers who receive unemployment insurance get a fraction--considerably less than half--of their regular wages. In this respect, US workers fare far worse than West European workers.

Under Reagan, all other forms of relief for unemployed and otherwise poverty-stricken workers, such as food stamps and aid to dependent children, have also been slashed.

The number of persons with incomes under the official poverty level gradually declined during World War II and for some time thereafter, until "only" 25 million were so classified in 1968. In the following decade, there was no further drop, and the number soared thereafter, reaching 34.4 million in 1982.



Undoubtedly, there has subsequently been a further rise. More realistic counting would show that nearly a quarter of the US population lives in poverty.

The deterioration in conditions of Afro-American workers has been especially serious. There has been an increase in discrimination all along the line, overtly encouraged by Reagan and his Administration. By 1982-83, the Afro-American unemployment rate was 2.5-3 times that for white workers, reaching, for instance, 24 per cent in Cleveland, 26 per cent in Pittsburgh and Chicago, and 34 per cent in Detroit.

The ratio of Afro-American to white family income--61 per cent in 1970--was down to 55 per cent in 1982, and the actual relative loss was even greater if the change in method of calculation by the Census Bureau is taken into account. The percentage of Afro-Americans living in poverty was three times that of whites.

In the 1960s and early 1970s, the militant civil rights struggles of the Afro-American people--with the support of major sections of the trade union movement--achieved significant legal and practical gains in employment, and in eliminating the most brutal apartheid practices. However, the Reagan Administration launched a head-on offensive against the affirmative action programmes that are the heart of the civil rights gains. He has, in effect, given employers an open invitation to discriminate, and landlords to segregate. They have taken advantage of it.

During this period, there has also been a major offensive by capital against the labour unions, the main organisations of the working class. The offensive has been most conspicuous in the



basic industries, where employers have used various tactics, such as plant shutdowns, concentration of declining production in non-union areas and in foreign countries; robotisation; incitement of divisions among workers on the basis of race, immigrant status, male supremacy, etc.

The percentage of wage-workers in trade unions fell from 35.5 per cent at the end of World War II to 27.4 per cent in 1970 and 22 per cent in 1980. The most dramatic drop was in material production (mining, construction, manufacturing) and transport and the utilities, where union membership declined from 15.4 million, or 55 per cent of employment, in 1970, to 11.6 million, or 38 per cent of employment, in 1980. Let us recall that at the peak, about 70 per cent of all production workers in industry were members of unions. This sharp drop is a serious blow to the entire working class and is not compensated by a slow rise in the percentage of service industry workers organised into unions.

#### Benefits to the Monopolies

The rapid increase in the rate of exploitation of labour in the United States and the mounting plunder of developing countries--through direct investments and through usurious interest on loans--have yielded unprecedented profits for the monopolies.

Examples of the extremely high rates of profit of major monopolies early in this century were given by Lenin in Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism.<sup>4</sup> These rates have now been sur-

<sup>4</sup> See, V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 22, pp. 207-208, 232-236.



passed by the leading US monopolies. But it is not enough to consider so-called net income after taxes, which has increased rapidly both in amount and as a percentage of equity capital. In conditions of the deepening general crisis, increased shares of surplus-value--gross profit--are going to finance capital in the form of interest; to the major billionaires in the form of profits of control, huge executive salaries, expense accounts, stock market profiteering; to promoters, lawyers, advertisers, etc.

Thus, in 1983, Exxon, which reported a "net income after taxes" of \$5 billion, reported a "gross profit" of \$32.8 billion, or 90.4 per cent of total invested capital of \$36.2 billion. And IBM, which reported a net income after taxes of \$5.5 billion, reported a gross profit of \$23.8 billion, or 73.6 per cent of its total capital of \$32.3 billion. Preliminary indications are that the gross profit of all corporations and unincorporated capitalists in 1983 approximated \$1.7 trillion, or half the gross national product. By contrast, total wage and salary disbursements in the private sector were only \$1.3 trillion, including the salaries taken by corporate executives and managers.

This gross imbalance in the national economy leads to greater extremes than ever of exorbitant wealth, at one pole, and mass poverty and hunger at the other. It accounts for the slow growth of the overall economy and for the increasing gravity of cyclical crises. It stimulates the mushroom growth of the variety of parasitic, speculative, gambling and criminal activities, as well as--most destructive of all--the militarisation of the economy.



In 1982, a crisis hit the international credit system of imperialism. In the last decade, some 40 countries have built up huge debts to imperialist private banks and the US-dominated International Monetary Fund (IMF). These debts cannot possibly be repaid through the ordinary sale of goods by the developing states to the capitalist countries. Most of the loans did not help develop Third World economies: the funds went to pay transnational oil companies multiplied prices; they temporarily absorbed the cost of the "price scissors" against the goods and resources of the debtor countries. Tens of billions were appropriated by Latin American (and African and Asian) dictators, capitalist generals and politicians. But even more damaging was the \$100 billion in interest paid by the Third World, and the direct investment profits garnered by the transnationals. By 1984, the mass revolts in several Latin American countries and the Philippines were a reflection of their peoples' unwillingness to bend to the dictates of the banks and Washington.

The imperialist states have been using the IMF to divide and rule separately each of the developing nations, but the progressive forces in the Third World are urging joint resistance, mutual cooperation and stronger relations with the socialist world to enable their countries to resume economic growth, raise living standards and achieve independence from neocolonialist rule.

At the risk of provoking a nuclear war, the US imperialists are trying to weaken and defeat the resistance forces by military intervention in several Central American and Caribbean countries.



But their neocolonialist plunder of the Third World cannot continue indefinitely. The financial crisis of international indebtedness is bound to end in large-scale repudiation or write-downs and drastically reduced interest payments, transferring the financial crisis to Wall Street and the money centres of Western Europe and Japan.

The timing and severity of this next stage of the crisis will, essentially, be determined by the development of mass struggles by the working class and its allies in the debtor countries, and the degree to which these struggles are united and take revolutionary, consistently anti-imperialist forms.

#### Two Ways of Development

The world capitalist system is unable to sustain the economic, social and political competition with socialism. Both the United States and the USSR have, of course, had problems in recent years. But the problems are different in character and in order of magnitude. The US problems are those of decline and decay; the Soviet problems are those of growth, problems inescapable in a society in transition from an industrialised, modern socialist society to the more complex, advanced socialist system that will achieve the highest living standards in the world. Difficulties in the socialist world are being overcome, and the pace of economic growth is once again picking up. There are rapid gains and improved coordination among the CMEA nations.

With their planned economy and the mass participation of their people, they can cope with any problems without harming the interests of the working people.



Militarisation is doing the people of the United States a lot of harm and is depressing their living standards. Reaganism is the most dangerous militaristic trend of imperialist policy since nazism and, like it, has an unlimited appetite for world domination. But the agents of monopoly capital are unable and unwilling to evaluate correctly the balance of forces in the world. The reality is that in the early 1980s the US economy has fared worse than under any other US Administration since World War II, and worse than the average--by every major economic indicator, except big business profits. Meanwhile the advance of socialism in the competition with capitalism has reached a qualitatively new stage.

The USSR, although still below the USA in total industrial production and national income, has surpassed the United States in those basic industries that provide the sinews of future growth and power. The last year in which the United States produced more steel than the Soviet Union was 1973. Between 1973 and 1983, US steel production declined 43 per cent, while Soviet steel output increased 16 per cent, reaching 153 million metric tons in 1983, almost double the US output.

The peaceful gains of socialism also strengthen the peace forces in the capitalist world by emphasising the losses suffered by working people in capitalist countries as a result of the policy of the militaristic circles. Even though consciousness of the advantages of socialism is much less developed in the United States, the working class, including the main trade unions, are now coming out strongly for a switch from military spending to social spending, for restoring the slashes put over by the Reaganites.



The struggle for peace, combined with the struggle for a policy that will meet the vital needs of the working class, is best formulated in the programme of the Communist Party of the United States. It calls for halving the military budget, for withdrawal from foreign bases, for a no-first-strike policy, for a nuclear freeze and rapid disarmament.

The CPUSA's programme is formulated to meet the basic needs of the people: rebuilding the infrastructure, providing health and educational services, erecting affordable, good-quality housing for the tens of millions who are poorly housed and homeless; providing 15 million jobs and ending large-scale unemployment through government programmes and by effecting a six-hour workday with no reduction in pay plus a national programme of jobs for youth; opening up trade with socialist countries, which would bring about, along with other measures, the revival of basic industries as well as advance the cause of peace; ending the gross discrimination against Afro-Americans, Hispanics and women, and the plunder of Third World countries, and assisting them to develop on the basis of economic independence; nationalising banks and basic industries to end the domination of finance capital over the life of the country; shifting the tax burden from labour to capital, and freezing and rolling back monopoly prices.

For the US working class, still suffering from near-depression conditions, the prospect of an early new crisis poses a serious danger, which can be warded off only by action powerful and united enough to improve labour's situation regardless of the stage of the business cycle.



Friday, June 27, 1986

9

02MI2-860626-86

### NEWS AND VIEWS

The recent session of the NATO Council in Halifax and then the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee Summit in Budapest made statements on intentions of each of the sides, writes Vladimir Katin, Novosti political analyst. Actually in both cases the meaning of the existence of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty was substantiated and their military doctrines were set forth.

The socialist countries of the Warsaw Treaty reaffirmed the exclusively defensive character of their military doctrine. The NATO countries also spoke about defence. If no one is going to attack, what then breeds suspicions and concern?

NATO was set up in 1949. At first this was an organization of 12 countries which claimed that they established it for self-defence and that it was open to other countries. But not to all, as it turned out. The USSR applied for membership, but was denied entrance. Why? Because NATO founders meant not defence in general, but "containment" of the "potential adversary" and regarded "containment" not in its direct narrow sense but in the broad sense called "roll-back" by Harry Truman.

"Roll-back" and defence, "brinkmanship" and peaceableness are contradictory combinations. And these were not just combinations of words. Under the "containment" and "roll-back" doctrines the United States brought nuclear weapons to Europe, then deployed missiles and nuclear-powered submarines there and sometimes threatened to use them for dealing preventive strikes.

In the face of the growing threats East European socialist countries established as a counterbalance their own military-political alliance -- the Warsaw Treaty Organization.



This happened only in 1955 as a forced counter-step prompted by the striving to ensure security and to maintain stable peace in Europe.

The establishment of the Warsaw Treaty Organization complicated NATO's activities, but, as facts show, did not compel NATO leaders to abandon attempts to reach -- by hook or by crook -- military superiority. The "massive retaliation" doctrine was replaced by "flexible response" with the aim unchanged -- to provide prerequisites for pursuing a US policy from "the positions of strength", of pressure and suppression, if needed, a policy in which the United States would have an opportunity to choose the means, directions and time for the main strikes.

The invariability of aims predetermines the invariably negative response to all proposals by the socialist countries on simultaneous disbandment of the two military alliances or, at least, their military setups. NATO countries class these proposals as aggressiveness and malicious intent because they are not prepared for such a radical step.

The leaders of the socialist countries call for the gradual rise in the level of confidence-building measures in the military sphere and for reductions in the armed forces and conventional armaments. They also made a proposal to conclude a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force, including nuclear force. According to the latest PCC proposal tactical nuclear weapons with a range of up to 1,000 km are subject to reductions along with conventional armaments. The proposed zone of reductions covers the whole of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

It is suggested that the cut-back of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe be done according to agreed schedules, and with a constant military balance observed at lower levels, so that no one's security is impaired. Alongside



Friday, June 27, 1986

9

- 3 -

formations and units, their complement of armaments, including nuclear weapon systems, would also be reduced.

A lump mutual reduction in the numerical troop strength in both military alliances by 100,000-150,000 within one or two years is proposed as an initial step. Reduction in the tactical strike aviation would be of much importance as part of this step. Immediately after that, the Warsaw Treaty is prepared for further considerable cut-backs, as a result of which, given reciprocity of NATO, the land forces and the tactical strike aviation of both alliances in Europe would be reduced in the early 1990s approximately 25 per cent on their present level, i.e. over half a million troops from each side. The armed forces of the opposing groups in Europe would thus be reduced by over million.

\* \* \*

The Congress of the Socialist International in Lima adopted the Manifesto of Lima, which contains an appeal to the US and the USSR to act in accordance with their statements in which both powers expressed readiness to abolish their nuclear arsenals writes Yury Gvozdev, APN political analyst. The Socialist International demands that research on anti-satellite and anti-missile weapon systems be banned, the ABM Treaty of 1972 retained, and militarisation of space prevented. The USSR works persistently and energetically against militarisation of near-Earth space and has recently submitted to the UN a comprehensive programme for cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space. And the US is openly advocating a Star Wars course, making NATO allies join in its designs.

The Lima Manifesto directly urges the US to abandon its negative attitude to the total prohibition of tests. This is tantamount to partial acknowledgement of the far from "equal responsibility of the two super-powers" for the arms race.



Friday, August 3, 1984

ORI4VO-2220

4

A NEW ROLE FOR A BRITISH LORD

Vikenti Matveyev

A member of the British aristocracy, Lord Carrington, has assumed the post of the NATO Secretary General. He has been in the upper chamber of the British Parliament since the age of 19. He has served as the First Lord of the Admiralty, defence and foreign secretary. One of the Western papers has characterized him as a typical British diplomat, combining pragmatism, easy manners and the sense of humour.

The problem is whether he will need these personal qualities in his new position of the NATO Secretary General where any, and far less constructive, diplomacy is totally out of place and where the militarist spirit carefully maintained and cultivated by American brass-hats is all-pervading. But then this must be a personal concern of Lord Carrington himself. Anyway, his biography clearly shows that the military sphere has always been more attractive for him than the civilian, and so in his very first statements he makes it clear that he will attend to his new responsibilities as best he can.

These statements now require special attention since they provide ample food for thought.

To begin with, let us examine Lord Carrington's attitude to the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe. In an interview to the Paris newspaper Le Figaro Lord Carrington sort of waves these missiles away, denying that they are a serious source of tension in Europe. "The Euromissiles", he claims, "have become a symbol which some people are exploiting in order to portray NATO as a military organization, forgetting about the political aspects of its activities."

This certainly sounds strange. Could this mean that the new NATO Secretary General intends to convince the public that NATO



- 2 -

has ceased to be a military organization? And is it out of his sense of humour that he calls the first-strike missile systems installed in combat positions in Western Europe by the US military "symbolic"? Maybe, to improve the situation on the continent, he will suggest doing without such a "symbol"? No, he certainly won't.

Having assumed his new post, the British lord speaks up for the strict observance of the schedule for the deployment of new American missiles and opines that "the most serious problem is over" -- meaning the opposition of the West European public to these plans.

As noted in the above interview, in the past six months 40 American missiles have been deployed in Western Europe. According to Carrington, the whole plan is scheduled for five years. The success with the deployment of the first forty missiles has apparently put the NATO Secretary General in a beatific mood. But there is no way to say the same about the mood of the general public in the West. This year, anti-missile manifestations in the FRG, Britain, Italy, Holland and Belgium were even more impressive and massive than before. Lord Carrington of all people must know what has happened in the tent camp at Greenham Common near London. Police have used brute force to disperse the anti-war pickets and have arrested dozens of women for participating in those pickets. The repressions against peace activists in Britain, the FRG and other NATO countries continue unabated.

Apropos, Lord Carrington's statement in the above mentioned interview with Le Figaro proves to the broad sections of the public how contradictory are the contentions by proponents of the new dangerous spiral of the nuclear arms race. When NATO's Secretary General was asked if the problem of accounting for the British and French nuclear forces could spring up again, he said: It is quite possible that the point will be raised again.



- 3 -

Yet it will hardly produce any differences in NATO, for neither Washington, nor Paris or London want the British and French arsenals to be taken into account during the talks, as that would place the US at a disadvantage when it faces the Soviet Union in weighing up the forces of each side.

Indeed, in that case, as it has been repeatedly stated by the **Soviet** side, Washington's "estimates" of the correlation of forces would be blown up like soap bubbles. As Lord Carrington has implicitly admitted the fact, it seems to be a good reason for him to oppose the taking into account of the British and French nuclear arsenals, as it is for the US leaders.

That way of thinking has nothing to do with serious arguments. And it smacks more of political stunting than "pragmatism" for which Lord Carrington is allegedly famous. He mentioned that a resumption of the Geneva talks was desirable, but kept mum about the most important thing: failure by the American side to provide prerequisites which would make such talks possible. The interviewee heard what the Americans had to say and arrived at a conclusion that their point of view should not be argued.

To put it differently, the British Lord ventured to summarize the things he would be or would be not in a position to do while holding the new post, although he dropped a hint that other countries sometimes gathered an impression that they were members of an organisation too rigidly controlled by the US. Admittedly, Lord Carrington does not regard Britain, or at least the British government, among those holding this view.

It seems that Mr. Luns has got a really good successor who will be sure to promote the interests of NATO's overseas bosses. But what about Britain's interests? As a matter of fact, NATO's new Secretary General is prepared to neglect them.

(Izvestia, August 2. In full.)



Monday, May 11, 1981

ORIOVO-14332

4

TASS STATEMENT

Recently, the ministers of foreign affairs of the NATO countries have held in Rome a regular session of the Council of that bloc and adopted a lengthy communique. In the political circles and in propaganda in the West, efforts are being made now to present that session as an event of almost some special significance, called upon to make a major contribution to improving the international situation.

Such assertions have nothing in common with reality. As is clear from the communique as well as from the statements made by a number of the participants in the session, its decisions reflected above all the line of the US Administration designed to heighten international tensions and to whip up the arms race.

As regards the West-European NATO participants, they, as can be seen, have obediently supported the decisions that were prepared in advance in Washington.

The vague verbiage included in some places of the communique as regards the desirability of a dialogue and stable East-West relations does not change the essence of the adopted decisions. Even the bourgeois press does not conceal that this camouflage was needed in order to mislead the international public and dampen protests in many countries against the militaristic plans of the USA and NATO, against turning Western Europe into a launching pad for new US missiles, and West Europeans themselves--into hostages, as it were, of the Pentagon's nuclear strategy. Official representatives of the USA declare openly, without even hiding behind a verbal smokescreen, that they see the main result of the session in the confirmation of the known NATO decision on the deployment in Western Europe of new US medium-range nuclear missiles.

Such revelations make futile the attempts to create the impression that it is not the United States and the military NATO bloc, but the Soviet Union and other socialist countries that bear responsibility for the present complication of the situation in



Monday, May 11, 1981

- 2 -

4

the world. The falsity of such allegations strikes the eye as soon as it comes to setting forth NATO's positions on concrete issues of the present international situation, particularly the situation in Europe.

What are these positions?

Let us take, first of all, the question of limitation of the arms race. The utterly hypocritical character of NATO's position manifested itself most clearly exactly in this question. On the one hand, they speak of desire to attain progress in the sphere of limitation of the arms race. And on the other hand, they immediately destroy any reasonable foundation for a solution of this problem, reducing the entire essence of possible negotiations to "introduction of substantial restrictions on the Soviet military might."

That's where the shoe pinches. There is neither equality nor equal security here, but it is only on the basis of observance of this principle that positive results in any negotiations can be attained.

The NATO members appear to be declaring in favour of reducing the level of armaments. It would seem that this is a reasonable task, had it been really implied. But, as it is clear from the Rome communique, when things come to concrete deeds, the aim is set not at all of reducing, but of increasing the level of armaments. It is not accidental that it is emphasized in the communique that fulfilment of the NATO decision, adopted in December 1979, is "the only realistic foundation for taking parallel steps of control over nuclear forces".

Translated into ordinary human language, this means that Washington above all strives to station in Western Europe US missiles at any price, under any conditions and does not wish to hear anything else. It is also this that underlies the approach to possible talks which, in the concept of the authors of the communique, must not at all be a hindrance to the attainment of the above objective.

Such militarist designs have also clearly dictated the NATO countries' refusal to accept the Soviet proposal to impose a



Monday, May 11, 1981

- 3 -

4

moratorium on the deployment in Europe of new medium-range nuclear missiles.

Against the background of such a position, there is even less credibility to the attempts to pass off as almost a grandiose concession to the Soviet Union the agreement of the United States to resume, toward the close of this year, negotiations on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe.

In the first place, they forget that the talks were suspended by Washington itself, and, secondly, the point at issue now is not so much readiness to hold talks, as intent to delay their resumption, by enveloping them in all sorts of reservations. In short, everything is again subordinated to gaining time for implementing the plans of deploying US missiles in Western Europe.

This time again the participants in the NATO bloc are having recourse to the invention about the Soviet Union's superiority in medium-range nuclear means. This is a deliberate distortion of facts, and there is no doubt that the authors of the communique know about it. That is why, they stubbornly keep silence about the hundreds of units of the US forward-based nuclear means in Europe and around it, which are capable of reaching the Soviet Union's territory, and about the nuclear weapons of some other NATO member-countries. Had they mentioned it, they would have to admit that there is an approximate parity in Europe as regards corresponding arms between NATO and the Soviet Union. **Z** They would also have to admit that deploying additionally in Western Europe about 600 US missiles would create for NATO an almost 1.5-fold advantage in medium-range means and, consequently, to concede that the real aim of the NATO plan is to upset the current parity in Europe.

To admit all this would mean to say the truth, and this is the least intention of the NATO politicians. They prefer to deceive people. And for this reason they resort to fabrications, to putting forward different types of linkages, conditions and reservations which even they are unable to explain coherently.



This approach indicates that its authors clearly lack a sense of responsibility and integrity in politics.

The Soviet Union favours an early holding, and without any pre-conditions, of talks on limiting nuclear weapons in the European continent.

The proposals, which the USSR put on the table of negotiations with the United States last year, and which express readiness to discuss and resolve the question of the limitation and reduction of medium-range nuclear arms in Europe, including naturally, the American forward-based nuclear means, remain in force. And the USSR is ready to resume these negotiations without delay.

It should be clear that the solution of this task is most essential above all for the European peoples themselves.

Such an important problem as limitation of strategic arms is mentioned only in passing in the NATO communique, while the question of continuing the relevant negotiations is simply bypassed. The US representative openly stated upon the ending of the NATO Council's session that he did not at all see the possibilities of resuming the SALT negotiations in the near future. He could hardly have put it more clearly.

And what is the attitude of the NATO member-countries to the question of the talks on force and arms cuts in Central Europe? Expressing regret over the lack of "substantive progress", they seem to forget that for some seven years now it is precisely the Western participants in the Vienna talks who are going in a circle pressing only for one thing -- to obtain information about the armed forces of the socialist countries and their structure without reciprocating in any way their constructive steps that meet half-way the Western stand. As far as the unilateral steps of the Soviet Union, which reduced its armed forces stationed in the GDR by 20,000 men and 1,000 tanks, are concerned, the leaders of the NATO countries have simply confined themselves to taking note of them.

The Communique makes no mention at all of the other talks on arms limitation and on disarmament, although there is no noticeable



progress in the course of these talks either while talks on some issues have been even suspended by the US side (the Indian Ocean, arms supplies to other countries).

The essence of the NATO position was frankly formulated by the NATO Secretary General Luns who publicly stated: "I repeat again: It is not true that disarmament can prevent war."

Neither can the words in the NATO communique about Poland be explained by anything else except by a desire to erect as many barriers as possible in the way of resolving topical international issues. While hypocritically calling for abstaining from any outside interference," the authors of the communique deem it necessary to hush up the fact that it is precisely from Washington and the capitals of a number of West-European states that all kinds of "recommendations" and "advice" continue to emanate on how the Poles ought to behave. In effect, this is a direct interference in the internal affairs of Poland, and it must be stopped.

If one is to listen to the authors of the Rome communique, it turns out that the United States and NATO stand for a political settlement around Afghanistan. Nothing could be further from the truth! All is quite the reverse. In the United States and NATO nobody wanted or wants now to search for a political settlement. But much is being done to prevent such a settlement. For when Pakistan recently expressed the cautious desire to establish contacts with Afghanistan, the United States and some other countries did their utmost to cut short such a possibility. In the NATO capitals they are wrong in thinking that people have a short memory. Neither have people forgotten the White House's open declaration of its intention to supply arms to the bands which intrude into the territory of Afghanistan.

NATO has neither moral nor any other right to question the Soviet Union's legitimate aid to the friendly Afghan people in repulsing aggression from outside. The USSR resolutely supports Afghanistan's well-known proposals aimed at attaining a political settlement. Within the context of such a settlement there can also be resolved the question about the Soviet limited military contin-



gent there, to which effect relevant statements have repeatedly been made by the Soviet Union.

The participants in the NATO session have not bypassed by their attention the developing countries. The subject, doubtless, is of exceptional importance, especially taking into account the fact that these countries continue to be the objects of plunder and exploitation by the major imperialist states. But the problem, however, was discussed not from the viewpoint of providing real assistance to such countries. Nothing was adopted on that score. And this cannot be hidden by a mere combination of words about desire to contribute to consolidating their economies and to respect their independence and sovereignty.

Apparently, the small oil, the craving for other resources of the developing countries stimulate the appetities of the NATO strategists and politicians. In practice this takes the form of encouragement of Israel to continue its expansionist course against the Arabs, of cooperation with the racist regime of South Africa, which keeps the African country of Namibia under colonial yoke, and the support for anti-popular dictatorial regimes in Latin America and other parts of the world.

What can be said about the trend of policy when not only individual countries, but even whole continents are declared zones of "vital interests" of the USA, which is incessantly continuing its drive for new military bases in the developing countries and, backed up by the guns of naval armadas, is trying to dictate to the independent countries how they should act, and to what way of life they should adhere. One should think that the peoples of these countries will be able to see through the real intentions of those who currently go out of their way to impose their friendship on them.

The Madrid meeting is mentioned in the NATO communique from the viewpoint of conducting the East-West dialogue. One could have adopted a positive attitude to this were it not for all kinds of specious reservations put forward here, too. And the essence



of these reservations is that progress on the main item of the agenda of the meeting - on convening a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe - is perceived by the NATO politicians only as a series of unilateral concessions by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It goes without saying, this is not a realistic approach.

The Soviet Union, as has been the case until now, will contribute towards reaching mutual understanding at Madrid. But in common with its allies in the Warsaw Treaty Organization it has the right to count on the same attitude by the Western participants in the meeting.

It is believed in the leading circles of the USSR that the vital interests of all peoples urgently necessitate a change over to the sensible, realistic way of talks on the basis of equality, renunciation of attempts to upset the existing military balance, to force one's will on others. The broad programme of proposals and initiatives, which was put forward in Leonid Brezhnev's report to the 26th Congress of the CPSU, is directed precisely at this. The Soviet Union is fully determined to consistently implement this programme by cooperating with all those who strive by deeds for reliable and lasting peace.

(Pravda, May 9. In full.)



Friday, May 15, 1981

ORIOVO - 14387

4

MILITARISTIC ASSEMBLAGES

Vladislav Drobkov

Sessions of NATO's Eurogroup, military command and the military planning committee followed each other in the Belgian capital. They were so to speak the final chords of the "NATO symphony" that sounded for several weeks now in Bonn, now in Rome, now in Brussels. Since all these NATO assemblages were conducted by representatives of the new US administration, coming out for rejecting everything positive that has been achieved in the sphere of detente in the past few years, their "music" merged into one militaristic march.

Summing up the results of NATO's conferences in Brussels, it becomes clear that Washington, brandishing the bugbear of the "Soviet threat", has again succeeded in pushing its allies further along the slippery path of speeding up military preparations. Defence Ministers and NATO's generals have taken decisions to continue to increase the military machine of NATO, especially its aggressive potential.

First of all they have decided to continue preparations for deploying in Europe Pershing-2 medium-range and cruise missiles which, according to military specialists, are "first strike" weapons. The decisions to speed up the conventional arms race, to secure annual increases in military allocations and to carry out an expensive modernisation of the military infrastructure in Europe also pose a considerable threat to peace.

It was also decided at the Brussels meetings to start drawing up plans of military preparations for 1983-1988 and set up a committee for studying the needs of the bloc in manpower; this may become the first step towards increasing the numerical strength of NATO's armies. The Ministers have also defined the basic guidelines for the long-term military planning in specific spheres,



Friday, May 15, 1981

2

4

including the bloc's approval of new systems of arms, their standardisation, and cooperation in their manufacture. All this testifies to NATO's intention to plan the arms race for many years to come.

Just as dangerous for peace is the recognition, displayed in Brussels, of the USA's "right" to military adventures outside the bloc if the notorious "vital interests of the West" are jeopardised there. Moreover, the final communique of NATO's military planning committee even hints on the possibility of NATO allies' participation in joint actions outside the framework of the bloc.

Against the background of all these aggressive preparations and plans, references made in Brussels to a certain aspiration of NATO for "genuine detente" and "control over armaments" sounded especially cynically. However, no camouflage will help. The assemblages of NATO's military bodies clearly demonstrated the aggressive nature of the North Atlantic bloc.

Brussels.

(Pravda, May 15. In full.)



NATO VS. EUROPE

Ernst Genri

That NATO is an aggressive military organisation obstructing the establishment of durable peace in Europe-- this not only people in the socialist and developing countries, but also many in the West understand today. That NATO armaments are now growing month after month, in fact week after week, is no secret either. But what are the strategic plans of the NATO headquarters on our continent? What is it preparing for?

Sources close to it usually say that its entire strategy boils down to one thing: defence. They assert that the NATO generals are only thinking of how to defend Western Europe from an allegedly planned "lightening attack" by the Warsaw Treaty states, how to protect it from a "breakthrough" of Soviet tanks across the Rhine and to the Atlantic Ocean -- from a terrible "Soviet threat".

For years the mass media of the capitalist world have been loudly talking about this. Whole books, looking like fantasy novels, are being published on the same theme. But, as a rule, they keep silent about what the Atlantic generals themselves are really planning. Yet the policy of NATO makes its military strategy quite obvious.

Back in the 50s, at the height of the cold war, something became known about the genuine intentions of NATO, at least in Central Europe. Information had seeped into the press about a plan of the NATO and revenge-seeking forces to make an eastward thrust at the right moment and inflict a number of blows on the socialist states. A break-through to Berlin, Prague and Budapest was meant in the first place.

I recall: in August 1960 a French newspaper carried an interview with two Bundeswehr officers who had crossed over to the GDR--major Wiener and Captain von Glieg, a former aide of General Kammhuber, the commander of the FRG air force. Wiener reported that in an attack on the GDR NATO would first of all seek to cut off Warsaw Treaty participants from one another.

"Use" of the territory of neutral Austria was envisaged for this purpose. The following operations were planned. The first army group of the aggressors was to start the attack advancing along the southern border of the GDR till the Oder-Neisse line. In this way they intended to cut off the GDR from Czechoslovakia. After turning to the north, in the direction of Frankfurt-on-Oder and Berlin, this group was then to cut off the GDR from Poland as well.



Friday, December 5, 1980

3

- 2 -

At the same time, the second army group advancing along the border between Czechoslovakia and Poland was to surround Czechoslovakia, invade Hungary and cut it off from Czechoslovakia and Poland. Meanwhile the NATO fleet was to attack the northern coast of the GDR in the area of Rostock and the Oder estuary. The GDR would thus be "surrounded". This is at least how they presumed it would go according to the plan of Heusinger, a Hitlerite general who was in charge of the Bundeswehr command and later became the head of the planning committee at the NATO headquarters.

Much water has flown under the bridge since then. People recovered after the shock of the Second World War, but now they are again looking into the future with alarm. Has the NATO headquarters abandoned its adventurous plans during this time?

Everything indicates that it hasn't. Of course, particular deployments have been repeatedly modified, corrected and supplemented since then. Weapons are changing, military art does not mark time. But the substance of the NATO strategy in Europe obviously remains the same: its edge is directed against the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community.

Hence the latest concepts of the NATO command: the project for stationing American Pershing-2 nuclear missiles in West European countries, the plans for the massive accumulation of cruise missiles, the plans to use neutron bombs and nerve gases, to build new airports in the FRG, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Italy and Greece...

Hence also the holding of military training exercises in direct proximity to the borders of the GDR and Czechoslovakia, the plan for using "rapid deployment forces", the continuous growth of the military expenditures of the NATO countries and so forth.

What for is all this? To strengthen the defences of the Western countries, which nobody is going to attack? No, to achieve a clear military superiority of the NATO forces in Europe, preparing for aggression against the socialist states.

And also from this finally comes the latest American military doctrine of a limited, that is, actually unrestricted nuclear war, a doctrine that has been announced to the constant noise of phrases about a "Soviet threat" and the "defence of Western democracy". All this is being done<sup>w</sup> the same main aim. The official policy of Washington and its allies continues to directly follow the NATO headquarters' strategy for the European theatre of operations.



- 3 -

Truman and Dulles, who founded NATO and started the arms race, have long since been dead. But the line of their successors is all the same, with the only difference that it is now pursued with still greater persistency, still greater aggressiveness and with still greater--ten-fold--spending of funds.

The present line-up of the bloc's forces in Central Europe also speaks of the invariability of the NATO generals' strategy. Two army groups of NATO are concentrated here: the group North along the borders with the GDR and the group Centre near the borders of Czechoslovakia. Advanced units of these armies are deployed just 60-70 km from the borders of the socialist states, are constantly kept on a high level of combat readiness and can be reinforced by American troops airlifted across the Atlantic.

Thousands of NATO's tanks and warplanes are based there today. Eighty per cent of all delivery systems NATO maintains in Europe for its atomic weapons are concentrated in Central Europe, and the bulk of the new US medium-range missiles are going to be deployed there as well.

On the left flank the NATO forces are deployed in the Baltic Sea, whereas the right flank, the Mediterranean, is covered by the US Sixth Fleet, which is not organic to the NATO forces but operates in close contact with the allied command.

All these forces put together represent a solid wall which passes across the European continent and faces, above all, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. But this is not all.

The aggressors believe that the road to Berlin and Prague is bound to eventually lead them to Warsaw. This is never said in so many words, but the propaganda campaign recently whipped up in the West, particularly by the West German revanchists, against the socialist Polish state throws sufficient light on the covert plans of the NATO command in this respect.

It is likewise clear that operations against Berlin, Prague, Budapest and Warsaw together with actions on the Black Sea (in the area of Greece and Turkey) are merely the first stage of the campaign planned by the NATO strategists and that its main objective in case of war is Moscow.

It appears therefore that the "ideas" of the North Atlantic Alliance ideed have not changed since the fifties.

But what do all these strategic schemes remind us of?



Friday, December 5, 1980

3

- 4 -

There can be no doubt about it: all this looks very much like a revised edition of the plans of the Hitler Wehrmacht for attacking Eastern Europe: Czechoslovakia is to be hit first, Poland next and finally the Soviet Union.

As I have already said, the NATO command has to develop many things anew, but the essence remains. Obviously, the present-day "Atlantic" generals are learning from Keitel, Yodl and Goering. It is symptomatic in this context that the post of the Commander-in-Chief of NATO's Central Europe Command invariably goes to a West German general; today it is held by Bundeswehr General Ferdinand von Senger und Etterlin, son of a well-known nazi general.

But how long will NATO be able to carry on its aggressive policy without pushing the world to the brink of actual catastrophe? This question is important not to computers but to everyone in the world, and even more so to the Europeans. One spiral of the arms race follows another, one billion dollars after another is added to military budgets, one "superweapon" after another is developed, and a new anti-Soviet myth is floated every week--all this at a time when the socialist countries are doing everything within their power to reach understanding with the other side and extend detente. Dulles, one of the architects of the cold war, once characterised this policy as brinkmanship. But even imperialist acrobats cannot indefinitely keep their balance on the brink of an abyss.

However, it is not they who are determining the course of history today. Let us look back at the past once more.

The peoples of Europe were unable to avert World War I. The working class was not yet prepared to make resolute efforts for peace, and the world was controlled by the imperialists. The Soviet Union was doing whatever it could to avert World War II, but at the time it was the only socialist country in Europe, and fascism had caught the Europeans unawares. Today the lineup of the world forces has changed so much that the NATO generals will no longer be able to decide the fate of Europe.

It is necessary, however, that the simple and honest people not only realise their strength but also become aware of their responsibility and potentialities and launch in all countries vigorous efforts for detente; unless these efforts are successful, the 20th century may have a worse ending than any of the previous ones.

(Sovetskaya Rossia, December 5. In full.)



Thursday, December 11, 1980

ORIO/v

33952

NATO

MILITARISTIC URGE

3

Vitaly Korionov

"To return the lost military superiority at any cost certain circles in the United States are using all means of deception, blackmail and diktat. They want to impose on mankind a new, ever more dangerous round of the arms race," says Pravda's political news analyst Vitaly Korionov.

According to him hundreds of institutions, thousands of politicians, generals and journalists are now busy releasing fabrications designated to keep people in the West in constant fear. "Russians are coming!", the Americans are being intimidated day and night. They in the Pentagon on the Potomac add that "America is defenceless". The chief of staff of the U.S. Army assures in earnest that he commands a "weak army" which is "understaffed", "ill trained", and "insufficiently financed". The chief of the Air Force staff complains that his planes "have no spares", the chief of staff of the Navy announces that he has to operate in three oceans while having a fleet enough for "one ocean and a half".

The author points out that the Pentagon's emissaries in the NATO headquarters are trying to present the aggressive war machine of the bloc as nearly disintegrating. An example of that is an article by American General Rogers, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, published in the December issue of the Readers Digest magazine. He offers a ready-made "recipe" of how to "rectify the situation".

The General outlines a new militarist programme. Here are some of its components: the United States should immediately start the production of modern chemical weapons. The United States should produce neutron weapons. Congress should immediately introduce a limited call-up into the first-line reserve. The General announces that the Pentagon has worked out a plan of airlifting six divisions to West Germany to reinforce the more than 300,000-strong army. So that no one has any doubts against whom Mr. Rogers is going to march, he explains that the potential common enemy is the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty.

(Pravda, December 10. TASS. Summary)



Tuesday, May 26, 1981

ORIO 14477

3

ATLANTIC FEVER

S. Zykov

A call to intensify the arms race keynoted a series of recent NATO high-level meetings. The call is not something new. Since the establishment of the aggressive North Atlantic Alliance, at all its sessions and conferences the United States has tirelessly called for building up the military might of its members. This spring, fanning the ballyhoo around the "Soviet threat", Washington has exerted special efforts to increase militaristic fever. It has largely succeeded in this.

At the Rome session of the NATO foreign ministers and in Brussels which hosted, in turn, NATO's "Eurogroup", military committee and military planning committee, it was decided to further increase the military budgets and expand the earlier long-term programme for building up conventional and nuclear weapons. By resorting to vague promises to resume talks with the Soviet Union, Washington has succeeded, to a certain extent, in influencing in the desired direction the positions of those West European governments which under public impact refused to unconditionally fulfil the orders of their American partner, and to accept new US medium-range nuclear missiles.

Commenting on the efforts exerted by the Pentagon and US diplomacy at the recent NATO conference, the world press noted with rare unanimity that they reflect the desire of the US administration to ensure America a military supremacy in the world. By building up its armed forces and allocating hundreds of billions of dollars for military purposes the United States wants other NATO countries to follow suit.

The Pentagon strategic plans provide for the active participation of the NATO countries' armies, navies and air forces in US adventures pursuing aggressive aims both within and outside the bloc's zone of operation, primarily in the Middle East, in the



Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean.

NATO's military bodies discussed moves connected with these plans. In particular, they discussed the question of establishing an "allied" rapid deployment force, the replacement by West Europeans of US troops which could be transferred from Europe to a "crisis region", the growth of the "allied" armies in the next few years to come, and so on and so forth.

A major emphasis was laid on siting in Western Europe of nearly 600 US medium-range nuclear missiles. The United States demanded that the states which are to accommodate its missiles rapidly prepare launching sites and build nuclear arms depots and other infrastructure.

NATO bosses do not conceal their satisfaction with the results of NATO's spring conferences. A. Haig, US Secretary of State, and J. Luns, NATO Secretary General, spoke enthusiastically about the bloc's spring conferences. In anticipation of new contracts, even greater enthusiasm was displayed by the military-industrial corporations, whose shares immediately went up at stock exchanges.

A different reaction to the NATO decisions was shown by the working people of Western Europe and America. West Germany, Britain, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium and other countries, see massive demonstrations of protests against growing military expenditures and whipping up of the arms race. Before his trip to Washington, West German Chancellor H. Schmidt was handed in a petition of protest signed by 800,000 Western Germans. Anti-war demonstrations also took place in many cities in the United States.

In reply to imperialist calls to intensify military preparations, the peoples of the world demand ever more persistently that the ruinous arms race be stopped and effective measures taken to promote detente and peace.

(Izvestia. May 25. In full.)



WASHINGTON'S TRAP

V. Vernikov on Economic and Political  
Differences Between the United States and Its  
West European NATO Allies

Judging by everything official Washington has put in action its heavy propaganda artillery, including the Secretaries of State and Defence, in a bid to present the Administration's foreign policy to its West European allies in the brightest colours. It is by no means an easy task to reduce the different interests of the countries on both sides of the Atlantic to a common denominator.

Confrontation with the Soviet Union, which may be considered to be the Bible of the present American foreign policy, is not in the interests of Western Europe at all, for that region has tested the good fruit of cooperation with the USSR and other socialist nations. That is why, as The Christian Science Monitor wrote, the allies are not going to put an end to their variant of detente only to satisfy Washington. It is naturally they do not like many things in Reagan's foreign policy and do not support it wholly and completely.

This is the pivotal problem from which other problems of no less importance grow as branches from the trunk. These are: the level of military expenditure, nuclear-missile rearmament and trade. All the problems form a tangle which it is impossible to straighten by resolving only one of them. Nonetheless, there are ample grounds to state that economic problems constitute the root cause for Washington's present foreign policy and rather uneasy, to put it mildly, relations with its West European allies. As they say, there's the rub.

It is common knowledge that some West European countries surpass America in the level of modern technology development and the United States is unable to continue successfully competing



Wednesday, June 10, 1981

3

- 2 -

with them in the marathon race which has been going on in the past ten to fifteen years. Among the numerous causes of this I would like to mention only one -- Washington's high military spending which has increased as a result of the war in Vietnam, support for anti-popular regimes and its Middle East (or Israeli, to be more exact) romance. The course to promote cooperation and develop and build up confidence, which has also taken shape in Europe in the 70s, could not but influence the level of the allies' military spending, although the current accusation of Western Europe of "pacifism" and "neutralism" is no more than a propaganda stunt.

It is in these conditions of tough economic rivalry between the leading capitalist countries which has been intensified by the energy crisis that the wise men from the Reagan team decided to use the evil to the Administration's advantage -- to put a rope on the neck of Western Europe by imposing on it military spendings which undermine its economic and social programmes and draw West Europeans into such a race from which only arms manufacturers and merchants can benefit.

I believe West Europeans have seen through this trick but notorious "Atlantic solidarity", coupled with Washington's gross pressure, does not permit them to say this out loud. While putting up resistance, they only say that their economies cannot shoulder a greater "defence" burden and that the rates of inflation and unemployment will be stepped up as a result of the increase in military spending. What is more, Western European leaders have to look back on opposition which exists both in the camp of the left-wing forces and inside their own, ruling, parties. This is borne out by the latest developments in West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and other NATO countries.

And this is precisely what Washington wants: to weaken Western Europe economically and to take it in hand by military measures. And, perhaps, the surest and most ingenious way to harness the hesitant and dissatisfied Europeans is by imposing on them at least a three per cent annual increase in military spending, urging them to go beyond the geographical boundaries



of NATO, and deploying about 600 new medium-range nuclear missiles in European territory.

Not all historical analogies are precise and some of them are conditional, because times change, as does the mentality of people. However, in this case the analogy suggests itself: Washington's present-day course vis-a-vis its West-European allies is just a militaristic Marshall Plan, modernised and adapted for a new "abduction of Europe", this time under the threat of nuclear death from a non-existent "Soviet menace". More than that, the allies were told once again that resistance to NATO's further missile build-up would negatively affect their relations with the United States.

Although the resistance of the West-Europeans does not manifest itself in spectacular forms, it does exist and it is felt on many problems. The movement of protest against nuclear threat and the ruinous arms race keeps growing. Today even the most ardent supporters of Washington's militaristic course in London and Bonn cannot hush it up, nor can they disregard it.

"An idea that European security policy can be reduced to the fulfilment of the demands of US presidents has become outdated", Willy Brandt told the magazine Der Spiegel. "One should not disregard one's own interests within the alliance (i.e. within NATO--V.V.); it is necessary to champion these interests...", he went on to say.

Of course, people in Washington realize that West-Europeans are ready to uphold their interests. However, they do not draw proper conclusions from this and continue to persist on their power politics in an attempt to reach their aims at whatever the price. This cannot but widen the gap separating the United States from its allies, because this is a question of the future of Europe.

(Izvestia, June 9. Abridged.)



Wednesday, March 25, 1981

3

ORI4V-871

PROPPING UP SOUTHERN FLANK

N.Paklin, Izvestia Staff Correspondent

Of late, the Pentagon and NATO have been devoting more and more attention to the Mediterranean. This points to the growing political aggressiveness of imperialism, first of all of US imperialism. This was stressed by L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his report to the 26th CPSU Congress.

The United States is working to consolidate its domination and capture advantageous positions in this region. The Mediterranean means not only Europe's southern flank, but also approaches to the Middle East and South West Asia, North Africa and the vast zone of the Indian Ocean, including the Persian Gulf. In an attempt to camouflage their imperialist designs, US leaders allege that it is necessary to "protect the oil riches of the Middle East and South West Asia" and oil routes leading to the West.

However, as is known, no one threatens these sea routes. It was said at the 26th CPSU Congress that the authors of this deliberate lie know very well that the Soviet Union does not intend to encroach either on oil or its supply routes. Imperialism's desire to turn the Mediterranean into a jumping off-ground is rooted in its far-reaching plans. "Washington strategists are obviously eager to involve dozens of other countries in their military preparations, and to enmesh the world in a web of US bases, airfields and arms depots," L.I. Brezhnev said. This is the central point of the political manoeuvres conducted by the United States and NATO in Europe's southern flank.

The United States gives Italy a special role to play in its plans for building up its might in the Mediterranean. Strategically, in the Pentagon's opinion, Italy holds the key to the region. The Italian Peninsula, cutting the Mediterranean into two, as it were, is a natural bridge connecting Europe with Africa. The



Pentagon regards Italy, Italian newspapers said, as a bridgehead for US armed forces to conduct direct military operations in the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and in the Indian Ocean.

The United States has, in point of fact, turned Italy into its outpost. The headquarters of the joint NATO naval force in southern Europe has been moved to Naples after NATO had to clear off from Malta. The ships of the US Sixth Fleet are based in the Italian ports of Naples, Gaeta, Spezia, Taranto. The Maddalena Island, near Sardinia, has been transformed into a permanent home of American nuclear submarines.

Up to one and a half thousand American nuclear warheads have been reported by the Italian press to be stationed in that country. There are all kinds of military installations of the US and NATO, including testing grounds, in Italy. Preparations are now under way to install 112 American theatre-strategic medium-range cruise missiles in Italy. The decision to this effect is known to have been taken at the NATO ministerial meeting in Brussels in 1979. Yet another plan afoot is to install neutron and chemical weapons there.

"It must be clear: the deployment of new US missiles, targeted against the USSR and its allies, in the FRG, Italy, Britain, the Netherlands or Belgium is bound to affect our relations with these countries, to say nothing of how this will prejudice their own security", Leonid Brezhnev said in the Report to the 26th CPSU Congress.

Washington does not take into account the real interests of its European partners. The US is trying to make the Italian government enlarge the nation's military potential. Washington's importunities have met with guarded reaction from the Italian public. The military are manifestly unhappy about these plans. Defence Minister Lagorio recently announced a project being worked out to set up a so-called "quick deployment force" to be formed of crack units of all the arms.

Political circles in Rome see this, not without reason, as a bid to increase Italy's contribution towards the reinforcement of the NATO southern flank, the idea Washington is so anxious about.



Wednesday, March 25, 1981

- 3 -

3

Then people of Mediterranean countries are showing great concern over the plans of American and NATO militarists. A campaign is gaining ground in Italy against American cruise missiles and neutron bombs being stationed in that country.

Democratic sections of public opinion of the Mediterranean countries see the latest peace proposals, put forward by the 26th CPSU Congress, as evidence of the Soviet Union's commitment to detente and to promoting confidence and cooperation among nations. The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries have declared more than once that the Mediterranean must become a zone of peace. This will respond to the aspirations of the peoples of Europe and to their desire to strengthen the Helsinki spirit and further the effort to promote detente, good-neighbourly relations and cooperation.

(Izvestia, March 24. Abridged.)

TÜSTAV  
TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARŞİVİ



Tuesday, January 20, 1981

OBPO/v 155

NATO PLANS REJECTED

6

West German Public Outcry Against US Missiles

E. Korolyov,

Izvestia Correspondent

There has been increased public pressure in West Germany in the opening weeks of the new year against the decision of the NATO ministerial meeting in Brussels in December 1979 to have American medium-range missiles stationed in a number of West European countries.

A large-scale campaign is under way throughout West Germany to collect signatures to the appeal of a public forum in Krefeld in November last year against the implementation of the NATO decision. The object of the campaign is to gather at least one million signatures against the installation of NATO nuclear missiles on West German territory. The Presiding Board of the German Communist Party issued a statement on January 9, calling on all members of the party to give their determined backing to the drive for collecting signatures to the "Krefeld Appeal".

In the meantime, the sponsors of the "Krefeld Appeal" called on the federal government, which had agreed to the installation of new American missiles on West German territory, to reconsider its position.

The latest wave of protests against the deployment of American nuclear missiles has been touched off by the reports that the West German government has already come to terms with the United States on the sites to be used for stationing these missiles on West German territory. It has come to light that 108 American Pershing-2 missiles are to be stationed on what are at present the sites of Pershing-1 missiles in West Germany. Ninety-six cruise missiles are to be deployed at US military bases in West Germany. West German democratic organisations have declared that, according to their information, preparatory work on the sites for new nuclear missile systems has already started in Lower Saxony, North-Rhine-Westphalia, Hessen, Baden-Wurtemberg and Bavaria.

These reports are adding to the West Germans' conviction that the NATO decision runs counter to the vital interests both of the population of West Germany and the peoples of the entire European continent. The NATO decisions, said Peter Tuemmers,



Chairman of the Works Council of a large textile mill in Krefeld, "contradict the basic interests of the working man".

Alarm over the stark danger which the deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles will spell for West Germany has been increasingly voiced in recent times by some of the membership of the SDPG, the largest party of the government coalition. More than 150 prominent party officials, including a number of Bundestag members, have signed an appeal to the government, urging it to decline the NATO decisions. The Chairman of the SDPG state organisation of the Saar region, Oskar Lafontaine has made a statement typical of the current moods in West Germany, emphasising that "it is not written anywhere that we must participate in the arms race just because the Americans want us to."

Under these circumstances, official Bonn, which has found itself in quite a predicament because of its earlier references to an interconnection between the ratification of the SALT-2 Treaty by the United States and the implementation of the NATO "arming-up" plans, has been trying in every way to assure its partners that the West German government is still willing to fulfil the obligations it has assumed. The public are being told, meanwhile, that everything is going on as it should and that there is no cause for concern.

Yet the resentment at the NATO decisions is being expressed by a wider cross-section of the West German population. Bonn must give up the idea of installing death-dealing missiles on West German soil! This demand is resounding louder and louder, drowning the appeals for "Atlantic solidarity", noisy speculation about a "Soviet threat" and criticism of those who question the official arguments.

While calling for the dangerous "arming-up" idea to be dropped, progressive sections of West German opinion are pointing out that the only acceptable way to strengthen peace in Europe is through negotiations to end the arms race, under the programme proposed by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Bonn

(January 19. Abridged.)



NEW NUCLEAR TEST IN NEVADA

A Course for Confrontation

A.Tolkunov

The succession of US nuclear tests is eloquent evidence of the US Administration intending to go on with its course for confrontation, and a blow to the hopes of those Americans who expected it to renounce the policy of building up nuclear weapons and to show a responsible approach to the destinies of mankind.

Many of these people are becoming active opponents of the White House policy and demonstrate their resolute protest against the course chosen by Washington.

Meanwhile, the nuclear arms race continues to gain momentum in the USA. The Lockheed arms factory at Santa Clara, California, is astir with feverish activity on account of the White House and Congress having released another hand-out for the development of Trident-2 D-5 supermissile which is to replace the "obsolete" Trident-1 C-4. Twenty-four such missiles aboard one submarine can cause destruction on a scale equivalent to that brought about by all the wars in human history taken together.

According to a report published by nuclear strategy experts Robert Norris, Thomas Cochran and William Arkin, the allocations for nuclear tests have grown dramatically in recent time. In the next few years the arms factories are to manufacture 1,800 warheads a year at the least.

As it steers toward developing space strike systems, Washington is beginning tests with nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers in Nevada. In this way the Nevada range is being drawn into the Star Wars programme leading to an uncontrollable arms race.

To break the vicious circle: this is today the demand of



Wednesday, April 23, 1986

4

- 2 -

the entire world community, including that of millions of  
sober-minded Americans.

(Pravda, April 23. Abridged.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA VAKFI  
TÜSTAV



ORI15VO-563

CHASING A SPECTRE

On Washington's Policy of Seeking Military Superiority

V. Matveyev, Political News Commentator  
for Izvestia

Developing the atomic bomb when the Soviet Union and the United States were allies in the common struggle against the Nazi aggressor and doing everything to conceal that from their Soviet ally, who bore the brunt of the war, American ruling circles believed that when they obtained that weapon, this country would take a long time to develop similar technology.

August 1949 when the Soviet Union successfully tested a combat atomic device was a shock for those US circles. It had a cold shower effect on some hotheads in the United States, but not on all.

At various times US ruling quarters pinned their hopes for military superiority on nuclear weapons, the intercontinental bomber, nuclear-powered submarines carrying strategic missiles, MIRV, the neutron bomb and new generation cruise missiles.

The attempts to make the other side vulnerable backfired at the United States. The other side, as might be expected, did not sit idle.

With the benefit of hindsight, when he was not restricted by his official status, Henry Kissinger deplored the decision by the Administration, in which he was Secretary of State, to start the production of MIRVed missiles. This country had urged the United States to agree on a ban on the development of such missiles, but Washington ignored the Soviet offer, believing, as it often did in the past, that the United States had left the



Soviet Union far behind in that field. Having quickly developed a similar technology, the Soviet Union eliminated American advantage. As a result, Henry Kissinger admitted, the United States became less, not more secure.

The same thing happened each time the Pentagon tried to tilt the balance to its advantage by using some technological novelty for military purposes. Nevertheless, the United States continued chasing the spectre of military and political superiority. That chase slowed down only when the American policy became less adventurous and when Washington responded to constructive Soviet initiatives. However, pressure from the extreme right flank in the United States, from die-hard militarist elements continued and the United States kept building up the most lethal and destabilising types of weapons.

The boundless expanses of outer space have long attracted the attention of those quarters in the United States who appreciate any technical novelty from the viewpoint of its military value alone.

While this country was beginning to embark upon its programme for peaceful exploration of outer space, in 1957 the United States began to develop a missile defence system called Nike-X. By 1967 allocations for that programme have totalled 2,500 million dollars and 23 companies were involved in that project. The aerospace industry was gradually becoming a leading business in the US military-industrial complex. However, its efforts to spread the arms race into outer space ran into growing difficulties. The opposition to the Nike-X programme and other Pentagon programmes for space was growing inside the United States. A worldwide campaign to prevent militarisation of space was mounting.

The Soviet Union, which pioneered peaceful exploration of space, was in the front ranks of that movement. On March 15, 1958, the Soviet government proposed setting up a UN body to



- 3 -

deal with international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. Persistent efforts in that field resulted in the conclusion in 1967 of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies.

Space is mentioned in the Soviet-American ABM Treaty of 1972, which pledged the sides not to develop, test or deploy sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based ABM systems or components.

The signing of that Treaty was a victory of commonsense and realism in the field of vital importance for progress in reducing the risk of war and limiting and reducing the most lethal weapons. That was the reason why it was fiercely attacked by the military-industrial tycoons, especially the aerospace corporations which seized the lion's share of orders. Among these are General Dynamics (the MX missile), McDonnell Douglas (the F-15 aircraft used in anti-satellite weapon systems), Hughes Aircraft (laser weapon research and electronic systems), United Technologies (missile engines), Boeing, Rockwell International, Grumman and Northrop.

Their stronghold is California where the present master of the White House has especially close ties with Big Business. The present US administration includes many people who used to hold high posts in aerospace corporations.

California is the site of leading research centres which are engaged in space research for military purposes. Among these are Rand Corporation and Aerospace Corporation, which are involved in the missile defence programme.

As a Pentagon directive says, their aim is to achieve and maintain national technological superiority in major military-related fields of technology. In the latter half of the 1970s the United States had at various stages of development and production major weapon systems worth a total of more than 150,000 million dollars.



- 4 -

It is a set of factors, like an insatiable thirst for more superprofits, unrestrained political ambitions and an inordinate belief in the "superiority" of American technology that should be seen as the reason behind the unending pressure from the US military establishment which has for decades been demanding an unlimited arms deployment not only on the ground, at sea, and in the air, but in space as well.

Having high-handedly cast away everything that had been carefully considered, even at top level in the US, before the present Administration first came into office in 1981, which restrained and, to a certain extent, neutralised the pressure of "space wars" strategists, Washington has now decided to give the green light to a "space arms fever".

The US President's speech in that vein in March 1983 had been preceded by his conferences with a restricted group of personalities who had long been pressing for the arms build-up to be taken out into space. One of them was David Packard, a co-owner of the Hewlett-Packard arms corporation.

No phasemongering of official American propaganda will ever obscure the object of the new programme which is what it has always been: to obtain military superiority. Once they have found they cannot do it on the land, at sea, or in the air, they have set out to try and bring those deadly weapons of theirs into space.

That is a crazy idea, to put it bluntly. The Deputy Chief of Staff of the US Space Command, Major General Nil Beer declared early in September 1983, that is after the White House had announced its space weapons programme, that its object must be to "establish control over the space outskirts" of the Earth. General Beer must be taking space for his own garden!

Perhaps, there is no point in taking that kind of talk seriously? For, after all, Beer is not a policy-maker. But there has been another statement along these lines, one of April 8, 1984, by Defence Secretary Weinberger, who stated that



- 5 -

he had never been a supporter of the ABM Treaty of 1972. Why? Because the treaty had put actual obstacles in the way of an arms race in space.

This pursuit of superiority in space is like chasing a phantom as the sponsors of that race have been doing in all of their previous undertakings of this kind. The only difference is that such a race will involve spending, in fact, wasting yet more means and resources.

Even the arms programmes already in hand, apart from the space programme, has strained the US federal Budget so much, as one can see from record-breaking budget deficits, that even some of those who have until quite recently been known as the most hawkish of the nation's hawks have begun to talk about the unbearable burden of such programmes. It is for this particular reason that Reagan's intimate friend, Barry Goldwater, Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has voiced serious reservations about the MX deployment programme which is estimated to cost between 30 and 35 billion dollars.

The White House's "star wars" programme is expected, as American experts estimate, to cost something between five hundred billion and one trillion dollars!

This figure does not embarrass the tycoons of aerospace business. On the contrary, it is whetting their appetite. But the Grummans, Hughes, and Lockheeds are not all of America as yet, not even all of its top crust. Many of its agents, having nothing to do with munitions production, have enough reason to pause to think over the fuss kicked by those tycoons and over the strategic designs of their friends and colleagues who forget that actual realities have nothing in common with the Hollywood "Star Wars" fantasy.

(Izvestia, February 26. Abridged.)



Tuesday, August 21, 1984

ORI5VO-2404

5

110 PAGES AND FIVE MINUTES

(On the election platform of the US Republican party)

Melor Sturua

Yesterday, on August 20, the nomination convention of the US Republican party opened in Dallas, Texas. Its voluminous 110-page election platform has been finally made public. The quintessence of these 110 pages can be gathered from the evil-minded statement by the White House boss about the "five minutes" remaining before the bombing of the Soviet Union "outlawed" by him. The foreign-policy section of the platform is a real catechism of hegemonism and international terrorism elevated to the rank of a state policy, an arrogant "justification" of Washington's imperial "right" to global supremacy and to uncereemonious interference in the internal affairs of other countries and peoples and a confirmation of the adventurist course at revving up the arms race and at gaining military superiority as a "material support" for the policy of diktat and for the policy "from the position of strength."

The platform contains two kinds of promises: demagogical and genuine. The former deal with freedom, democracy, peace, good will and all those other elevated notions used as a blind, while the latter constitute a real guidance to action for the Pentagon "crusaders" and their allies united in all sorts of aggressive blocs.

The election platform of the US Republican party drafted by its ultra-right wing reflects the truly global appetites of American imperialism. All the globe with all its land, water expanses and even the surrounding space are announced by Washington as spheres of its "vital interests." The world knows from its own bitter experience what this means. These spheres have been either hit by the Yankees' mailed fist or have fallen



- 2 -

under the radioactive shadow of their nuclear missiles.

The platform begins with Central America and the Caribbean. After some indistinct gabbling about "freedoms," its authors make a deliberate observation that two-thirds of the US foreign-trade shipping lines pass through the Caribbean and the Panama Canal. The implication here is only too obvious, and indeed, the above observation is immediately followed by undisguised threats to socialist Cuba and independent Nicaragua. It is "reminded" that El Salvador is closer to Texas than Texas is to New England, and so on. In other words, the whole of Latin America is announced a private ranch of Washington, while the wayward are advised to recall the example of Grenada.

Although the Middle East is farther from Texas than Texas is from New England, the Republican platform deftly throws it into the Pentagon's bag, too. After an awkward attempt to explain away the Lebanon tragedy, its principal makers proceed to praise the Israeli aggressors who are Washington's loyal policemen in the Middle East. The Platform provides for a further invigoration of the military-strategic alliance with Tel Aviv and for the galvanization of the defunct Camp David accords and the "Reagan plan," and abounds in open threats to Syria, Libya, the PLO and all other Arab states and organizations which refuse to give in to Washington's diktat.

The next item in the platform is Asia and the Pacific. This region, too, is viewed by the drafters of the platform as a reserve and inland lake of Washington's. The main accent is placed on the consolidation of the existing aggressive blocs there and on the formation of new ones. The platform guarantees "aid to the front-line states": South Korea, Thailand and Pakistan, and proclaims the unshakability of the system of American military bases in South Korea, Japan, in the Philippines and in the Indian Ocean -- naturally "for defending the vital sea-lanes." To Japan the platform prescribes a major



- 3 -

increase in military spending and building relations with China on the basis of the "common interest in countering Soviet expansionism," or on a common anti-Soviet basis. Here, incidentally, one should point to the arrogant imperative character of the platform. It is composed in such a way as if its provisions are mandatory not only for the US Republican party, but for the whole mankind as well. But then this is only natural, for imperial ambitions and megalomania have always come hand in hand and have always nourished and provoked each other.

Next Africa. The American neo-colonialists promise in their platform to safeguard that long-suffering continent from the "threat of new colonialism" coming from the "trilateral axis: the Soviet Union, Cuba and Libya" conceived by their raving imagination. In reality, the platform calls for the consolidation of the actual axis between Washington and racist South Africa. The authors of the document make a clumsy attempt to overlook the policy of apartheid pursued by Pretoria and to pave the way for the continued penetration by multinational corporations of the economies of developing African countries.

The platform does not make a mystery of the fact that American "aid" is motivated by unambiguous political demands. Its recipients must adopt the capitalist road of development and obediently allow themselves to be hitched to the American military-economic chariot.

Soviet-American relations and the closely related problems of the arms race naturally hold a central place in the draft platform of the US Republican Party. The platform's approach to Soviet-American relations is quite uniform. It is based on Dulles's policy from positions of strength, which has been only slightly rephrased: a policy of peace from positions of strength. But this hypocritical insertion changes practically nothing for it is still that same idee fixe of American world domination.



The platform authors make openly crude attacks against the Soviet Union in the spirit of Reagan's speech at the Westminster Palace and at his ranch in Santa Barbara and declare the Soviet system an anomaly. Disquisitions about the "anomaly" of socialism once again reveal the true meaning and far from accidental nature of Reagan's brash act. It was not just an inappropriate joke, but a reflection of Washington's inmost aggressive designs, its insane ideas of outlawing socialism and even crushing it by force of arms.

The simple method of putting the blame where it does not belong is especially in evidence when the platform authors go over to the problem of problems of our time -- the issue of war and peace. They reaffirm the principles and tasks of the 1980 platform which proclaimed a strategy of peace through force. Four years have passed since then. The United States has been feverishly building up its military might, but has this improved the prospects of peace? No, it has not. On the contrary, it is precisely Washington's race in nuclear missile and other arms that has made peace on this planet still more precarious. The existing rough balance of forces in the world arena does not suit American imperialism. It is trying constantly if unavailingly to erode the military parity between the USA and the Soviet Union, between the armed forces of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries. This maniacal purpose is served by Pentagon budgets which swell from year to year, with the momentum of the arms race acquiring an ever more dangerous nature. The principle of equality and equal security does not appeal to Washington, for this principle is incompatible with its claims to world hegemony. On the other hand, an upsetting of nuclear balance is seen by it as the way leading to imperial heights.

It is this approach to questions of war and peace that has been the root cause of disruption of Soviet-American talks in Geneva -- both on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe



- 5 -

and on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms. It is this approach that is holding back talks in Vienna on mutual reductions of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. It is this approach that underlies Washington's refusal to outlaw chemical and bacteriological weapons, that underlies its hypocritical manoeuvres around the Soviet proposal to prevent the militarisation of space. The platform describes the United States as country No.1 whose armed forces must dominate the world scene. It could not be said more clearly. It is for this that the United States is being turned into a garrison state, with its rulers viewing the rest of the world as if it were the Los Angeles Coliseum stadium, the scene of the recent 23rd Olympic Games of sad fame.

Lenin once called representatives of the extreme right wing of the Republicans a party of war. And 110 pages of the platform and Reagan's five minutes show conclusively that this definition of Lenin's is today more apt and pertinent than ever before. It urges the peoples to display vigilance in the face of the "war party's" schemes, to take firm action in defence of peace and the future of our planet.

(Izvestia, August 20. Abridged.)



Wednesday, September 12, 1984

ORIOVO-2639

2

"STAR-SPANGLED" ARMS BUSINESS

G. Tsagolov

When the US President, in a TV programme in March last year, called for a new comprehensive anti-missile defence system to be deployed, incorporating space-based elements, many Americans did not take that seriously. They thought it was a pure flight of fancy. But they were wrong.

Events followed each other in rapid succession. The first act was to set up special "analytical" commissions. With their estimates to go by, the Pentagon recommended last autumn that 26,000 million dollars should be set aside in the next five years for research to develop a number of space weapons systems. Last January, the President signed Directive 119 giving an actual go-ahead along these lines. Next came the first flight test of the ASAT anti-satellite system, part of the "Star Wars" arsenal. Each subsequent month bore out Washington's intention to take the arms race out into space.

x

x

x

Lockheed, Hughes Aircraft, Boeing, General Dynamics and other firms got down to research and development with a view to the military exploitation of transatmospheric space when the first artificial Earth satellites went up.

International detente and the Soviet-American accords of the early 70s stood in the way of the plans of the space weapons lobby. And yet they were at pains to pursue their business. The efforts of aerospace corporations and their political emissaries to secure a decision on the production of orbital-based weapons became particularly persistent from the latter



Wednesday, September 12, 1984

2

- 2 -

half of the 70s on. The hour of a "Star Wars" bonanza for arms business struck in the full sense of the term when the present Administration took office. As early as October 1981, the Fortune magazine wrote that the Administration wanted to have a system capable of destroying anything launched by the Soviet Union.

It was General D.Grahm, a former director of the Pentagon's Intelligence Department and Co-Chairman of the pro-militarist "Coalition for Peace through Strength," who was Reagan's adviser during the 1980 presidential election campaign, that was the standard-bearer of the "Star Wars" partisans. A "High Frontier" project was devised and advertised under the General's direction and with financial support from the extreme right "Heritage Foundation" organisation. It contained a detailed description of a large-scale depth-echeloned anti-ballistic missile system using a host of combat satellites and space stations in orbit at various distances from the Earth, equipped with a wide range of "death beams" capable of hitting enemy missiles and other targets in no time.

A notable role in producing and realising the fantasmagoric ideas of "Star Wars" is being played by nuclear physicist Edward Teller, known as the "father of the hydrogen bomb." He shared also in creating the world's first atomic bomb and did whatever he could to encourage the US ruling establishment to speed up the "Manhattan Project." At this moment, the "nuclear old man" is working at the Livermore Radiation Laboratory outside San Francisco on an "Excalibur" programme, designed to produce X-ray lasers actuated by the energy of nuclear explosions and targeting it through space at the velocity of light over distances of scores of thousands of kilometres. Teller is, furthermore, one of the pillars of the reactionary "American Security Council", and a member of the US Air Force Advisory Board.

Last spring the "Star Wars" programme was put under the control of its official director - General Abrahamson who had until then been in charge of the programmes for the production



of F-16 fighter-bombers by General Dynamics and a Rockwell International product - Space Shuttle craft designed to play an important part in Washington's space militarisation plans.

The United States' military-industrial élite is in the grip of a "star fever". Lockheed, Northrop, United Technologies, Avco, and Martin-Marietta besiege the Pentagon and Congress, offering their choice of sophisticated "Star Wars" armour.

US imperialism has fostered the military-industrial complex and placed it on a golden pedestal. J. Galbraith, a professor emeritus of Harvard University, who has studied the "anatomy of power" under Reagan, concludes that this is not civilian control, but a highly perverted management of the military-industrial complex by the military-industrial complex itself in the interests of the same military-industrial complex.

The war machine of imperialism has long been developing according to the laws of "its own logic." During the First World War, gun and other arms magnates of different powers, while expatiating about patriotism, united among themselves and participated in the enterprises that supplied weapons used against their own peoples. In the thirties American and British concerns actively participated in the revival of German arms manufacturing, with the monopolies of which they maintained economic ties even during the Second World War. The constant renewal, sophistication and updating of military equipment, which is being done to a noisy accompaniment of hypocritical statements about a "Soviet threat," has become the principal way of "self-expression" of militarism in our time. Unceasing, expanded reproduction of arms and large-scale and long-term military programs that ensure the military business guaranteed prosperity for a long period - such are the "requirements" of the modern military-industrial complex of imperialist powers,



Wednesday, September 12, 1984

2

- 4 -

above all the USA, which are continuously whipping up the arms race.

The special interest of the military-industrial complex in military space programs is easily explainable. Arms manufacturing corporations see unprecedented opportunities for enrichment in the production of sophisticated and highly expensive equipment for "star wars" and the newest types of weapon. According to the latest estimates made in the USA, the realization of the "space plans" of Washington will pump a truly astronomical sum of 1.5-2 trillion dollars from the American taxpayers' pockets into the coffers of the military-industrial complex.

It is well known that the more cunning one's schemes, the more sugar-coated one's words to cover them up. While shedding crocodile tears over the fact that a nuclear "sword of Damocles" now hangs over the world, the US President declares that militarizing space represents a "new hope for children in the 21st century" and urges scientists to focus their talent on producing means which would render nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete. The White House and the Pentagon are vainly trying to reassure the public that this only involves a modeling of an anti-missile defensive shield so as to safeguard the security of the USA and its NATO allies. Washington conceals in every way that the "anti-missile umbrella" conceived by the US ruling circles is in reality designed to "serve" the suicidal doctrine of a first nuclear strike and that with its help they expect to weaken the might of retribution and thus change the existing military-strategic balance in their favour. The White House is silent on the fact that the implementation of the sinister plans of preparation for "star wars" would signify a direct violation of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems of 1972. This is the most dangerous provocation - far more dangerous than the deployment of Pershing 2s or cruise missiles in Europe, notes outstanding American astronomer C. Sagan.



The "new initiative in the field of strategic defence" with which the US ruling circles have come out has nothing in common with defence. The current American leadership is the yes-man and executor of the will of the military-industrial complex, this most aggressive bellicose imperialist force which has for several decades been whipping up the arms race and imparts to modern militarism an ever more pronounced self-contained character.

Are those who still believe in the sham God-fearing posture of the present White House chief aware of this? So far time is still there to avoid a perilous space arms race and to prevent the militarization of space.

(Pravda, September 12. Abridged.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMALARI



Monday, September 10, 1984

ORI5V0-2608

9

GREEN BERETS AGAIN

S. Demidov

A ceremony devoted to the formation of a new, largest Green Beret unit of 776 men took place at the Fort Lewis air base in the state of Washington. Speaking at it, Major General L. Sattet, a representative of the American special-purpose troops command, declared that the United States again needs Green Berets in order to check "liberatory wars." The number of such units will continue to grow.

Well, the current US administration, which has declared a crusade against socialism and the national-liberation forces, is by no accident opening the highway for Green Berets. These special troops were established in 1952 as the striking force of US imperialism outside the United States. The thugs in Green Berets particularly "distinguished themselves" during the "dirty war" in Vietnam. Incalculable crimes in other countries also feature in their record. The American department of "cloak and dagger knights" - the CIA - has long since become one of the secret "bosses" of the Green Berets. Now in the guise of "advisers" they are teaching the art of murder to Nicaraguan, Salvadoran and Honduran punitive troops.

The Green Berets leave their traces wherever Washington considers it necessary to "protect the vital interests" of the USA.

Before the formation of the new unit, according to the press, the US armed forces included 3,700 Green Berets. In the near future the number of these murderers and terrorists is planned to be considerably increased, which conforms to the political line of Washington.

(Pravda, Sept. 10. In full.)



FACTS EXPOSE  
DANGEROUS SCHEMES OF NUCLEAR MANIACS

S. Shavlov

It is claimed in Washington that the United States does not need to assume the no-first-use commitment. Presumably, the US leadership have never thought of using nuclear weapons, even when the United States had the nuclear monopoly.

Those who claim this probably hope that there is no evidence of the opposite. But this evidence -- irrefutable evidence -- is found, in particular, in collected official documents on the international relations of the United States in 1953-1954, released by the US Department of State. The collection includes declassified records of meetings with the participation of top political and military leaders of the United States during the US aggression in Korea.

What do claims about Washington's "clean conscience" with regard to nuclear weapons look like in the light of the facts contained in those documents?

Claim number one. The United States has never planned the first use of nuclear weapons.

Facts. It follows from the documents that during 1952-1953 alone the question of the possible use of atomic weapons against the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was discussed 22 times at meetings of the US National Security Council and at other high-level conferences.

President Eisenhower said on March 30, 1953: If we go over to more positive (sic) action against the enemy in Korea, it will be necessary to expand the war beyond the boundaries of Korea and to use the atomic bomb.

General Hull, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on May 13, 1953: There are no good strategic targets in Korea itself but the military would like very much to use atomic weapons in any option involving operations outside Korea. Their use would be most



profitable from the purely military point of view.

P. Nitze, Director for Policy Planning at the US Department of State, on March 27, 1953: Politically, there is no insurmountable barrier to the use of atomic weapons.

Claim number two. US policy is based on the awareness of the consequences of the use of nuclear weapons and is characterised by a responsible approach to this matter.

Facts. In reality the US leadership were most of all pre-occupied with overcoming people's fear of nuclear weapons and with leading them to the idea that it was admissible to use those weapons.

President Eisenhower, on May 6, 1953: We should regard the atomic bomb as merely another type of weaponry in our arsenal.

Secretary of State Dulles, on March 31, 1953: One way or the other, the taboo on the use of atomic weapons must be broken.

Claim number three. The United States does not plan a disarming first nuclear strike.

Facts. The keynote of all documents is that the United States should use nuclear weapons first, in a surprise attack, and employ them on a large scale.

President Eisenhower on January 8, 1954: If we succeed in a simultaneous nuclear attack on all the forward air force bases of the Communists, the enemy will be bled white from the outset of the hostilities. It is our plan for Europe as well.

Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on January 8, 1954: The military are constantly working to cut back the 22-hour period needed to prepare a nuclear attack so that a nuclear bombing of the 22 enemy air fields in the Far East could be carried out as swiftly as possible.

Claim number four. The United States does not think in terms of nuclear escalation, limited nuclear war or attacks on civilian targets.

Facts. Basic adventuristic premises on which the US military doctrine rests today were formulated as far back as the early 1950s.



President Eisenhower (January 8, 1954): The worry of the military that they need time to prepare an atomic strike is understandable. They could begin by using conventional weapons until the atomic systems are ready for attack.

Defence Secretary Wilson (January 8, 1954): There is a divide between the strategic use of atomic weapons, for which Washington's authorisation is of course necessary, and tactical.

Bowie, Director, Policy Planning at the Department of State (December 3, 1953): Since the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff mean by enemy all the communists without exception, in practical terms all the Soviet and Chinese armed forces and military targets in the Far East will have to be annihilated by atomic weapons. Moreover, the proposal of the Joint Chiefs of Staff means atomic bombings of virtually all the Chinese cities.

Claim number five. The United States, in pursuing its nuclear policy, thinks about the security of its allies, consults them and respects their opinion.

Facts. Statements by the President and his aides leave no doubt that Washington guided itself exclusively by its own goals during that period, too, and viewed its allies as an obstacle to its plans to use nuclear weapons.

After being advised that Churchill was not enthusiastic about the use of atomic weapons, President Eisenhower wondered if Sir Winston had gone soft in his head.

Secretary of State Dulles (December 10, 1953): Churchill's belief that the use of atomic weapons by the United States would disgust the whole world only shows that the US views of atomic weapons are years ahead of the thinking of the rest of the free world.

Secretary of State Dulles (January 8, 1954): To neutralise the possible negative reaction of the allies to a US nuclear strike, it is necessary to exchange information with the West Europeans in the atomic weapons field and to allow some of them to acquire a few atomic bombs.



Claim number six. The United States has always had a "highly moral" attitude to nuclear weapons.

Facts. The kind of morality the United States followed is graphically illustrated by President Eisenhower's statement at a meeting on May 13, 1953. That statement needs no comment: Counting in dollars, it is cheaper to use in Korea atomic weapons than to continue to fight with conventional ones. This is particularly true in view of the cost of bringing conventional ammunition from the United States to the frontline.

It is the words of American leaders that paint Washington's true face.

The documents cited above show only a part of that disgusting face. In January 1954 President Eisenhower ordered that in future no records should be kept on the "more sensitive" questions discussed at the closed meetings.

But just as history has brought to light this horrible evidence of plotted crimes, it will one day reveal the truth about what Washington did and planned in the course of the US aggression against Cuba, Vietnam and Iran and the plans being hatched in connection with the deployment of US nuclear missiles in Western Europe and preparations for star wars.

The present US leaders have gone even further than their spiritual fathers in their gut hatred for socialism, in their militarist fever and in their obsession with nuclear weapons. Paul Nitze, who personally participated in conferences at that time, now conceals that he had championed the use of nuclear weapons but he is the same Nitze. Neither he nor other participants in those "military councils" ever showed a mere sign of moral indecision when they planned in cold blood the holocaust for millions.

They only failed to burn the world in a nuclear fire because even at that time they were not certain that they would escape retribution. This should be borne in mind also by those who are laying down US policy today.

(Izvestia, August 11. In full.)



Tuesday, January 22, 1985

OR115VO-207

POLITICS OF GUILLE

Valentin Falin

The diplomatic correspondent of Time magazine, Strobe Talbott said in his new book significantly called "Deadly Gambits" that some Washington officials had questioned the desirability of any agreement that would settle relations with America's chief adversary and limit her military potentialities. In the absence of such accords, those officials believed, the US would have a greater freedom to put new pieces on its half of the chessboard and secure such a position as would enable it to make winning military moves, if need be, in their game against the Soviet Union.

So the approach to the USSR, as they see it, must be governed by the overall framework of hostile relations and military considerations must take precedence over "high" politics. The National Security Council, Talbott said, had authorized the Joint Chiefs of Staff to produce assurances that no proposal about strategic arms reduction that might be put forward in the course of the talks and ultimately included in the agreement would stand in the way of resolving the new "strategic objective", implying a defeat of the Soviet Union. In that context, Talbott quoted a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as having declared that the Commander of the Armed Forces had ordered them to be ready at any moment to destroy the whole of the Soviet Union, all things everywhere, everything in any way essential.

Because of Washington's abrupt change of the "rules and purposes of the game", Talbott concluded, the last few years had seen a deep crisis of arms control. Naturally, that crisis would be impossible to overcome without the United States



Tuesday, January 22, 1985

- 2 -

2

renouncing the provocative guidelines for achieving American military superiority and establishing global American hegemony.

But the reason why I mentioned Talbott was not only because I wanted, with that well-known American expert present to bear me out, to emphasize the full complexity of the situation which has arisen through the US fault because of its disloyalty to the accords which made peace more stable in the 70s and opened up a favourable prospect for the future. I found it important to show that even many Americans, who have an inside knowledge of Washington's realities, are disturbed by the growing ill-feeling in certain US quarters towards equal agreements and law in general and towards the commonly recognized standards which enable the elementary order to be maintained in international communication.

An American researcher, R. Kolkowicz has been speaking about the "liberation of American strategic thinking" from most of "ethical deterrence". That is like saying that any means, even arbitrary practices, are good to achieve this end. The comment made by one of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, quoted by Talbott, was outspoken as befits a military man. It was, perhaps, more outspoken than Defence Secretary Weinberger would have liked it to be. The latter held forth in his report to Congress about the US determination to limit the scale, duration and intensity of the conflict. He was merely talking about it for he has never moved a finger to cancel or replace the guidelines for a total destruction of the adversary which all the services of the US Armed Forces are known to have been proceeding from all along. Servicemen are being urged in a hundred and one ways to accept the idea of American exclusiveness. The do-what-you-will principle does not remain a propaganda subject alone. It is being impressed through Army field regulations and through the practice of combat training.

Last year I had an occasion to offer you an excerpt from a standing NATO instruction for the North Army Group in time



Tuesday, January 22, 1985

- 3 -

2

of hostilities (No.6368/1/ Org and Trg NS 316/70). It referred to secret re-deployment of North Army Group forces by small units in time of increased alert or even before the start of that period, in the guise of an exercise, from peace-time locations to military target areas with a view to preparing for a subsequent rapid and unobstructed deployment. The instruction described it as "preparatory deployment" or "cover deployment" in pursuance, as another paragraph specified, of "offensive action". That is to say that the idea, disguised as an exercise or otherwise concealed, is to advance to starting positions and make a sudden attack. Suddenness, combined with a concentration of fire, is an earnest of success. In any case, as the NATO legend would have it, it must give the attacker some irreplaceable advantages.

It is not in Europe alone that such "exercises" are conducted on an American initiative. The United States has been doing the same thing in Central and South America, in the Middle East, in Asia and Africa. But for all I know it is not everywhere as yet that such exercises--to make them look best like actual combat operations--involve the use of the "potential adversary's" uniform by the men and officers of companies and battalions as well as by Air Force crews, all of them being issued with fake documents.

So what is on? American servicemen in the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany are made to put on Soviet uniform, issued with forged Soviet identification papers and compelled to act "Soviet aggressors". I am not interested to know how efficient they are in this impersonification. Europe is not a theatre, although somebody in Washington is still much too eager to see it as an attractive theatre of military operations. I am convinced that just as the Gleiwitz drama, which was the prelude to the Second World War, did not produce any stars for posterity to remember, so the present fancy-dress-ball shows will not add anything to the treasury of Melpomene. It is not for that purpose at all that they are being put on.



Tuesday, January 22, 1985

- 4 -

2

I have seen three authentic NATO fakes mentioned in the guide as "intelligence documents" for "field exercises". The first "document" is an "identification card" supposedly issued by "the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union". It has some space left inside for a photo. The heading "name" is given twice, and there is the space for vital statistics, indicating your stature, colour of your hair and eyes, your weight and your title. Nor are distinguishing marks overlooked. There is a page with imitated references to your service record and medical check-ups.

Or take an "officer's military service card". It is again said to have been issued by "the Ministry of Foreign Affairs". The order of vital statistics is a little different. It calls, notably, for information about your "family status", "civilian education", "military education", "employment", "unit".

Finally, there is a third fake, a "Komsomol card". Its reddish back carries the full name of the Leninist Young Communist League and a reference to "The Central Committee of the Komsomol" as the organisation which has supposedly handed you the card. Inside pages carry a remote semblance of the Order of Lenin and something that is supposed to remind you all at once of the Order of the Red Banner (Military) and the Red Banner (Labour) or an unfamiliar badge with a spade, a crescent and bars engraved on it. To make it look more convincing, it has indications of membership dues paid with a date and a "secretary's" signature.

Those are all most glaringly insolent fakes, to put it bluntly. All of the "intelligence documents" carry a note "only for exercise". But what does that change? One must presume that the personnel that are supplied with such fakes have no more knowledge of the Russian language than do the "specialists" who made the "cards".

The instruction as to how to use the "documents" contains a reference to a "plan of attack on enemy forces". This plan, we



Tuesday, January 22, 1985

- 5 -

2

find, "is usually kept in a battalion headquarters or, perhaps, in that of a company commander". "Usually", means that this plan and its fake accessories are not something out of the ordinary. In fact, they are part and parcel of the routine training programme. The plan provides for breakthrough operations by combat infantry machines (CIM) of a battalion with a tank company to reinforce it. A thousand men on tanks and CIM's with jet and conventional artillery attached to them acting as "red aggressors" are anything but a joke.

For we do know that the men across the Atlantic, free from "ethical deterrence", get even supersonic aircraft and combat ships resembling Soviet ones by their configuration and carrying identification marks used in the Soviet Armed Forces, involved in their undertakings. In short, they are trying out a full range of instruments designed to create a most realistic semblance of "threats" and justify the American "counter-measures" taken for "self-defence".

Ours are strange times. In the last half a century, man has learned more of the mysteries of matter and existence than at any time in his preceding history. And yet the "enlightened" United States still has no respect for Charles Darwin: an American cannot be a product of somebody or something. He is one in his own right. Nor do those obscurantists honour Ivan Pavlov because his idea is alleged to be "deforming" the minds of American children in a Communist spirit. There is a witch-hunt on against William Shakespeare, Mark Twain and other "dangerous" writers. The fires of the Ku Klux Klan, an American version of the Inquisition, flare up here and there now and again. Yet obscurantism and chauvinism are getting along perfectly with militarism. They are just like twin brothers, birds of a feather.

(Izvestia, January 19. In full.)

THE END



WHAT'S BEHIND THE US PRESIDENT'S "JOKE"?

A "Test of Voice" with a Nuclear

Accent

Melor Sturua

The world's public is excited and outraged. The remark made by President Reagan in Santa Barbara, California, last Saturday roused everyone, though in different ways. One must not play with fire and the Reagan administration has received a painful burn, giving the world another chance to see it as a warmonger and the main party responsible for the arms race.

The "voice test" on the Californian ranch was merely an echo of the aggressive policy pursued by Washington against the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries, the peoples fighting for national liberation and, lastly, all peaceloving mankind. In that "voice test" on the Californian ranch one could clearly hear the bursts of Pershing missiles test-launched in Florida, the salvoes of 16-inch guns of the battleship New Jersey in Lebanon, the explosions of mines planted by terrorists in Nicaraguan ports and the roar of bombers over the Indian Ocean. The "voice test" on the Californian ranch was just a continuation of the sabre-rattling practised by the advocates of the policy from strength.

Reagan's feelings towards the Soviet Union and to socialism and communism are well known. The expression "an evil empire" was not a "voice test." It was included in the official texts of his speeches. The problem is broader and deeper, however. There is more to it than the feelings of one man, even though he is vested with presidential powers. The kernel of the matter is that these "feelings," just as the "jokes," are rooted in the policy pursued by Washington today.

Although Reagan has not signed legislation "that would outlaw Russia," for four consecutive years he signed astronomical arms race budgets and instructed his delegations in Geneva, Vienna, Stockholm and other places to behave in a way that bars all



progress in the field of limitation and reduction of mass destruction weapons.

The remark made by Reagan in Santa Barbara last Saturday is backed up by the 313-billion-dollar defence appropriations bill for the 1985 fiscal year, the biggest defence budget in US history which exceeds the 1981 budget by 72 per cent. The remark made by Reagan in Santa Barbara last Saturday has not simply settled on a tape of the CNN television company. It is crying to the skies with "Star Wars" plans; it gnaws holes in the earth with MX missile silos; it dives under water with Trident submarines.

What was clear before has become crystal clear after Reagan's Herostratean "joke." I mean the monotonous and routine "no" which Washington says to all the peace moves made by the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries. This endless line of no's, for which American diplomacy won notoriety in the international arena, is not a "voice test" either. Nor is it even a test of our patience. It is a consistent and criminal effort to torpedo all foreign-policy moves that might consolidate peace and international security, help mankind ward off the threat of a nuclear disaster and guarantee mankind's future.

The American President's irresponsible "joke" played a bad trick on Washington's propaganda machine. Unwittingly, Reagan brought to naught all its efforts to create a semblance of a change in US foreign policy from confrontation to co-operation, peaceableness and readiness for sensible compromise. The "joke" also broke to pieces the statue of "a new Reagan" built to symbolise the President's transformation from an advocate of the cold war into a promoter of peace.

The President's outrageous remark has already gone down in history. It cannot be deleted, just as no one can delete the notorious Watergate records. Let the Americans and all mankind well remember what kind of jokes are made in the Washington halls of power. Let them remember this not as an example of cowboy



humour but as an unambiguous warning about the need to act resolutely and without delay. Peoples must respond to playing with fire by increasing their vigilance and to the "voice test" by raising their voice for peace and the future. The mad plans harboured by the warmongers should forever remain on television tapes and never materialise into a real war.

(Izvestia, August 15. Abridged.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA  
TÜSTAV



Tuesday, January 8, 1985

5

ORIOVO-73

SINISTER TRADITION

Vitaly Gan

It has already become a tradition in the United States that at the end of the outgoing year the US Administration, as if confirming its oath of loyalty to the arms industry, begins to reward the Pentagon's contractors with particular zeal. The eve of 1985 was not an exception in this respect.

According to the American press reports, in the last days of December more than 20 companies of the powerful arms industry received literally a heap of federal contracts on the development and production of deadly weapons. The cost of the contracts amounts to scores and in some cases to hundreds of millions of dollars. But the distribution of the main "rewards" still lies ahead -- in the current fiscal year of 1985 the appropriations for the Pentagon are planned at an unprecedented level, over 300,000 million dollars.

The list of those on whom the gifts have been lavished puts precise accents on the direction of the "main strike", which the US Administration now follows in its long-term but short-sighted programme of unprecedented arms build-up. The list of the recipients of the contracts includes the leading corporations of the aerospace sector of the American war industry, which supply ideas and technology in the sphere of space militarisation. Its backbone is formed by Boeing, McDonnell-Douglas, Rockwell International, General Dynamics, Texas Instruments and General Electric. It is in their laboratories and at their experimental plants that research into technological possibilities of implementing the adventurist "star wars" concept is being conducted.

This fact, among others, graphically illustrates the hypocrisy of the Washington representatives who tirelessly claim that the large-scale ballistic missile "defence" system



- 2 -

with elements of space basing will become the "decisive means" for ... radically reducing and even completely eliminating nuclear weapons. It is absurd even to suppose that the idea of helping resolve the problem of curbing the arms race and staying off the threat of nuclear destruction, the problem which is the most pressing for all mankind, has come to anybody's mind at the headquarters of the arms manufacturing corporations.

They are dedicated to tension in the world, continually fuelling it by brainwashing the population through the use of anti-Soviet and anti-Communist stereotypes. But the Big Lie fails ever more frequently. Millions of people who do not want to live on mountains of weaponry join the ranks of the anti-war movement which has engulfed all the continents.

(Pravda, January 8. In full.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH  
TÜSTAN ARASTIRMA



IN SUPPORT OF UNO

A. Ivkin

Fulfilment of the resolutions of the UN General Assembly depends first of all on the attitude of the UN members to them, i.e. on whether they themselves regard these resolutions as binding on them. The United Nations is not a "world government" empowered to force sovereign states to obey its instructions and orders. In keeping with the Charter, its resolutions of the general political character are nonbinding on the governments. But since such resolutions are adopted by a majority vote, it is clear that the sweeping majority of the world community is inclined to translate them into reality in their political practice. It is also clear that the countries which have voted against one or another proposal will not follow the recommendations issued in relation to it. This, in essence, reflects the struggle of the two diametrically opposite lines in international politics--the anti-imperialist, peaceable and progressive line, on the one hand, and the reactionary line trying to uphold the positions of imperialism which weaken under the pressure of the objective factors of the world's development, on the other.

There are 159 members in the United Nations, which means that almost all the states on our planet are represented in it. The UNO has won great moral and political prestige. And those who try to ignore the will of the majority of its members act vis-a-vis the international community as enemies of peace and cooperation. Herein lies the root cause of the "disappointment" of the imperialist countries, first of all the United States, with the United Nations. After a great number of countries which had cast off the yoke of colonialism joined the Organisation and the United



Monday, January 8, 1985

- 2 -

4

States lost the mechanic majority in the United Nations when the "voting machine", adjusted by it, began to fail ever more frequently, Washington started talking about "inefficiency" of the United Nations. Its present position with regard to the UNO can be qualified simply as an attack.

The USA, which is accustomed to view everything from the standpoint of a businessman, formulates the question point-blank: either the small countries, which make a correspondingly small contribution to the Organisation's budget, will follow in the wake of the US policy during the votings, or the United States and other democratic (this means capitalist--A.I.) countries should consider the possibility of their withdrawal from the UNO, as the extreme rightist organisation Heritage Foundation advised the Republican Party which is the ruling one in the USA.

The Americans' conduct at the 39th session of the UN General Assembly accords with the aforesaid. The United States voted against the UN resolutions almost on all key international issues relating to curbing the nuclear arms race, disarmament, and condemnation of aggression and repressive regimes. The United States is infuriated by the efforts of the peaceloving countries to use the UNO as an instrument for furthering the cause of disarmament, for establishing just economic relations, and for resolving global problems. The criticism at the United Nations of Israel, Chile and South Africa--the accomplices of the US aggressive policy--arouses its open anger.

In the course of all its activity at the United Nations the Soviet Union has firmly stood for strict observance of its aims and principles laid down in the Charter. As a result of the principled position of the USSR and other socialist and peaceloving states, at this Organisation effective steps in the sphere of disarmament have been taken and important international treaties and conventions have been drafted and signed. The UNO has attained positive results in eliminating colonialism.



Monday, January 8, 1985

- 3 -

4

The Soviet Union fully supports the efforts aimed at boosting the role of the United Nations as an instrument for strengthening peace and constructive cooperation of the states. Fresh evidence of this are the initiatives which the USSR launched at the 39th session of the UN General Assembly.

(Pravda, January 7. In full.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA  
TÜSTAV



# EXCHANGE OF VIEWS. DISCUSSION

## BOURGEOIS CONSERVATISM: REACTION ALL ALONG THE LINE

The WMR Commission for Problems of the Class Struggle in Industrialised Capitalist Countries sponsored an exchange of views about the substance and dimensions of the influence of bourgeois conservatism today. The participants in this exchange were Bruno Furch, Communist Party of Austria, Bert Ramelson, Communist Party of Great Britain, Johannes von Heiseler, German Communist Party, Domingos Lopes, Portuguese Communist Party, John Pittman, Communist Party USA, and Professor A.A. Galkin (Doctor of Hist.), department head at the Institute of the International Working Class Movement of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The following is a summary of the discussion.

The early 1980s saw an activation of conservative political forces in the capitalist world. The most obvious expression of this is their assumption of power in leading NATO countries-- notably the USA and also Britain and the FRG. Bourgeois conservatism is today affecting various areas of society's life and is a broad-based ideological, philosophical, and political school. The implementation of its tenets, which mirror mainly the interests of the imperialist circles and big capital, signifies, to use a phrase by Lenin, "reaction all along the line".<sup>1</sup>

While noting this activation of conservatism, the participants accentuated the fact that this is only one of the trends in the capitalist world today. There are in opposition to it

<sup>1</sup> V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 106.



powerful democratic trends and influential political forces.  
The objective processes of society's development create realistic prerequisites for the decline of the influence of conservatism, and this depends largely on how organised the resistance is of the forces opposed to it. Developments give many examples of how the right-wing forces suffer setbacks in their efforts to impose their supremacy on society. However, there should be no underestimation of the political and ideological offensive mounted by the reactionary, bellicose quarters of the monopoly bourgeoisie under the guise of modern conservatism (neoconservatism, ultra-conservatism, right-wing conservatism).

Depending on the actual situation, the "drift to the right" in individual countries manifests itself differently. In some countries (Britain, the FRG, Denmark, Norway, Belgium) it has led to the replacement of social democratic or bourgeois-liberal by bourgeois governments with various hues of conservatism. In others (France, Austria, Sweden), right-wing bourgeois circles are stepping up their attacks with the objective of seizing political power. In some cases an essentially neoconservative policy is pursued, albeit in a toned down form, by ruling social democratic parties themselves.

In the USA the latter half of the 1970s and the first half of the 1980s have been characterised by a shift of the centre of political life to the right. The election to the US presidency in 1980 of Ronald Reagan, who represents the extreme right-wing conservative quarters of the American bourgeoisie, and the policy pursued by the government in Washington have had some effect on



other capitalist states. To put it metaphorically, the USA has become the locomotive hauling the capitalist world in a conservative direction. Reagan's re-election in November 1984 for another four-year term only reaffirmed the preference that US monopoly capital now gives to conservative methods of administration.

It was stressed at the discussion that despite the installation of right-wing bourgeois governments, the conservative trend in Britain and the FRG is not as accentuated as in the USA. The victory of the British Tories at the 1979 elections was in large measure facilitated by the split in the Labour Party, thanks to which they won the majority in parliament without polling even half of the votes. Moreover, this was also a result of the impact of the majority electoral system. The Thatcher government's obvious failures in the economic and social spheres once again left the Tories well below 50 per cent of the votes at the 1983 elections. Nevertheless, the unfair electoral system enabled them even to strengthen their position in parliament.

In the FRG the turn towards conservatism was facilitated by the fact that when they were in power the right-wing socialist leaders pursued what, in many aspects, amounted to a conservative policy, and this eroded the support that they had among the population. The Free Democratic Party's defection to the opposition allowed the CDU-CSU bloc to seize power. It strengthened its positions at the 1983 elections.

In France, the results of the elections to the European Parliament in the summer of 1984, even with a small turnout



at the polls, unequivocally pointed to a strengthening of the right-wing forces, including the extreme right that is close to the fascists. In Italy the neofascist party compensates, as it were, for the certain decline, due to a number of reasons, of the influence once enjoyed by traditional conservative forces that dominated the nation's political life for several decades. In Austria the growth of conservative feeling affected the results of the latest parliamentary elections, in which the Austrian People's Party came a close second to the ruling Socialist Party.

Conservatism is making a weaker showing in countries that relatively recently shook off extreme right, fascist regimes: in Spain, Greece, and Portugal. The wounds inflicted by fascist rule and the memories of the close bond that existed between extremists-fascists and traditional conservatives are still fresh. Nevertheless, even in these countries conservative elements are consolidating themselves, trying to retrieve, even if partially, the positions they have lost.

The participants in the discussion were unanimous in the view that the working class movement had to take into account the changes in the bourgeoisie's political strategy, for these changes are significantly influencing the condition of the working people and the struggle they are waging for their interests.

#### Credo of the Right-Wing Forces

Local distinctions and national specifics do not alter the basic, general content of the credo of the monopoly bourgeoisie's



right wing. Spokesmen of conservative circles in industrialised capitalist countries are preaching what are, on the whole, identical views.

In the economy they are out to replace the reformist model of development based on the Keynesian methods of state-monopoly regulation and social manoeuvring by a monetarist model oriented on freeing private business from state interference, on the utmost encouragement for market relations, for private enterprise, and on reduced social spending. This is to be achieved by tax and other benefits for capital and a drastic growth of military expenditures. The economic programmes of the Reagan Administration, the Thatcher government, and the Kohl cabinet are publicised as a return to a "free market", although all they are doing is to lift some of the restrictions imposed earlier on the monopolies.

In the social sphere the more flexible liberal-reformist policy of promoting a social compromise has given way to an undisguised bent for an "austerity economy" at the expense of the working people. The former contention that a "social economy" can ensure "universal welfare" has been replaced by an apologia of "economic realism" purged of sentimentality. Hence the cutback of expenditures on the people's needs in many capitalist countries and the restrictions on social security programmes, and the widening gap between the poor and the rich. The reformist calls for "social harmony" are now outshouted by the assertions that inequality is a perpetual state, and this has been expressed in a consummate formula in Margaret Thatcher's



words about the "right to inequality". Guidelines of this sort are inducing the conservative forces in industrialised capitalist countries to make forcible attempts to take from the working class and all other working people what had been won by them in the hard-fought class battles of the preceding decades.

Taking advantage of the fear of unemployment, the conservatives have launched what amounts to an offensive in the real sense against the rights of working people and against their trade unions and political organisations. Actions such as the dismantling of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organisation in 1981 on direct orders from the US president and the police harassment of British miners (whose strike is the longest in the history of the British working class movement) are evidence of an inclination to intimidate the working people, to break their resistance to an anti-people policy. The readiness to ignore the rules of bourgeois democracy is accompanied by a striving to limit it on the pretext that there is a "surfeit of democracy" and that consequently the mechanisms of management are not effective enough.

Attention is attracted by the obvious intention of the conservatives, especially those in power, to divert the working people from domestic disorders by whipping up chauvinistic passions, jingoism, and militarist hysteria. In the USA the Reagan Administration persists in preaching the cult of a "strong America" prepared to use weapons, as has already been demonstrated on Grenada. The British conservatives organised a propaganda orgy over the "victory" in the conflict with Argentina over the



Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. The resultant wave of chauvinism helped them to win the parliamentary elections that were held soon after. In the FRG the ruling CDU/CSU bloc, aided by the FDP, is unabashedly whipping up revanchist feeling and supporting revanchist associations. Frenzied anti-communism and anti-Sovietism are the common denominator of all these efforts to mislead the people.

In foreign policy the accent on the use or threat of force is now more distinct than ever before. "Godless communism" is anathematised, a "crusade" has been declared against it, and the course has been set towards an aggravation of the confrontation with the Soviet Union and the socialist world as a whole. Brazen interference in the internal affairs of independent nations is said to be almost a "moral duty" before God. This is seen most clearly in the USA, where in terms of scale and expense a gigantic programme for "America's rearmament" has been started with the objective of achieving military superiority and putting the USA in a position to dictate its will to other nations. All the other NATO countries are following in the wake of Washington's adventurist policies, some with vacillations and reservations and others, notably Britain and the FRG, blindly, with their own militarist programmes.

The attitude to settling urgent international problems, it was noted at the discussion, is being worked out in accordance with the recipes of the conservative school of "political realism", which, proceeding from the fallacious theory that the struggle "for power and strength" is eternal and inevitable,



reduces all processes in the world to the "bipolar" confrontation of the USSR and the USA, and declares that the buildup of military strength is the sole form of this confrontation. In short, the aggressive aspirations implicit in imperialism generally and predicated by its "ancestral" features and the growing influence of the military-industrial complexes are to be seen in ever more sharp relief. The growth of conservative tendencies in domestic policy is giving the incentive for an aggressive foreign policy, which, in turn, facilitates the spread of conservative views.

On the whole, present-day conservatism is an anti-communist, anti-democratic, and anti-liberal trend permeated with hatred of social progress and its champions--all the democratic forces and progressive parties, the Communists in the first place.

The characteristic of the policy and ideology of modern conservatism, given at the discussion, sums up the common features inherent in the political circles representing it in industrialised capitalist countries. Further, it was pointed out that sight should not be lost of the fact that conservatism itself is heterogeneous, that the proponents of a "hard line" sometimes encounter resistance in their own ranks. In Britain, for instance, the Iron Lady, as Margaret Thatcher has been christened, has on several occasions had to reshuffle her cabinet in order to rid herself of ministers worried about the negative impact that her inflexible policies are having on the positions held by the Tories. On the other hand, in the USA even the accentuated confrontation course adopted by the



Reagan Administration in domestic and foreign policies has been criticised by the so-called "new Right", who speak for the most reactionary segment of the monopoly bourgeoisie. In the FRG, alongside the Christian Democrats, who support revanchist demands, there are conservative elements, albeit not many, who deplore the deployment of US nuclear missiles in the country. Generally speaking, in various countries there are in the conservative milieu, including the government, marked distinctions in the attitude to peaceful coexistence with the other social system--socialism. In the opinion of the participants in the discussion, this differentiation must be taken into account when present-day conservatism is assessed.

#### Roots of a Phenomenon

The discussion considered what is making the monopoly bourgeoisie turn to the ideology and practices of conservatism. On the historical level, this has always occurred in periods witnessing an aggravation of the crisis development of exploiting society.

In the 1930s, after the Great Depression, monopoly capital went much further in using traditional conservatism. In the onslaught against democracy and socialism the stake was placed on fascism. Differing, of course, from conservatism, fascism absorbed all of its key postulates: a hostile attitude to social progress, the preaching of a strong authority and dependence on military strength, the apologia of the hierarchal principle for society's structure, scorn for the working masses (the "plebeians"), and a hatred for social move-



ments aimed at reshaping social relations in the interests of the majority of humankind, and chiefly for communism, for the doctrine of Marxism.

After the Second World War neoliberalism and bourgeois reformism moved into the forefront in the bourgeoisie's ideological armoury. This was the consequence of fascism's military and political downfall, which led to the discrediting, world-wide, not only of fascist ideology as such but of conservative thought and currents that were, as a rule, direct or indirect allies of nazism. With the weakening of conservatism the most influential sections of monopoly capital resorted mainly to bourgeois-parliamentary forms of political power.

Meanwhile, the capitalist system's instability globally induced the ruling class, notably its most reactionary, bellicose quarters, to sustain conservatism as a reserve means of maintaining and consolidating its supremacy.

Drawing upon historical experience, the participants in the discussion showed why modern conservatism became active in the latter half of the 1970s. It was then that there was a sharp exacerbation of all of capitalism's contradictions. The years of a relatively stable economic development were superseded by a period of mounting instability. The cyclical crisis of 1974-1975 proved to be the most serious after the Great Depression of 1929-1933. The upswing of production that followed was sluggish and, more importantly, shortlived. The new crisis of 1980-1983 was long and its effects are felt to this day in a number of countries.



The deterioration of the economic situation brought with it a sharp aggravation of the contradictions in capitalist society. The material base of the policy of social manoeuvring, which was pursued by the ruling class in the preceding decades, shrank significantly. Moreover, large investments in new plant required the mobilisation of additional resources. Reluctant to surrender their profits and agree to a cutback of military expenditures, the reactionary monopoly circles saw as their only source of funds the dismantling of the system of social security created in the preceding years thanks to the struggles of the working people. A reconsideration of views commenced with the object of developing the most preferable forms of ensuring the political supremacy of the bourgeoisie. Those who during the post-war decades had oriented themselves on utilising bourgeois-democratic institutions and indirectly manipulating mass behaviour found their positions weakened. On the other hand, there was a growth of the influence of the proponents of "folding up democracy" and using direct political compulsion and violence.

Against the background of all these processes it was seen that imperialism could not compete with socialism by peaceful means in a situation of detente. And since the efforts to turn it into a weapon for "softening" and destroying socialism failed, detente was jettisoned. Conservatives, including those of the extreme right, were found to be best suited for the aspiration of imperialism's aggressive circles to put more pressure on the socialist world and the national liberation movement. The course towards achieving global military supremacy and ceasing cooperation with the Soviet Union, set



in the USA by the Carter Administration, was made the foundation of the policies of the Reagan Administration. The support that West European conservatives gave to Washington's illusory hopes of attaining "positions of strength" relative to the socialist community predetermined the consent of some NATO countries to the deployment of US nuclear missiles in Europe. This has resulted in a dramatic growth of the danger of a nuclear conflict.

The most reactionary groups of the monopoly bourgeoisie not only laid claim to but also got their hands on the direct levers of power largely as a result of the growing influence of the military-industrial complexes in the socio-political life of the leading capitalist states.

Conservatism, it was said at the discussion, proved to be the most suitable ideological and political instrument for realising the strategy of monopoly capital. Of course, in the various countries the new orientation taken by the ruling class manifests itself differently. But despite this diversity it is unquestionable that in the capitalist world this activation of conservatism in ideology and politics mirrors general in-depth tendencies. It is a result of the sharp aggravation of capitalism's crisis and is a form in which this aggravation manifests itself. The ruling class counts on this replacement of bourgeois-liberal and bourgeois-reformist by conservative methods of administering society producing a means of taking the edge off the crisis development and, correspondingly, strengthening the power that it enjoys.



Social Changes and the Mass Consciousness

At the discussion much attention was given to the factors that help to spread conservatism's influence in the various strata of capitalist society. As the experience of recent years demonstrates, the right-wing parties are managing to win, at elections, the votes of a large section of the working people, including industrial workers. Noting this fact, the participants in the discussion spoke of the complexity and diversity of the processes that bring certain support to the conservatives. The deterioration of material condition under the impact of the crisis and the mounting social instability and uncertainty about the future are simultaneously evoking protests and fostering conservative feeling among the people. On the one hand, social demands and the readiness to fight for them are mounting and, on the other, a predominant factor guiding a section of the working people is their fear of change for the worse, a desire to preserve the status quo, and a belief that the conservatives are better equipped to cope with economic difficulties. The diversity in the response to the crisis and to the offensive of the capitalists springs from the dissimilar experience and class consciousness of the various social strata.

While noting the determination of the most conscious circles of the working people, chiefly the working class, to fight for their rights and interests, the participants in the exchange of views tried to ascertain what conditions contribute to the spread of conservative feeling.



The postwar decades saw the rapid break-up of long-established, traditional production structures. In a number of industrialised capitalist countries there appeared large social groups that had lost their former status in society and were compelled to abandon their accustomed life-style and adjust to the new conditions. Of determining significance for the working class was the intensive growth of its ranks through (a) the diminution of the number of people engaged in agriculture and (b) the swift growth of groups of working people employed on non-physical jobs (junior clerical workers, technicians, rank-and-file engineers, and so on).

Of course, these processes proceeded dissimilarly by virtue of the specific conditions obtaining in the different countries. For instance, in the USA, where the traditional peasantry has long been replaced by capitalist agricultural enterprise, the changes in the social structure of the population were dictated mainly by the appearance of new branches of production and the expansion of the services industry. The people employed in the latter industry are weakly unionised and their class consciousness is low. They are consequently often compelled to accept smaller pay and poorer social conditions. By virtue of their political backwardness such groups of the population are, more than others, exposed to the ideological influence of conservatism.

In Britain new strata of working people have formed under the impact of the reorganisation of economic structures. Half of these joined trade unions recently and have no experience of class struggle. That a section of them voted for the Tories is, however, due not so much to acceptance of the Thatcher policies



as to their protest against the fact that the preceding Labour government undisguisedly shifted the burden of the economic crisis to the working people by raising taxes, prices, and so on. A similar situation was taking shape in the FRG. There the conservative thinking of a section of the workers was to some extent fostered by the policy of social partnership pursued by the Social Democrats and the trade unions linked to the latter. In a broader context it may be said that the idea of social partnership, in other words, renunciation of the class struggle for the sake of agreement with capital, is a form of the penetration of the bourgeois way of thinking into the minds of the workers. To a large extent this is applicable, for instance, to Austria, where the ruling Socialist Party likewise preaches a concept of social partnership. In that country, as in some other states, the army of wage workers has been increased through the influx of ruined peasants, who brought with them their traditional conservative thinking.

The integration of these groups with the working class proceeded and continues to proceed with contradictions. In cases where they found themselves in united workers' collectives with militant traditions they assimilated proletarian ideology and methods of struggle more easily. In other cases, dissatisfaction spilled over into the backward political views disseminated among unorganised masses.

Although the addition of new strata contributed to the growth and strengthening of the working class, their ideological integration lagged far behind their socio-economic integration with the workers. Even where they assimilated proletarian methods



of struggle (strikes and unionisation), many members of these strata clung to their former, in many cases conservative, political orientations.

Since the close of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s the capitalist way of using scientific and technological achievements has led to a sort of division of production into "promising" (developing) and "unpromising" (dying) industries and the relocation of new industries to "interior" regions, where traditions of unionisation and class struggle are non-existent. The brutal, asocial methods of dismantling "unpromising" industries evoked in working people the natural striving to preserve their jobs. This has generated a guarded attitude to technological progress, an attitude that is used by the conservatives.

Further, the structural reorganisation of production is accompanied by an aggravation of class battles involving those who are losing their jobs and those who are entering new industries. The latter are quickly finding the advantages of organising in trade unions and of workers' solidarity in safeguarding their interests. In combination with the activities of left-wing parties, of the Communists above all, this is creating the prerequisites for limiting and surmounting the influence of conservative ideology.

The image of the "social state", of the "welfare state" allegedly capable of giving all citizens a high standard of living, an image formed in preceding years, was shattered in the mass consciousness by the blows it received from one crisis after another. Since the policy oriented towards the broad



utilisation of state-monopoly regulation and, consequently, expansion of the sphere of state intervention in society's life, was identified with it, this policy was the first to be discredited. Simultaneously, the political parties that implemented this policy—in most cases liberal and social democratic but in a few instances centrist-reformist—found their influence downgraded.

Workers with experience of class battles saw the changes in the political situation as stemming from the exacerbation of capitalism's contradictions. For many working people this realisation served as the impetus to shed the illusions, spread by bourgeois propaganda, about the possibility for "social harmony" under present-day capitalism, and to go over to a more consistent class position.

However, individual groups of workers, disenchanted in myths of the "welfare state" sort, that had determined their way of thinking in previous years, lost their orientation. Coming under growing socio-economic and ideological pressure from capital, they are accepting a deterioration of the conditions of their life in the hope that a consensus, based on "lesser expectations", will allow them to retain their jobs and create the conditions for a subsequent return to the former living standard.

Reflecting these sentiments, some right-wing leaders of the British Trades Union Congress, for example, tried to arrive at such a consensus. Drawn up in mid-1983, the "new realism" concept suggested that working people should take the reality of the capitalist crisis into account and meet employers "half-way". This concept encountered strong opposition in the branch trade



unions and was ultimately rejected. In 1983 trade union leaders in the FRG consented to a wage cut for working people under new collective bargaining agreements in an effort to find a base for a "reasonable compromise" within the framework of "social partnership". At the present stage the "lowering of social claims" is making for a more "tolerant" attitude on the part of a section of the working people to the policy of social dismantling pursued by the conservative forces.

However, the consent of some groups of the population to a lowering of their living standard cannot be long-lived and durable. It only encourages the capitalists to mount a new assault on the interests of the working class. The class conscious segment of the workers is determined to protect its rights. A striking example of this is the many months' long strike of the British miners. It began in defence of the right to work, as a protest to the closure of a number of pits on the pretext that they were unprofitable, but it gradually acquired a political significance, the character of a clash of the British working class with Tory economic policy. This has been underscored by the great tidal wave of solidarity with the miners that has rolled across the country's frontiers.

The growth of the influence of conservative ideology on the working class is obstructed by the latter's objective position in exploiting society. Under crisis conditions what we are witnessing is not so much a diminution of proletariat's militancy as a narrowing of the former base for concessions on the part of the bourgeoisie. The impact of this factor on the class confrontation depends largely on the stand taken by the trade union leader-



ship and also on the potentiality of the powers that be for conducting a "hard line" towards the working class movement. In Britain the miners' confrontation with the government has acquired an exceedingly acute form. In the FRG the initially defensive actions of the working people against unemployment have evolved into an attack with the demand for a 35-hour working week without pay cuts. As this movement gained momentum it was joined by the leadership of some trade unions that had at first held aloof.

A huge potential for an assault has been demonstrated in many West European countries by the struggle of large numbers of working people against the deployment of US nuclear missiles. In many cases this potential is growing into actions against the militarist policies of the USA and NATO, against the arms race, which the latter are escalating, and the accompanying threat of a nuclear disaster. This spells out resistance to conservatism in foreign policy.

It was stressed at the discussion that conservatism should not be regarded as an almost inevitable outcome of the aggravation of capitalism's contradictions. Socialist parties suggesting a reformist way out of the crisis are in power in some Southwest European countries. The reforms that have been carried out in these countries in the interests of the working people were made possible by the struggles waged by the working class and democratic movements against the policies of right-wing elements. In Portugal the counter-offensive of the reactionaries, now being conducted with the hands of right-wing Socialists, is encountering stiff resistance from the people, chiefly from the working class. The democratic movement is thus in a position to place a limit on the



penetration of conservatism into the working class milieu.

Although conservatism has been able to bring a section of the workers under its influence, it has not had decisive success. The story is somewhat different in regard to its influence on the middle strata, including the petty bourgeoisie, various categories of white-collar workers, and intellectuals. Their values, guidelines, orientations, and political behaviour have undergone serious tests since the end of World War II. The traditional belief that they enjoy a status "superior" to that of the working class has failed the test of reality. The crises of the past decade have brought many of them material losses, a decline of their status in society, and a limitation on their social mobility. But this did not necessarily lead to the disappearance of their illusions about their status. On the contrary, some groups identify themselves with the privileged class, showing an involvement in conservative ideas and values, this being particularly typical of the petty bourgeoisie. In its midst there has been greater hostility for the trade unions and the strike struggle, which it sees as one of the principal causes of its economic difficulties or as the main impediment to economic recovery.

While the position of junior office employees in the system of social reproduction and their susceptibility to conservative ideas differ little from those of workers, the middle echelon of white-collar workers is much more susceptible to the impact of these ideas. Members of this group are psychologically tied in more closely with the capitalist social system and are inclined to accept elitarian and technocratic theories.



The exacerbation of the crisis development in the latter half of the 1970s and the early 1980s was seen by a considerable segment of the middle strata as evidence that the liberal reformists were wrong in pursuing a policy of increasing the public, notably socio-economic, functions of the state. Hence this segment's growing support for conservative ideology.

A strong eruption of nationalism has become a specific form of the middle strata's reaction to the falling living standards. In the industrialised capitalist countries the edge of this reaction is often directed at immigrant workers. Regrettably, a section of the working people is involved in the wave of xenophobia. On account of the mass unemployment immigrants have come to be regarded chiefly as rivals for jobs. Nationalistic feeling has also been shown relative to the peoples of developing countries, to whom, largely under the influence of the bourgeois mass media, the responsibility is imputed for the deeper and more frequent economic crises, the rising rate of inflation, unemployment, and so on. Such ideas evoke hostility also towards those states whose stand prevents former imperialist metropolises from regaining their colonial spheres of influence, above all towards socialist states.

The fact that the middle strata are more susceptible to the influence of conservative views than the working class does not at all signify that they are totally submissive to the conservatives. In the USA, for instance, a large proportion of these strata are not relinquishing their bourgeois-liberal views and at the 1984 presidential elections the Democratic candidate Walter Mondale received many votes. In the FRG the Greens and the alternative movements draw support mainly from the middle strata. It would therefore be wrong to ignore the latter's considerable anti-conservative potential.



Further, the discussion touched on the role played by de-classe or marginal elements that have been pushed out of society's social structure. Capitalism is constantly enlarging their ranks with the victims of unemployment or of the structural re-organisations of industry. In periods of crisis this process is stepped up perceptibly. Declasse elements are to a large extent inclined to rebellion, which can, however, be funneled in any direction. Political obscurity, instability, and the absence of distinct social aims often turn them into the "political infantry" of the conservative forces.

The aforesaid does not, naturally, mirror the entire sum of the changes taking place in the social consciousness in industrialised capitalist countries. An aim of the discussion was to identify above all the trend towards the reanimation and spread of conservative views in various social strata and groups. But it is quite apparent that conservatism is not inescapable in the capitalist world and that it is meeting with resistance in different strata of society.

#### Resistance Is Possible and Necessary

The participants in the discussion were unanimous in the view that contrary to the will of the conservative forces their anti-people domestic and aggressive foreign policies are building up an enormous potential for resistance from the people. In the obtaining situation the political parties championing working class interests are concentrating on repulsing the offensive mounted by conservatism, defending and increasing the social gains of the working people.



It was noted at the discussion that conservatism's most vulnerable aspect is that its recipes for resolving domestic and external problems are totally incompatible with the actual imperatives of the day. State-monopoly capitalism has shown how archaic and untenable the economic theories are that had been borrowed from capitalism of the days of free competition. The stake on force in foreign policy, to say nothing of the danger of such a course to the whole of humankind, can offer no hope in the face of the growing strength of the world socialist system.

Conservatism is trying to benefit by the loss of orientation on the part of a section of the working people, especially in view of the crisis exacerbation of capitalism's contradictions. But the way out of the crisis and the means of "improving" the economy offered by it only signify additional help for the monopolies at the expense of the people. In this lies conservatism's main weakness, for sooner or later, the implementation of its recipes inevitably alienates those strata of the population that support it. The growth of the mass protest movement and of the strike struggle of the working class in Britain, the FRG, and Belgium, and the shift to the left of such influential contingents of the social democratic movement as the Labour Party of Great Britain and the Social Democratic Party of Germany are bringing about a polarisation of political forces, eroding the social base of the conservatives, and undermining their position. In this connection it was pointed out at the discussion that the efforts of the communist parties to reinforce and promote class consciousness in the working class movement were of paramount significance. It is important that disappointment in conservative



methods should not take the shape of leftist or right-radical negativism, that it should acquire a definite class, anti-capitalist orientation.

In its pronouncements modern conservatism dissociates itself from extreme right-wing currents. Indeed, it differs perceptibly from them in a number of ways. Nevertheless, there is a genetic kinship between conservatism and right-wing radicalism, including the latter's fascist variety. Right-wing radicalism only brings the underlying postulates of conservatism to their logical end. This likewise increases its vulnerability in the face of the people's democratic and anti-fascist potential in industrialised capitalist countries. In exposing neofascism, which is, for example in the FRG and Austria, supported by conservative forces, the Communists reveal its camouflaged link to conservatism.

The activation of the people's anti-conservative potential in capitalist countries is an important aspect of the work of communist parties. This work proceeds differently, depending on the actual political situation. Nevertheless, a common feature of this work, in the opinion of the participants in the discussion, is the cohesion of all left and democratic forces, establishment of cooperation with democratic and liberal circles, including those of the bourgeois camp, in order to repulse the attack from the right effectively. This political line was, in particular, reaffirmed at the latest congresses of a number of communist parties. For instance, the 7th Congress of the German Communist Party declared: "It is legitimate and justified that in the Social Democratic Party of Germany they have made up their



minds to regain governmental power as soon as possible... The more resolutely the SPD adopts the stand of the trade union and peace movements, the more it relies on the democratic forces, on the left-of-the-CDU majority, the more realistic will its chances be of inflicting a defeat on the currently ruling parties at the elections. In conducting this policy the SPD will always find that we, Communists, are not adversaries but supporters, albeit of a critical frame of mind." The Communists are oriented on cooperation with democratic elements in all strata of the population and they use concrete examples to expose the nature of conservative policy, which is directed against the people to the benefit of big capital and imperialist reaction.

The people are finding the communist programme of safeguarding world peace and limiting and ending the arms race increasingly more attractive. US imperialism's adventurist first-strike guideline and its efforts to achieve, for this purpose, military superiority over socialism--hence the unprecedented arms race started by Washington--have evoked an explosion of protests among all classes and strata of the population. The powerful, anti-imperialist-slanted peace movement is objectively opposed to conservative reaction. While doing their utmost to promote . this movement the Communists are trying to wean the people from the influence of conservatism.

A lesson of history is that the loss by conservatism of its mass base is not always the guarantee that it will depart from the political scene. Once gaining possession of the levers of power, it does not relinquish them without a fight, and if it



feels that it may be defeated it has increasingly more forceful recourse to violence and moves ever farther to the right. Drawing upon experience, the Communists are warning the working people against harbouring illusions about conservatism being ready to comply with bourgeois-democratic "rules of the game" or even elementary constitutional legality. Authoritarian tendencies are not at all alien to modern conservatism.

The participants in the discussion were unanimous in believing that the working class and its trade unions and political organisations, and the left forces generally have every possibility not only of repulsing the offensive of conservatism but also of inflicting a crushing defeat upon it. Key conditions of success are the consolidation of the working class, the settlement of the divergences between its various groups, and the liberation of the middle strata from the influence of conservatism. In this context it is of decisive significance for the left forces to advance compelling alternative economic and political programmes and work tirelessly to put them into effect.



THE PENTAGON'S TRICK

The Republican Administration has not changed its course of the previous four years -- the stake on the arms race and the desire to gain at any cost military superiority over socialist countries. This conclusion is drawn by G. Vasilyev, Pravda Washington correspondent, commenting on the farce staged in the USA and aimed at producing the impression that the Pentagon's budget is being reduced.

As the reference point for "reductions" the Pentagon style, the correspondent notes, Washington takes not the military budget for the 1985 fiscal year, which has already been endorsed, but much higher figures for the future which are being sought by the US military-industrial complex.

As a result, the Pentagon's budget, which has reached about 300 billion dollars in the 1985 fiscal year, is to increase up to 313.7 billion in 1986, up to 362.6 billion dollars in 1987, while in the 1988 financial year it will attain the enormous figure of 411.5 billion dollars. Even with the corrections for inflation the growth of military spending over the next three fiscal years will amount to 6.4, 8.1 and 8.8 per cent, respectively.

The semblance of reductions is achieved mainly due to manipulations with salaries of the military -- regular salary rises have been transferred from the budget of one year to the budget of another year. But the main thing is that the saving Weinberger's style will not relate to a single rearmament programme adopted by the Republican Administration. As it has been planned, new strategic first-strike weapons -- MX and Midgetman intercontinental ballistic missiles, ballistic missiles of Trident-2 submarines, B-1B and Stealth strategic bombers, Pershing 2 and Cruise long-range missiles -- will be created in full swing. The militarization of space is being accelerated, including the realization of vast plans of deployment of anti-missile defence with space-based elements.



Monday, December 23, 1984

2

- 2 -

Thus, the Pravda correspondent concludes, in actual fact military spending is to be raised at very fast rates, while social programmes -- aid to the poor, the creation of jobs for the unemployed and health care for the needy -- are being slashed.

(Pravda, December 24. Summary.)

TÜRKİYE SOSYAL TARİH ARAŞTIRMA KURUMU  
TÜSTAV



"TRUTH VS. LIES"

The newspaper Vodny Transport published an article under the headline "Truth Vs. Lies" about the activity of traitors and renegades harboured by the so-called "People's Labour Alliance," a motley group of rabid anti-Sovieteers who enjoy patronage of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

In April 1984, the newspaper writes, a certain Eduard Ginzburg made an attempt to palm off anti-Soviet leaflets on Soviet sailors, who arrived on board the trawler V. Adonkin, on a beach near Las Palmas, Canary Islands. They rejected his dirty provocation and forced the "distributor" to tear up the leaflets and bury them in sand.

Who is Ginzburg? He was born in Moscow 52 years ago, worked as assistant cameraman at a film studio. By the age of forty, he suddenly developed an unchecked desire to unite with some relatives in Israel. No one kept him, so Ginzburg left for the "promised land." His "patriotism" did not last long, however, and he started looking for an easier life. Finding himself in West Germany, he got involved with "Liberty" radio station and then with the "People's Labour Alliance."

In order to get access to the feeding ground for renegades of all sorts and gain weight among anti-Sovieteers, Ginzburg started mongering scandals. In 1979, at the world hockey tournament in Vienna, he was detained by police for hooliganism and given ten days in jail. After that, he was offered a "job" to spread anti-Soviet literature among Soviet sailors working on international routes. The newspaper described how he did this on the example of the incident in Las Palmas.

He did not report the incident to his bosses from the "People's Labour Alliance." Of course, Americans from the CIA are not interested in Ginzburg, he is too small a fry for them.



- 2 -

He "works" for the "People's Labour Alliance" whose bosses, in turn, serve the Americans. By the way, the newspaper recalls, the PLA not always served them. Shortly after the white emigrant organization was formed, before the war, the "Alliance" served the Gestapo. Its chieftains, trumpeting that they "stand up for Russia," were faithful and loyal servants of Hitler who wanted to erase Russia from the map of the world and exterminate the Russian people. Surviving the defeat of the Third Reich, the remnants of the "Alliance" members turned to the British and then to the Americans. The hands of the majority of them are stained with blood of Soviet partisans, prisoners of war and civilians from temporarily occupied Soviet territories.

Bandits from the "Alliance" now pose as "fighters for democracy and human rights." But the essence of their activity remains, as ever, anti-Soviet. Yesterday, it was the Gestapo, at present, it is the CIA, with the bosses having the same aim (although unattainable) of crushing socialism.

The rabble of all sorts are gathering together in response to a call for a "crusade" proclaimed by extreme imperialist reactionaries. "Heil dollar", shout characters of the Ginzburg type. All he cares about is how to get his piece of the pie, there is nothing he cannot do. His tours of ports are paid by the "Alliance," but Ginzburg deceives them as well. He makes up reports saying how many "literature" he palmed off on Soviet sailors. But this is a lie. That is why he throws the leaflets away and fabricates financial reports that are sent to his superiors.

Well, the newspaper concludes, this is what the "People's Labour Alliance" also does. It deceives its bosses from the CIA, claiming that the USSR is just short of shattering under the "Alliance's" onslaught. It is not known if the bosses believe it, but they continue to provide money for the parasitic existence of the gang.

(Vodny Transport, December 27. Summary.)

THE END



Saturday, December 29, 1984

ORIOOVO-3638<sup>3</sup>

7

Scanning Periodicals

REVIEW OF THE JOURNAL "USA: ECONOMY, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY"

No.12, 1984

The journal carries an article "Money in Election Campaign" by N. Sakharov. When a regular election takes place in the United States, not only the personality of the candidates and their election promises but also the information on the funds which they spend on the election campaign are in the focus of attention, the author writes. In the context of the great diversity of the sources of finance for elections, the decisive force are the biggest monopolies which wield immense financial resources. The mighty banks and corporations, the leading business organisations and the biggest businessmen have enormous influence on the outcome of elections and after them, on the policy of those who come to power as a result of the elections. The data for the past 25 years show the rapid growth of the funds which are spent on election campaigns in the USA (from 175 million dollars in 1960 to nearly 1,000 million dollars in 1984). Particularly great sums are spent on the Presidential election campaigns.

The greatest part of American business clearly tends to support the Republican party because it carries out a more conservative policy which accords with the ideological and political positions of the majority of the US business community. The alliance between the big businessmen and the Republicans has consolidated even more during the rule of the Reagan Administration which is the most pro-corporation administration in the postwar history of the United States. The election campaigns in the USA have long become a special sector of political business with multimillion capital turnover, N. Sakharov notes.



- 2 -

N. Turkatenko publishes the article "Washington After Elections." Has Ronald Reagan's victory been as much of a "landslide" as it is presented, the author asks? Figures and facts give no conclusive corroboration of a "landslide," although at a first glance it is there. Ronald Reagan has indeed won an unprecedented number of electoral votes: 525 out of 538. Walter Mondale had to his credit only 10 votes in his home state of Minnesota and three votes from the Columbia district.

However, this does not signify that Ronald Reagan had an overwhelming, or even simple majority of votes. In keeping with the US electoral system, the entire electoral vote in a state goes to a candidate who has received 50 per cent plus one vote of all participating electors.

The scale of US electoral absenteeism and its causes are well known. They proved quite significant this time too. According to preliminary estimates, 60 million US citizens eligible for vote did not even think it necessary (or found it impossible) to register in the elections. In addition, 25 million out of 115 million of those who put their names on the voting list failed to turn up at polling stations. In all a little more than 90 million persons took part in the voting. As a result Reagan polled 53 million votes, or 30 per cent of all Americans eligible for vote, and Walter Mondale had 37 million votes or 20 per cent. So this gives no ground to speak about the "national support" for the Reagan policies and the ensuing "general mandate," N. Turkatenko says.

E. Henry publishes an article, "Collusion Between American and German Corporations." The alliance between the leading American and German monopolists, the author writes, undoubtedly represents a significant component of the capitalist world's modern history, as many things in the international affairs continue to be linked to this alliance.



- 3 -

Deals between companies of various countries are described in stock exchange reference books and are sometimes covered by mass media. In the past, however, most of such deals were kept secret. Although the United States and bourgeois Germany were in opposing camps in both world wars and are still rivals at world markets, the corporate capital maintains strong links between both countries, the links many think have resulted from the arms race. Reports to this effect are run on a regular basis, although the most important details are still kept secret.

To all appearances, the postwar years have been marked with the exact repetition and continuation of the process which started shortly after World War I and played a major role in global behind-the-scenes politics in the 20s and 30s. Of course, the point is not that some corporations reach agreements as the arms race goes on. In this particular case, E. Henry suggests, the point is / <sup>that there is</sup> a large-scale collusion between American imperialists and West German revenge seekers, for none of them have learned anything from the bitter lessons of the 30s and 40s and are again playing with fire.

The journal also carries the following articles: "Missile Defence System Limitations--Problems, Lessons, Prospects" by A. Arbatov, "U.S. and Mexico's Economic Problems" by V. Kudrov, "Canada: Conservatives in Power" by S. Danilov, etc.

(APN)

THE END