

~~020007~~

033007

JPRS-UIA-86-046

23 OCTOBER 1986

USSR Report

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20000104 144

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

USSR REPORT
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

UN Financing, Budgetary Process Described
(I. V. Pochigayev; IZVESTIYA AKADEMII NAUK SSSR: SERIYA
EKONOMICHESKAYA, No 4, Jul-Aug 86) 1

Link Seen Between Western Ideology, Politics, Propaganda
(Eduard Ya. Batalov, et al.; OBSHCHESTVENNYYE NAUKI,
No 1, 1986) 18

Racist, Nationalist, Other Aspects of Neoconservatism Exposed
(T. Kondratkov; KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL, No 10, May 86) 28

Briefs
New Geneva UN Representative 36

UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Soviet-American Conference in Jurmala Described
(PRAVDA, 20 Sep 86; IZVESTIYA, 28 Sep 86) 37

Media's Role Discussed, by T. Kolesnichenko,
B. Grishchenko 37
Results Summarized, by V. Matveyev 39

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR Quoted on Radio Liberty, RFE
(IZVESTIYA, 15 Sep 86) 42

WESTERN EUROPE

Greek Veto of U.S. Nuclear Modernization Praised
(Moscow in Greek to Greece, 16 Jul 86) 43

France Renounces Independence, Aligns With U.S. (Vsevolod Mikhaylov; Moscow in French to France and Belgium, 1 Sep 86)	45
FRG Social Democratic Party Congress Reported (PRAVDA, 30 Aug 86; TASS, 29 Aug 86)	47
Policy Platform Outlined, by Yu. Yakhontov	47
Congress Ends	48
Commentary Views Western Perspective on Berlin (Moscow World Service, 3 Sep 86)	50
Soviet Delegate Addresses Nordic Council Environmental Meeting (TASS, 8 Sep 86)	51
Saxony Election's Implications for FRG CDU Government Weighed (Yuliy Yakhontov; PRAVDA, 18 Jun 86)	53
Briefs	
Danish Parliamentary Delegation	55
German CP Delegation	55

CHINA/FAR EAST/PACIFIC

Soviet Media Shows Positive Aspects of China-USSR Relations (KOMMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 12 Sep 86; Moscow Television Service, 15 Sep 86)	56
Beijing Mayor Interviewed, Chen Xitong Interview	56
PRC Visit Favorably Evaluated, by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov	57
Japan's Defense Force Reportedly To Receive Nuclear Subs (S. Agafonov; IZVESTIYA, 16 Jul 86)	59

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

Pakistan's Political Unrest Viewed, U.S. Support for Zia Hit (V. Skosyrev; IZVESTIYA, 19 Sep 86)	61
Iran's Aims of 'Islamic Expansionism' Seen in War With Iraq (G. Chipashvili; KOMUNISTI, 25 Jul 86)	65
USSR-Algeria Protocol on Mutual Consultations (SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SOYUZA SOVETSKIKH SOTSIALISTICHESKIKH RESPUBLIK, No 14, 1986)	68
Indian Women's Delegation Visits Alma-Ata (SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN, 30 May 86)	71

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Congo Party Delegation Studies Soviet System (Al'fons Fungi; SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN, 30 May 86)	72
Congo Delegation From Alma-Ata Sister City (SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN, 7 Jun 86)	72
Congo Delegation Chief Recalls Alma-Ata Visit (Al'fons Fungi; SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN, 11 Jun 86)	72
Mozambique Delegation Visits Kazakh Capital (SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN, 20 Jun 86)	73

/7310

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

UN FINANCING, BUDGETARY PROCESS DESCRIBED

Moscow IZVESTIYA AKADEMII NAUK SSSR: SERIYA EKONOMICHESKAYA in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 86 pp 130-140

[Article by I.V. Pochigayev; first paragraph is abstract]

[Text] The article describes the features of the mechanism for financing the activity of the United Nations Organization. It points up the problems involved in drafting and carrying out the budget of that organization; the excessive growth of expenditures, the lack of balance in the breakdown of expenditures by basic purposes in the activity of the UN, and the financing of measures contrary to the charter. It covers the procedure for distribution of budget expenditures among the member states of the UN and trends in the evolution of the methodology for computing contributions. The USSR's fundamental position is set forth concerning the topic raised, including ways of overcoming the financial difficulties which the UN is experiencing.

The results of the 40-year activity of the Organization of the United Nations, which celebrated this anniversary on 24 October 1985, have been evaluated as they deserved by the international community. As noted by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "the UN Charter...has withstood the test of time, and the UN itself has become an important factor in the system of international relations" [1].

The constant activization and expansion of the sphere of activity of the United Nations has resulted in a multiple growth of its expenditures and the related need to obtain an ever growing amount of financial resources. There has, then, been a substantial increase in the topicality of issues related to financing the UN, and the manner of their discussion has become more harsh in the various organs of that organization.

In aspiring to effectively solve problems affecting their vital interests and related to peace and security, disarmament, social progress, and economic cooperation on an equal footing, the UN member states have shown a readiness to furnish the organization the necessary funds to perform those tasks which it has under the charter. At the same time, while allocating for these purposes sizable amounts in their national budget, primarily in convertible currency, the states have a right to expect that those funds will be optimally and effectively used with due observance of an economy regime and will in no case be

detrimental to the legitimate interests of individual countries or groups of countries.

At the present time about \$5 billion are spent annually to finance the diverse activity of organizations within the UN system (with the exception of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and its related entities the International Finance Corporation and the International Development Association). About 15 percent of that amount goes for the UN's regular budget, while the rest is made up of the regular budgets of the specialized agencies, so-called nonbudget resources (these are made up from voluntary contributions and are committed to financing operational programs to extend technical assistance), and also the funds used to finance peacekeeping operations.

The UN's regular budget builds up resources used to finance its main and auxiliary bodies. (Footnote 1) (The principal organs of the UN are the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat.) It includes appropriations to carry out programs undertaken under the resolutions of the main and other organs, the holding of international conferences, the conduct of varied research, local projects, the information service, and so on. According to the precise meaning of the UN Charter, this budget is restricted to purely administrative purposes.

The Soviet Union's fundamental position on issues related to financing UN activity is based on unswerving support of this organization's efforts to achieve the aims which have been set for it. As Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has noted, "the Soviet Union--one of the founders of the UN and a permanent member of the Security Council--will, as in the past, do everything to promote this worldwide organization's effective performance of its high mission on the basis of strict adherence to its charter [1].

The basic principles for building the financial mechanism of the UN are defined in its charter. It states the following:

- i. the budget of the organization shall be approved by the General Assembly by a majority of at least two-thirds of the votes (budget matters are included in the list of important matters on which decisions are taken by a qualified majority);
- ii. the members of the organization shall finance its expenditures according to the apportionment set forth by the General Assembly.

In practice the settlement of financial questions has been accompanied by a fierce struggle between different positions and viewpoints held by the states represented in the UN over the entire range of their political, ideological, socioeconomic, and cultural peculiarities. It has been political considerations that have above all predetermined the approach of the delegates of the various countries to the settlement of budgetary issues, which is why attempts to evaluate particular aspects of the UN budget process solely on the basis of

purely economic criteria and without posing the question of whose political interests are served by the particular financial measures and procedures, will not lead to objective results.

The regular budget of the UN is drawn up in the form of a balanced advance estimate of revenues and expenditures for a 2-year period (beginning with the even-numbered year) on the basis of the organization's current plans for activity. The budgetary accounts are drawn up in accordance with programs adopted by the policymaking organs of the UN, and their description is given in the budget form itself (referred to as a budget by programs). This procedure creates conditions for the dovetailing of purposes, ways of achieving them, and potential resources, it makes it possible to obtain an objective idea of the distribution of resources by the various lines of activity, of their use, and of the result achieved. Inclusion of information on nonbudget resources affords the possibility of evaluating the general efforts made in a particular field.

Within the limits of the programs expenditures are listed by cost elements (salaries and general expenditures for personnel, travel, furniture and equipment, accessories and supplies, operating expenses, shares in financing general administrative and service activity, etc.).

The revenue side of the budget is made up of the mandatory contributions of the UN member states (more than 80 percent of the total) and also diverse revenues resulting from the activity of the organization itself (taxation of personnel, income from rendering paid services, the rental of space, the sale of publications, postage stamps and souvenirs, bank interest, etc.). The estimate of revenue is an integral part of the regular budget and is approved by the UN General Assembly together with the appropriations on the expenditure side. The total amount of mandatory contributions for the given period, which is apportioned among the member states according to a special scale, is also approved at the same time.

One of the important features of the UN budgetary process is that by contrast with national budgets, in which the volume of expenditures is governed by the amount of revenues and possibilities for obtaining domestic and foreign loans, coverage of the total amount of the organization's expenditures approved by the General Assembly is guaranteed by apportioning the bulk of those expenditures among the member states.

It must be said that the entire course of development of the UN's financial mechanism and the changes that have taken place in it over the period of 40 years have reflected changes in the very character of the organization's activity, in the size and composition of its membership, as well as in the entire international situation and the range of increasingly complicated international issues. This is an outlook that can serve as a point of departure for examining the highly severe contradictions and problems that have accumulated and have led to the occurrence of financial difficulties which cannot be overcome without the strenuous efforts of the countries collaborating within the framework of the UN and on the basis of strict observance of the provisions of its charter.

The following should be included among the most complicated problems related to drafting and carrying out the regular UN budget: the excessive rise of expenditures; the disproportion between the pattern of expenditures and the significance and urgencies of the tasks under the charter which are performed within the limits of the various lines of activity; the inclusion in the budget of expenditures for purposes contrary to the charter; and ways of improving the methodology for computing the mandatory contributions of the UN member states.

An analysis of the dynamic behavior of the expenditure side of the regular UN budget reveals the extremely rapid growth of its size. Over the period 1946-1985 it has increased from \$19.4 million to \$818 million, i.e., more than 42-fold. The period required for doubling total expenditures decreased from 14 years over the period 1949-1962 to 5 years over the period 1976-1980, which indicates the constant acceleration of the budget's growth rates over almost the entire history of the organization. What in the initial period represented the sum total of annual appropriations is today equal only to the annual growth.

It is manifestly inadequate to explain this phenomenon by referring solely to such indisputable factors as the nearly threefold growth of the UN staff, the invigoration and expansion of its activity both in functional and geographic terms, the increase in the number of staff members of the Secretariat, and the rise in the level of their remuneration.

A large impact has been exerted on the level of expenditures by such interrelated processes as the rise of prices and inflation, which have been deep-rooted in capitalist reality. This has been felt throughout the entire system of the UN, since the majority of its organs and all the specialized agencies are located on the territory of capitalist states. This impact is manifested through the rise in the cost of living for international civil servants, as well as the higher prices of the entire volume of goods and services obtained on the capitalist market. The scale of the financial consequences of inflation for the regular UN budget is such that more than \$150 million, or more than 9 percent of all expenditures according to the draft budget for the 1984-1985 budget period, was provided for solely to offset the rise of prices, not to increase the real volume of resources [2].

Considerable damage has been inflicted on the UN budget because of monetary instability, above all the sharp fluctuations in the exchange rate of the American dollar, which serves as a worldwide reserve currency and the money unit in which the budget is drawn up and the contributions of the member states are paid.

The influence of this external factor has been ambiguous, and it is manifested in connection with the international functions of the UN, the activity of the components located outside the United States, the regional economic commissions, and so on. The share of expenditures of the regular budget which are made in other currencies than U.S. dollars (Swiss francs, Austrian schillings, Kenyan shillings, Dutch guilders, etc.) represents approximately half of the total.

The long-term trend since the beginning of the seventies toward a drop in the exchange rate of the dollar has required that substantial appropriations be included in the principal budget as well as in the supplemental budgets to cover the negative exchange rate difference.

The rise in the exchange rate of the dollar beginning in 1980 has led to formation of a certain saving, especially in the period 1982-1983, and this is also anticipated for the 1984-1985 budget period.

The question quite naturally arises as to the responsibility for the financial consequences of the inflation of the advanced capitalist states which have received the international organizations on their territory and which have obtained certain economic advantages from their presence. The Cuban delegation presented a motion in the 37th Session of the General Assembly (1982) for study of this question and for adoption of specific decisions. But the report of the general secretary submitted pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 37/130 contained only an observation as to how complicated it is to determine the level of significance of internal economic factors of inflation relative to foreign economic factors, and consequently the measure of a given country's responsibility for the inflationary processes taking place within it [3]. One can see through this thesis to the viewpoint of the Western states, which regard inflation as a worldwide phenomenon whose effect is to be overcome or mitigated thanks to a concern shared by all countries.

This approach does not, of course, satisfy many delegations, and the issue continues to be under discussion in the relevant bodies of the UN. It is obvious that it would serve achievement of progress for the interested member states themselves to make specific proposals concerning methods of fair coverage of the damage caused by inflation.

The present pattern of expenditures of the UN regular budget in the breakdown by the principal spheres of its activity defined by the charter: political, socioeconomic, and legal--also deserves very critical evaluation. These lines of activity had shares of 18.6, 77.7, and 3.7 percent, respectively, in the budget for the period 1984-1985, out of a total amount of \$1,611.5 million. (Footnote 2) (Total expenditures pertaining to the work of the entire organization (sections: "General Formation of Policy, Management, and Coordination"--\$40.2 million, "Public Information"--\$70.2 million, and "General Auxiliary Services"--\$570.1 million, and miscellaneous--\$283.4 million) were distributed in proportion to these shares.)

Thus less than one-fifth of budget funds were spent to perform the principal task under the charter--maintaining international peace and security, while the relative share of socioeconomic activity came close to four-fifths of the regular budget. It should be noted that the practical benefit from those expenditures is not great, since the bulk of the resources is spent not for real economic and technical assistance to countries in need of it, but to maintain the administrative staff.

Without underestimating the importance of the cooperation of all countries in solving social and economic problems at the national and international levels,

it should still be acknowledged that in the present situation political activity and above all the struggle for peace and for disarmament should have priority importance. The well-known figures on the military expenditures running into the many millions, the high growth rates of military budgets in many advanced countries and developing countries burdened with external debt have diverted immense material and creative resources to developing and refining more and more new methods of mass annihilation of human beings. In a not so distant future all of this threatens to take all humanity and its environment to the threshold of disaster, while at the present time it is absorbing resources on a scale which if properly used would be enough to achieve strong progress in the socioeconomic field and to render effective assistance to the developing countries in eliminating backwardness and hunger, disease, and poverty. That is why the Soviet Union wants more attention to be paid to the aims of the struggle to preserve and strengthen the peace and to avert a new war and wants the resources of the UN reoriented accordingly.

The adverse consequences for the regular UN budget arise not only out of the numerousness and scale of expensive programs, but also from the performance of those programs continuing out of inertia although they have lost their relevance, have become outdated, and have ceased to yield the anticipated benefit. Vigorous efforts to overcome this situation are being made by Soviet representatives. To be specific, the Soviet delegate in the meeting of Committee V of the 39th Session of the General Assembly declared: "Unfortunately, quite a few decisions have been made in the present session which have marked the beginning of new types of activity without the requisite efforts toward redistribution of the available resources.... The Secretariat has not responded adequately to the resolution on supplying information on resources made available as a result of termination or curtailment of programs and also on presentation of the reasons for irrelevant, outdated, and ineffective programs. The absence of an opportunity to evaluate what kind of activity might be performed on what scale with the resources made available has again created difficulties in the effort of Committee V to increase the economic efficiency of activity" [4].

The main obstacle to solving many problems has been that feature of the budget process (as mentioned above) whereby the course of decisionmaking that has financial consequences is not regulated in the UN by the need to remain within a volume of resources given in advance. The advisory committee on administrative and budgetary questions and also Committee V, which have taken up the draft budgets, have made their recommendations concerning the methodology of budget calculations and reduction of certain expenditure items, but they do not cast doubt on the advisability or possibility of carrying out the entire range of programs over the given period, they do not look at the budget as a unified whole in order to monitor the rates of its growth on the basis of firm criteria, for example, relative or absolute limitations established in advance.

Proposals to introduce limits on the growth of the regular budget have been made repeatedly by the Soviet Union, especially in the 30th and 31st Sessions of the General Assembly, but they did not receive sufficient support from the capitalist and developing countries.

Along with the problems indicated above, deep concern is caused by the practice which is still continuing of including in the regular budget expenditures which fall outside the limits of purely administrative purposes (contrary to the UN Charter). There is no legal basis for such actions; they overload the expenditure side of the budget, and they undermine the stability of the organization's financial condition. For example, provision was made in the 1984-1985 period for \$32.9 million (2 percent of the total) to finance the regular program for technical cooperation, which can only be seen as a mixing up of the operational and regular activity performed by the UN. This makes those expenditures subject to the mandatory scale of contributions, and consequently, certain states are compelled to extend assistance without reimbursement to other states. Moreover, given the predominance of civil servants of Western orientation on the technical assistance staff, the resources allocated are mostly committed to pay for deliveries and services supplied by the advanced capitalist states.

In order to counteract the persistent attempts of the Western countries and some of the developing countries to legitimize and expand this practice, the USSR made a decision beginning in 1963 to pay in Soviet rubles that portion of its contribution to the regular UN budget which goes for technical assistance programs.

As for the basic Soviet viewpoint on extending effective economic and technical aid to the developing countries under the aegis of the UN, it is amply illustrated by the proposal made by the USSR in 1974 that the military budgets of the states which are permanent members of the Security Council be reduced by 10 percent and a portion of the resources saved be committed to extending aid to the developing countries. Unfortunately, this initiative was not taken up because of the position of the Western countries.

For 20 years now what are referred to as special expenditures to repay the 1962 bond issue of the UN have been provided for in the budget. The decision to float the loan was taken as an extraordinary drastic measure to overcome the immense deficit that occurred in connection with financing the UN operations in the Near East (1956-1967) and in the Congo (1960-1964). They were carried out and the costs incurred covered in a manner that is contrary to the UN Charter, and the level of expenditures proved to be disproportionately high because many member states refused to participate in financing those armed forces. Taking positions on the basis of principle, two permanent members of the Security Council--the USSR and France--refused to make contributions for that purpose. In that situation, the bonds of a 2-percent loan were issued in spite of many objections for the amount of \$200 million to be repaid over 25 years out of the appropriations in the regular budget. First of all, such a measure was altogether unacceptable for a world governmental organization if for no other reason than by placing itself in the position of a debtor it made itself the potential object of pressure from the largest creditors (in particular, the United States); second, it was an attempt to compel a number of sovereign states to participate, if not directly, then indirectly, in paying for expenditures for illegitimate actions whose performance they had opposed. On the political plane it was a question of "certain states attempting to draw the UN into violation of its charter in order to justify illegal acts committed

under the banner of the UN in the past and of making it easier to violate the UN Charter in the future" [5]. The Soviet Union accordingly refused to participate in repayment of the loan and withheld the corresponding amounts from its contribution to the regular budget.

The impact of these events on the UN's financial condition has joined the other consequences in the occurrence of the current deficit, whose size has been increasing every year. At the present time it is being covered out of the working capital fund, whose size has reached \$100 million, as well as from funds left over in various nonbudget accounts at the disposition of the United Nations.

The search for ways of eliminating the financial difficulties has gone on for a long time now, but so far no real way out of the blind alley has been found. The last of the official bodies created in this connection--the Committee for Negotiations on the UN's Extraordinary Financial Condition, consisting of 54 states--was unable to reach consensus, and it has not held meetings since 1976. Nevertheless, it is clear that correction of the causes that led to the constant growth of the deficit and also adoption of measures to hold back the high growth rate of budgetary expenditures as a whole constitute an invariable condition for finding mutually acceptable solutions.

The debates have been strained concerning the issues of the methodology of determining the relative share of mandatory contributions of the UN member states. In the years that have gone by it has undergone substantial changes, some of which should be regarded as a definite bending of the original principles.

The vigorous and coordinated representations of the developing countries have become a distinguishing feature of the last 1.5 decades, even though they are not the organization's financial "bulwark." One cannot explain their speeches solely in terms of the size of the expenditures which they have to support, since the minimum contribution paid by almost half of all the member states does not exceed \$70,000 per year at the present time. There are several reasons why these countries, which belong to differing political and socio-economic groups, have been participating with such interest in discussing the problem of contributions and have been taking their positions in a vigorous way. One of them is the approach to the system of determining the proportions of contributions based on principle. In a majority of the cases it is not the size of the payments that is in question, but disagreement with the method of calculating its relative share. It is this computation that is generating dissatisfaction of many countries even when the financial obligations imposed on them are within their capability, against the background of a constant comparison with the contributions of other states.

The economic difficulties being experienced at the present time by many countries whose governments face the acute problem of balancing national budgets also play a substantial role.

But the fact that in recent years the question of the scale of contributions has been closely linked to the entire context of "North-South" negotiations

being conducted within the framework of the UN should be considered the most important factor that has been aggravating the differences manifested in the discussions of this problem. Disagreements over the more particular problem of apportionment of the UN's expenditures among its members are rooted in this difference of fundamental opinions and positions which is characteristic of those negotiations.

The UN Charter, as indicated above, does not set forth a specific procedure for computing the proportions of the member states in covering the expenditures of the regular budget. The General Assembly approved the principle that is in effect to this day, which is that of ability to pay measured above all by the size of the national income, which is then adjusted for such factors as 1) per capita income; 2) economic disruption caused by World War II (Footnote 3) (Ignored since 1952); 3) the country's abilities to obtain foreign exchange [6]. National income is computed in current prices and is converted to a single currency--the U.S. dollar--at official exchange rates.

Even when the scale of contributions was being drawn up for 1946 there was a certain departure from consistent adherence to the principle of the ability to pay. We are referring to adoption of the upper and lower limits of the contributions. The former affected only the United States, whose contribution on the basis of the preliminary computations amounted to 49.89 percent of the entire amount apportioned, which objectively reflected the prosperous condition of the American economy contrasted with the states of Europe that had been devastated by the war. But the U.S. delegation, ignoring all economic criteria, demanded a revision of this indicator, arguing that, first, this result supposedly did not correctly reflect the actual ability of the United States to pay, and second, the organization should not be made too dependent on the financial participation of just one member, thereby weakening the principle of the sovereign equality of nations with respect to budget problems. Consequently, at the insistence of the United States, a provision that in normal times "no more than one-third of the ordinary annual expenditures of the Organization of the United Nations shall fall to any one state" was included in the relevant resolution of the Third Session of the UN General Assembly in 1948 [7].

In subsequent years this "ceiling" has been lowered twice, and at the same time it stands at 25 percent.

The lower limit on contributions was established in 1946 at 0.04 percent and has been successively dropped to 0.01 percent. It applied to 78 countries out of the 157 contributions included in the scale for the period 1983-1985, i.e., to half of the entire UN membership.

Establishment of a "ceiling" should first of all be regarded as a method of easing the burden of expenditures on such states as the United States in supporting the UN. The level of the limitation was set arbitrarily and is not consistent with the economic criteria adopted. This measure unconditionally and directly runs counter to the interests of all other states, since substantial resources which the income side of the budget are consequently deprived of are made up at the expense of others, which, of course, are by and large the major payers.

The narrowing of the opportunities for the state in question to use financial blackmail and bind other countries to its will under the threat of paralyzing the operation of the entire organization is a certain constructive aspect of establishing the upper limit on contributions in the scale of the United Nations, but it does not offset all the adverse aspects. It should moreover be added that as time has passed the question of the legitimacy of the existence of a maximum contribution has lost its cutting edge, since according to recent computations of the Committee on Contributions, the contribution of the United States calculated by the methodology common to all countries would amount to about 26 percent. But its significance as a historical precedent should not be underestimated.

As for the lower limit on contributions, its assessment cannot be so unambiguous. On the one hand it is still a fact that the developing countries with a low level of national income paying contributions at the established minimum rate are still frequently forced to commit to these purposes a higher share of this income than others, including the advanced states. Moreover, this fact seems all the more unjust when a comparison is made with the advanced capitalist states, which have been continuing their economic exploitation of the developing countries. The acuteness and scale of the problem are not diminishing, though it might appear so at first, even in spite of the gradual reduction of the level of the lower limit on contributions, since at the same time there has been a process, first, of increasing the number and relative share of member states in the UN which have a low absolute and relative size of the national income, and second, there has been a constant growth of budgetary expenditures in absolute terms.

At the same time, the trends toward an excessive swelling of the budget of the UN and of its specialized agencies have been advancing ever more urgently among the current issues the question of the financial consequences and financial responsibility of the states for decisions in which they have participated.

Calculations made concerning the scale of contributions for the 1983-1985 period show that the shares of the contributions of the principal payers, which include (in descending order) the United States (25 percent), the USSR together with UkSSR and BSSR (12.22 percent), Japan (10.32 percent), West Germany (8.54 percent), France (6.51 percent), Great Britain (4.67 percent), Italy (3.74 percent) and Canada (3.08 percent), are incommensurable with those of other countries. For instance, of the other 149 member states, which cover 25.92 percent of the expenditures, there is a group of 100 countries whose contribution represents 0.06 percent or less and whose total share does not exceed 1.5 percent.

The course of events at the practical level indicates that even when faced with the necessity of making contributions in larger proportions than if the same formula were applied to all, the states whose payments have been set at the level of the minimum possible rate have not displayed a readiness to link their actions in the UN closely to financial responsibility to that organization. This consideration speaks in favor of maintaining the minimum level of payments into the UN budget at the present level. It should also be taken

into account in evaluating the special benefits extended to the developing countries, which we shall be referring to below.

The special reduction for countries which have a low level of per capita income has been an important component of the methodology for calculating the scale of contributions for many years. This benefit contains elements of a progressive system, and its operation is defined according to the following formula:

$$[(A - B)C]/A,$$

in which A--the upper limit on per capita income qualifying for the deduction;
B--the given country's per capita national income;
C--the reduction coefficient.

This reduction was first introduced in 1948, and the parameters of the formula have undergone substantial change since that time. At present the limit on per capita income qualifying for the reduction is \$2,100 (a proposal to raise it to \$2,200 was presented for consideration to the 40th Session of the UN General Assembly), and the coefficient in effect is 85 percent.

The size of the reduction that applies to national income depends on the amount by which a given state's per capita income falls below the level set, for example: \$2,100. If in some country this figure is \$165 or 8 percent of \$2,100, then the reduction amounts to 92 percent multiplied by the coefficient of 85 percent, i.e., 78 percent of national income. Thus only 22 percent (100 - 78) of the country's national income is used in calculating the share of its contributions. The reduction is financed by the states whose per capita income is above this level, with the exception of the United States.

The kind of deduction the developing countries get can be judged according to the figures in a report of the Committee on Contributions for 1984, which points out that the amount by which the national income of countries receiving the deduction was reduced amounted to 16.2 percent of the aggregate of the national income of states whose per capita income exceeds the established limits (not including the United States) [8].

A proposal has been made to introduce in the near future yet another type of reduction which would take into account the interests of the developing countries which have a high level of external debt. Proposals on this question prepared by the Committee on Contributions in accordance with a decision of the General Assembly [9] were submitted to its 40th Session. A combined index consisting of the coefficients of external debt relative to export proceeds and to the given country's national income is proposed as the basis for calculating the size of the reduction. According to preliminary figures, 37 countries would qualify for this benefit.

The length of the statistical base period, which at first was limited to 1 year, is another question that has been a topic of harsh discussion. This is what determines how responsively the scale calculated with it reflects the current economic condition of a given country and thereby its real ability to

pay, just as it does the size of the range of fluctuations of the percentages of the contributions of particular states during the two subsequent periods of the scale's validity. Concern for smoothing out these fluctuations has over the entire history of the UN been the predominant factor in determining the length of the base period. At the present time average figures on national income over a 10-year period are used.

Economic indicators obtained by applying a longer base period lose their relevance, especially in view of the fact that the base period is separated from the period of the new scale's validity by an interval of 2-4 years. For example, the scale of contributions for the period 1986-1988 is made on the basis of figures for the period 1974-1983.

Unfortunately, the problem of fluctuations of the relative level of contributions in two successive scales has been perceived by many member states of the UN as so acute that the measure described above turned out to be insufficient, and a special formula for restricting such fluctuations was introduced to supplement it; it establishes two types of limits: in percentages and in points. This scheme first took effect in working out the scale for the period 1986-1988 (see the table).

Combination of Limits in Percentages and Limits in Points With the Eight Restrictions on the Shares of Contributions

If Official Contribution of State Is as Shown Below, in %	Procentual Change in New Computer* Scale Must Not Exceed Less of Limits	
	<u>%</u>	<u>Point</u>
Higher than	5.0	0.75
2.50-4.99	7.5	0.30
1.00-2.49	10.0	0.20
0.76-0.99	12.5	0.11
0.51-0.75	15.0	0.10
0.25-0.50	17.5	0.06
0.05-0.24	20.0	0.02
0.01-0.04	--	0.01

* The term "computer scale" refers to a scale calculated on a computer so as to take into account all the operative components of the methodology, i.e., the size of the average national income of the countries over the respective base period, the upper and lower limits on contributions, the formula of reductions for countries with low level of per capita income and countries with a high level of external debt, apportionment of the total saving afforded those countries among the other states, limitation on the fluctuation of contributions in two successive scales. This scale, which was the basis, has been subjected to adjustment on the basis of compromise solutions, and thus became the official scale. Source [10].

The mechanism for operation of the limits can be demonstrated with the following example. For instance, for the Soviet Union, which is in the first group of countries, the share of contributions according to the new scale may not

change in either direction by more than 5 percent, or 0.75 point, compared to the lower scale in effect. There are figures to the effect that according to the preliminary calculations of the computer scale on the basis of the period 1974-1983 (10 years), without taking into account the limits on fluctuations, the share of the USSR (including BSSR and UkSSR) was 10.32 percent, as against the 12.22 percent according to the official scale for the period 1983-1985, i.e., the reduction was 15.6 percent, or 1.9 points. But since the established limit allows our country's share to drop only 5 percent, which is 0.61 percent of a point, the USSR's contribution in the new scale may not be lower than 11.61 percent ($12.22 - 0.61 = 11.61$).

The recommendation on establishment of the limits was adopted by the Committee on Contributions even though many of its members, including the USSR representative, pointed out the mechanical and artificial character of these limitations and the fact that they do not conform to the principle of real ability to pay. It was noted that when these limits are applied consistently over a lengthy period of time, the accumulated deviations distort to an ever growing degree the scale based on figures concerning national income.

In the course of development there has also been a considerable change in the makeup of the factors which the UN General Assembly deems necessary to take into account in determining real ability to pay in addition to the basic assessment on the basis of national income. Moreover, for many countries national income itself unfortunately does not appear today to be such an unshakable criterion of the measure of ability to pay as it was at the beginning of the UN's existence.

In this connection the Committee on Contributions was commissioned by the General Assembly to prepare a "comprehensive survey of alternative methods of determining the real ability of the member states to pay" [11] in the light of such factors as the particular economic and financial problems of the developing countries, including those which are poorest; the situation of states which have a one-crop type of economy; the conditions of the external economic relations of individual countries; differences in statistical methodology and their impact on the comparability of figures on national income; and the size of accumulated national wealth.

During its 43d Session (1983) the Committee on Contributions took up four alternative methods (including the one now in effect), two of which deserve attention.

One of them was to analyze the accumulated national wealth as the principal indicator of a country's real ability to pay. Acknowledging the unfeasibility of its practical use at the present time, in its report prepared for the 39th Session of the General Assembly, the committee confirmed the need for it to be retained in the work program "so that when the conceptions and definitions of national wealth are standardized, and estimate figures on national wealth are available for a large number of member states, this criterion could be taken under consideration as an alternative to national income" [12].

Thus the present methodology, in whose future development particular emphasis has been placed on consideration of social and economic indicators as well as the problem of inflation and adjustment of currency exchange rates, has been recognized as the only suitable one.

In making experimental calculations of new formulas of reductions involving social and economic indicators, the committee extended its consideration to five principal factors expressed in a special combination of indicators in which each of them is given its respective weight in percentages. They include economic development, level of education, level of health care, external debt and international reserves, and the terms of trade.

An analysis of the resulting computer scales indicates that this method had an effect directly opposite to the one anticipated by the representatives of the developing countries, who were the initiators of this type of computation. The aggregate share of the developing countries increased substantially, and the advanced capitalist states turned out to have the largest gain (because of the reduction of their share). There was also a reduction, though, to be sure, not very sizable, in the share of the socialist countries. The reason for this is that the sum total of reductions resulting from the supplemental indicators, when they are made up in this way, was considerably less than the reduction for per capita income in effect at the moment when the computations were made, and in certain cases it even turned out to be negative.

The Soviet position with respect to the supplemental consideration of socioeconomic indicators is a negative one on the basis of the economic and methodological insubstantiality of this proposal. It is well known that each country's ability to pay depends on the level of its economic development, which is measured by the total volume of the national income produced. The national income is the sole source of all personal income and government revenues and is thereby a universal indicator which makes it possible to determine the general level of a country's economic and social development. The insufficient level of development of a certain group of countries is automatically reflected in the relatively low volume of the national income produced and correspondingly the low level of per capita income. Accordingly, the calculated quantities of national income and correspondingly the rates of the contributions in the scale are reduced for countries with low per capita income.

The negative feature of the approach that presupposes supplemental consideration of socioeconomic indicators is once again the unlimited opportunity for arbitrary variation of the indicators themselves, of their weights, and consequently of the results obtained.

The other version of the methodology in effect that has been proposed provides for taking into account differing levels of inflation in the countries, and consequently its differing impact on the comparability of national incomes. In other words, it is based on the premise that since the rates and level of inflation differ from one UN member state to the other, this supposedly makes the national income incomparable, since in money terms their size is hiked up in those countries where inflation is relatively high and is depressed in those where it is relatively low. But when the differing level of inflation

in the countries is not always accompanied by changes in exchange rates, this ultimately results in an incorrect evaluation of their relative ability to pay.

Two methods have been proposed for eliminating these differences. The essence of the first is that the national incomes of the various countries are converted to U.S. dollars not at the official exchange rates in effect, but at so-called "exchange rates adjusted for prices" (STsOK). This means that the national incomes of countries expressed in U.S. dollars are adjusted with the STsOK coefficient in accordance with the level of inflation in the United States. In this case the incomes of countries with a level of inflation higher than the American rate are reduced, and those of countries where the level of inflation is lower than in the United States, are increased. The scale of contributions would also be constructed from the levels of national income revised in this way.

Preliminary calculations of the computer scale with the STsOK method have shown that use of this method raises the rates of the contributions of the socialist countries, above all the USSR, while at the same time it reduces as a whole the rates of the advanced capitalist states, the members of OPEC and the other developing countries.

The second method proposes that the differences in level of inflation from country to country be eliminated by converting the size of the national income in U.S. dollars at purchasing power parity (PPS) of the national currencies against the American dollar.

This method is based on the well-known theory of the purchasing power parity of currencies, the gist of which is that if prices rise in a particular currency, then that country's currency loses a portion of its purchasing power. The latter is inversely proportional to the average rise of the price level. For example, if the average price level in a country doubles, the purchasing power of that country's currency is correspondingly cut in half. Therefore, goes the theory of PPS, over any given period a certain market basket of goods and services must have one and the same value expressed in the given currency regardless of the country where this market basket of goods and services is obtained. This requires that the difference in price levels, or inflation, of any two or more countries must be precisely offset by a corresponding change in relations between the currencies of those countries. In other words, there must exist a direct and mutually compensated correlation between changes in prices and changes in exchange rates. But in real life this does not happen and never has.

"Floating" exchange rates, which fluctuate under the impact of many economic and political factors and not solely under the influence of changes in relative price relations within the countries, and characteristic of the present-day international financial system of capitalism. It is from that viewpoint that we must examine the actual relative ability of countries to pay on which calculations of the scale of contributions are based. The changes of prices and exchange rates, which to a considerable extent result from the domestic and foreign economic policy conducted by the states, ultimately have an impact

on the movement of the national income, which reflects the changes that have taken place in the economy. That is why purchasing power parities of currencies, as well as other relations between currencies which have been hypothetically calculated in accordance with this or that theory and for this or that purpose, cannot be applied to determine the real ability of countries to pay.

It should also be noted that the calculations of purchasing power parities of currencies are themselves very provisional and approximate in nature because the necessary statistical data are lacking for many countries, and the complexity of computing the parities, the great diversity of the results depending on the market basket of goods and services, the weights of the representative goods, and other methodological factors open up ample room for subjective solutions of all kinds.

The results of preliminary calculations of the computer scales by the PPS method are such that the aggregate share of contributions required from the socialist states are even higher than when the STsOK is used, while the share of the contributions which must be paid by the advanced capitalist countries are reduced by approximately the same amount. The members of OPEC receive a certain gain on the contributions, but at the expense of the other developing countries.

In evaluating the methods described above it is also important to bear in mind that in using both the STsOK and also the PPS method the issue ultimately comes down essentially to renouncing the principle of current prices in which according to the criterion now in effect the national incomes of the member states are denominated, not only in the national currency, but also in U.S. dollars.

Thus both these methods are vulnerable from the economic and statistical-methodological points of view. In their practical application they are detrimental to the interests of the socialist countries, while at the same time they have not brought any sort of appreciable benefits to the group of developing countries as a whole. Only the advanced capitalist states would gain from their application.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "Message of M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to H. Perez de Cuellar, General Secretary of the Organization of the United Nations, and to Participants in the Anniversary Session of the UN General Assembly To Celebrate the 40th Anniversary of the Organization of the United Nations," PRAVDA, 25 October 1985.
2. United Nations Document A/38/6, p 27, the result of columns 6 and 8.
3. United Nations Document A/C.5/39/44.
4. United Nations Document A/C.5/39/SR 55, p 12.

5. "On the Question of the Financial Condition of the United Nations, Memorandum of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Dated 11 September 1964," United Nations Document A/5729, p 1.
6. "Doklad Podgotovitel'noy komissii Obyedinennykh Natsiy" [Report of the Steering Committee of the United Nations], PC/20, 23 December 1945, p 10.
7. "Obyedineniye Natii. Ofitsialnyy otchet pervoy chasti III sessii Generalnoy Asamblei. Rezolyutsii. 21 sentyabrya-12 dekabrya 1948 g." [United Nations. Official Report of the First Part of the Third Session of the General Assembly. Resolutions. 21 September-12 December 1948], Paris, 1948, p 51.
8. United Nations General Assembly, Official reports. 39th Session. Supplement No 11 (A/39/11), p 11.
9. Resolution No 39/247 of the United Nations General Assembly.
10. Report of the Committee on Contributions. United Nations General Assembly. Official reports. 40th Session. Supplement No 11 (A/40/11), p 11.
11. Resolution No 36/231 (Part A) of the United Nations General Assembly.
12. United Nations Document A/39/11, p 5.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Izvestiya AN SSSR, seriya ekonomicheskaya", 1986.

7045

CSO: 1807/388

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

LINK SEEN BETWEEN WESTERN IDEOLOGY, POLITICS, PROPAGANDA

Moscow OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI in Russian No 1, 1986 pp 144-160

[Article by Eduard Ya. Batalov, candidate of philosophical sciences and sector chief in the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences [ISKAN], Igor Ye. Malashenko, candidate of philosophical sciences and senior scientific associate of ISKAN, and Andrey Yu. Melvil, candidate of philosophical sciences and sector chief in ISKAN, under the rubric "The Struggle of Ideas in the Modern World": "Ideology, Politics and Propaganda in the Contemporary Strategy of Imperialism"; the published article was prepared on the basis of a chapter in the monograph "Ideologicheskaya strategiya SSHA na mirovoy arene" [The Ideological Strategy of the USA in the World Arena], Moscow, Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya, 1985; italicized words enclosed in slantlines]

[Excerpts] Ideology and politics have always been closely connected to each other. And although in conformity with individual nations and regions in different historical eras, this interdependence has been distinguished by a certain specificity and it is characterized by several common features which spring from the internal unity of the two phenomena.

Politics as an activity of social groups, classes, nations and governments, directed at the protection of one's own basic interests and the ensurance of personal power in a class society, inevitably bear a party and class nature. It is precisely for this reason, as K. Marx and F. Engels understood, that, along with the elimination of classes (and the government), the elimination of the political forms of relations between people will also have to take place. With regards to ideology, despite all the diversity in its interpretations, the majority of Marxist-researchers agree on the main item: it is a system for the ideas of a social group, a party or a class and in specific instances of a nation or a government on society and man, a system which expresses the specific nature of the social being of the given subject; it represents, theoretically, the official expression of its self-consciousness; it serves as a means (a mechanism) for protecting its interests and as a general guide to action.

Ideology is a multi-dimensional concept. It can be worldly or religious; progressive or reactionary; revolutionary or reformist, and so on and so forth. But, in fulfilling its function of protection of the basic interests of a specific social community, each ideology, like politics, has a more or less clearly expressed class and party nature. Ideology is still an organic element of politics and a specific form of their development. Without politics

there is no ideology. But, without ideology there are no politics. In the history of political thought there have been attempts to "liberate" politics from ideology. The tendency towards "de-ideologization," which appeared in the West at the end of the fifties and the beginning of the sixties, intruded as well into the political sphere. But the "liberation" did not take place. As was shown in the subsequent decade, the role of ideology in the political affairs of bourgeois society not only did not decrease, but, on the contrary, increased, which found expression, to a great degree false, in the concepts of the so-called "re-ideologization," which became popular in the nations of the West in the second half of the seventies.

In characterizing the phenomenon of ideology (of ideological activities) we proceed from the principle unity of its internal and external aspects. Such an approach is based on the premise which has received practical confirmation that no matter what sphere these activities have proceeded in, at their basis lie one and the same principles, that they are intended to protect the interests of one and the same social forces and pursue in the final accounting one and the same goals. In the same manner we proceed from the fact that the interdependence between politics and ideology is expanding both in the sphere of internal affairs and in the sphere of international relations.

The promotion of the external ideological activities of a bourgeois government and the ideologization of its foreign policy, in essence, are nothing more than the mobilization of additional resources for domination, caused by the changes in the role of the ideological factor in international relations and primarily by the strengthening of the influence of the ideological struggle on the course of political events in the world. A typical situation would be one in which ideological conflicts are not so much generated by political ones as, on the contrary, they entail them (as happened during the time of the "Cold War").

At the same time, behind the growth of the role of the ideological factor in the sphere of international relations stand the objective processes of modern social development.

First, there is the division of the world into two systems, the struggle between which includes not only political, economic and military aspects, but an ideological one as well. Second, there is the broad involvement of the masses in politics. There is both a direct growth (by means of participation in elections and the electoral organs, and in the various types of political organizations and movements, etc.) and an indirect growth (by means of the expression of public opinion, which an experienced politician can not ignore) in the role of the masses in the political process, including the formulation and implementation of the foreign policy course. Third, there is the growth in the interdependency and the mutual influence of the subjects of international relations and there is the globalization of political affairs. Today it is less possible than at any time in the past to carry out far-sighted policies while ignoring the positions of other governments or international public opinion. Hence, the attempts at ideological influence and the striving to reorganize or, at least, to "correct" these positions. And fourth and finally, there is the limitation under contemporary conditions of the

feasibility of governments using military force as a means for solving international problems and, consequently, it is necessary to promote ideological activities in order to safeguard one's own political and economic interests in the world.

The achievement of parity between the USSR and the USA in the area of strategic weapons, the strengthening of the positions of Socialism in the world arena and the stirring up of the proponents of peace in the capitalist countries make it impossible today for the reactionary circles of the West to turn to arms for the solution of emerging problems with the same ease as they did just a few decades ago. They are attempting to compensate for the limitation on the feasibility of using military force with more active ideological and psychological influence.

The ideologization of international relations is a process which has a natural historical nature, i.e., it occurs by virtue of specific objective reasons and develops according to its own internal laws, which, however, does not preclude attempts by individual politicians to influence the course of this process. An artificial, hypertrophic ideologization of international relations creates additional tension in the world arena and obstructs the solution of pressing problems.

In speaking about the correlation between ideology and politics under the conditions of a bourgeois society it is impossible not to touch upon the contradictions which arise between them and which are particularly clearly revealed in crisis situations. Although, as noted above, the politician and the ideologist are frequently combined in the one person, these functions are carried out, as a rule, by different people who are oriented towards the solution of perhaps interdependent but all the same not identical problems and who develop various practices associated with the specific nature of a sphere of activities and their characteristic cultures. Naturally, as professionals these people think differently, adhere to differing aims and use identical "sets of tools." And this is fraught with conflicts and contradictions between the ideologist and the politician in their approaches to one and the same questions.

Another situation which generates contradictions between ideologies and politics (including the foreign policy aspect) is the lack of convergence between the rates and the direction of their changes. The relative independence of ideology leads to the fact that in some things it lags behind political development and in others it leaves political development behind and this inevitably affects their functional ties. But this is not the only item. Politics are more dynamic than ideology and change more rapidly than ideological orientations and prevailing types of consciousness replace one another more rapidly than the generations of politicians, educated in the spirit of specific standards and principles, which yield to change only with great difficulty and therefore are not always adequate for the requirements of the times, replace one another. However, the momentum of inertia--an inevitable characteristic of the thinking of individual persons or groups--is inherent also to organizations (particularly large-scale ones), including those which are engaged in external political and ideological activities.

In this connection it is necessary to note yet one more momentum in the activities of organizations in the sphere of international relations, to be precise: their safeguarding of corporate and bureaucratic interests. The bureaucracy converts its own interests into the government's and vice versa. (Footnote 2) (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Sochetaniye" [The Works of ...], Vol 1, pp 270-271) If you add to this the intercorporate (interdepartmental) competition which is natural for a bourgeois society and which in its most compact form is associated with monopolistic competition and with the struggle, not always on the surface, between business and the government, then the increasing secret and open struggles between ideologists and politicians for priority, for budget allocations and for the subordination of the activities of rivals to their own corporate interests become obvious. These are struggles which in the final accounting affect the nature of external ideological activities and the development and implementation of ideological strategy as a whole.

Western propaganda places special emphasis on the formation among the mass audience of such a specific form of (orientation) as the /social stereotype/. The latter makes it possible to modify in a specific direction the perception of information received by the subject on the basis of personal experience or via the mass media. From this point of view the propaganda directed at the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries represents an attempt to realize the striving of the USA and its allies to form in the consciousness of the citizens of these countries stereotypes of the Western (American) way of life, of Western (bourgeois) democracy and the "Welfare State" (all in a positive aspect) and negative stereotypes of the socialist (communist) system of social relations, of the socialist way of life and of the policies conducted by the governments and ruling parties of the socialist countries in internal affairs and in the world arena and so on.

The ideological strategy of imperialism, just like its political strategy, bears a global nature. Today, for all practical purposes, the entire world finds itself to be within the sphere of its influence. At the same time the implementation of the strategy in the relations of various countries and also regions has its own specific character. Within the limits of the post-war decades four basic objectives are notable in the ideological strategy of imperialism: the Soviet Union, the countries of the socialist commonwealth, the socialist countries not belong to the commonwealth and, finally, the developing countries. In relations with each of these objectives a more or less differentiated strategy is being implemented, taking into consideration the role of the country or group of countries in the international association and its (their) historical and cultural traditions, the geopolitical situation and so on.

The priority of the named objectives (particularly in the ideological strategy of individual imperialist governments) can, of course, change. However, if one excludes the short-term (and insignificant in size) fluctuations, then it is possible to state with good reason: the point of Imperialism's ideological strategy was and remains aimed at the socialist commonwealth and primarily at the Soviet Union. The undermining of international authority, the weakening of the ideological and political influence of the socialist countries on the world community, the hindering of the formation and strengthening of the

socialist consciousness within these countries, the alienating of the members of the world socialist commonwealth in order to destroy it as a result and the discrediting of Marxism-Leninism as a revolutionary theory--such are currently some of the main goals of Imperialism's foreign policy strategy.

Anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism (the latter as a specific development of the former) thus form permanent and central elements of this strategy, both within the borders of these same capitalist countries and in the world arena. First of all, this is associated with the world-view positions of the more reactionary circles of the ruling class, with their notion of the Soviet Union and the other nations of Socialism as the "focus of evil" and with the setting for the struggle against it. But there is another side to this matter. Anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism are used by the Western authors of policies as a tactical cover for carrying out hegemonistic policies directed not only against the socialist world, but also against the developing countries, as well as, however, for the purposes of internal capitalist competition. And here it is no longer a matter of anti-Communist or anti-Soviet convictions or of "realization" of the "Soviet military threat" to the West, to which certain Western politicians and ideologists so love to allude. Primarily it is a matter of the fact--and this has been noted more than once in Marxist literature--that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries /objectively/ form the main obstacle and the basic restraining force in the path of the realization by Imperialism, and primarily the Imperialism of the USA, of its hegemonistic pretensions.

It is worth noting that, while striving to create in the world community a false impression about the extent of anti-Communist sentiment within the countries of Socialism, Western propaganda quite often intentionally identifies with anti-Communism practically any kind of critical statements on the part of the citizens of these countries. At the same time, there is deliberate concealment of the fact that a similar type of criticism arises in many instances because of occurrences which, in fact, are contrary to the principles of Socialism, occurrences against which the communists themselves are leading the struggle, clearly demonstrating that the new social order springs up amidst contradictions and struggle and that constructive criticism of existing shortcomings contributes not to a negation of Socialism (Communism), but rather to its affirmation.

The realization of the external ideological strategy of a bourgeois government is achieved in the process of its ideological activities in the world area (those external ideological activities which are characterized in various ways--as "international propaganda," "international information," "public diplomacy," and so on). But no matter how they are designated the basic content of these activities has always been and will always remain /propaganda/.

One fact that draws attention to itself is that many of the definitions of propaganda, proposed by Western authors ("the dissemination, for a specific purpose, of ideas, doctrines and opinions," "the attempt to exert influence on the views of other people, in order to influence their behavior," "communication for the purpose of exerting influence on the thinking, the emotions or the actions of a group or community," and so on) accentuate its manipulative

nature, i.e., its orientation towards obtaining the sought-for behavioral reaction using specific technical methods. The approach to propaganda as a lever for manipulation of the audience received particularly widespread dissemination in the USA. And there were particular reasons for this. In the forties and fifties, when there occurred a much more intensive process of formation of ideas about propaganda among American sociologists, psychologists and politicians, these ideas were, for a time, widely disseminated within the sphere of the social science of the psychology of behaviorism, which reduced almost all the forms of a person's psychological activities, including the complex ones, to an aggregate of simple reactions and which saw in a person's behavior an elementary "response" to a stimulus set up by a situation. The circumstance that the Americans' ideas about propaganda were formed under the influence of the methods employed in advertising, in which the inhabitants of the New World have accumulated a great deal of experience, which they were inclined to carry beyond the limits of the sphere of trade, also played a substantial role. As a result, at times they considered propaganda as a political variety of commerce, assuming that, with an appropriate statement of the matter, the consumer of political information will behave the same or approximately the same as a consumer of soap or whisky, acting under the direct pressure of the advertising. At the same time the methods of internal political propaganda were expanded into the foreign policy sphere.

In recent years Marxist researchers both in our country and abroad have done a great deal to clear up the essence and the basic parameters of propaganda, both internal and international. Despite all the differences in the interpretation of individual aspects of this phenomenon, there is agreement on the main item--on the understanding of its essence and basic indicators.

In its most common features propaganda can be defined as the dissemination of information (reports, opinions, theories and so on) with an overt or covert ideological content and calculated to consolidate or change the consciousness and behavior of the recipient in the desired direction, with all the ensuing political consequences. (Footnote 3) (As the Polish researcher, L. Voytasik, notes, propaganda activities "can be represented according to the following schematic: communicator--communication--recipient." (L. Voytasik, "Psikhologiya politicheskoy propagandy" [The Psychology of Political Propaganda], Moscow, 1981, p 34) We use the concept of the "audience" with the same meaning as "recipient.") Naturally, the given definition states only the generic indications of the phenomenon and does not take into account the differences, including essential ones, in accordance with the whole series of parameters. While following the Marxist tradition and drawing a distinction in principle between socialist and bourgeois propaganda, it is necessary at the same time to take into account the latter's internal heterogeneity, in order to see the differences between bourgeois-liberal, bourgeois-conservative, radical right-wing and radical left-wing propaganda as having differing political content. It is necessary likewise to differentiate bourgeois propaganda according to its methods for influencing its audience (persuasion, manipulation), according to its way of identifying the disseminated information with its sources ("white," "grey" and "black"), and so on. (Footnote 4) (See S. I. Beglov, "Vneshnepoliticheskaya propaganda. Ocherk teorii i praktiki" [Foreign Policy Propaganda. An Outline of Theory and Practice], Moscow, 1980.)

Propaganda can be aimed at both the affirmation of the ideals of a specific set of values or an ideology and the dissemination of information about specific events in the economic, political and cultural affairs of one country or another ("factual" propaganda). (Footnote 5) (See V. L. Artemov, "Pravda o nepravdy" [The Truth about Untruth], Moscow, 1984.) In solving the task of consolidating the convictions (the lines of conduct) of the recipient or reorganizing them, both "evaluative" and "factual" propaganda can also be deprived of their hostile nature to correspond to the standards of international law, as well as to the spirit and the letter of agreements existing between two antagonistic sides. A convincing example of this is the external propaganda activities of the socialist countries.

At the same time, as the methods of the USA and its NATO allies has demonstrated, propaganda can pursue detrimental and subversive goals. While contradicting international legal documents, and frequently also multilateral agreements (such as the Helsinki Accords), such propaganda is called upon to slander the social and political order of one country or another, to distort the policies conducted by said country, to disrupt the normal rhythm of life, and in specific instances even to sow panic among the populace and to drive the people to acts of subversion and sabotage. This, as it is usually designated, is /detrimental or subversive/ propaganda. It is precisely this type of propaganda which was conducted intensively against the socialist countries by the United States and its allies during the years of the "Cold War." Even now they are actively resorting to this type of propaganda.

Within the framework of the external ideological activities of a bourgeois government, its actions are notable for those which are distinguished by a number of specific features. First, there is their clearly expressed mobilization trend. The information disseminated in the process of these actions contains, as a rule, a direct call to specific actions, frequently of a disruptive nature. Second, the appeal is not so much to the intellect as it is to feelings and subconscious inclinations and the aim is the formation not of convictions, but rather opinions. Third, the simplicity, which is not to say primitiveness, lies in the maximum clarity of the disseminated information, which has clearly lowered the theoretical level. Fourth and last, there is the strict localization, both in spatial and social terms. The leaflets scattered by warring sides on the position of the enemy and containing a call to "surrender" and so on can serve as a graphic example of a similar type of information.

External ideological actions of a similar type have their own internal analog. We are talking about agitation, which is distinguished from propaganda by the greater specificity, the simplicity, the emotional saturation and the orientation towards mass action. Therefore, it makes sense that, if there is not a strict demarcation between external political agitation and propaganda (which would be difficult to do, technically speaking), then, at the least, there is an isolation of the informational actions which are notable for their greater agitational orientation. In our opinion this would make it possible to fix more accurately the changes in the course of the ideological struggle, of its forms and of the nature of the ideological strategy of a bourgeois government.

Mutual relations between the subjects of ideological activities in the world arena are cloaked in the broad spectrum of the form--from the ideological union when they advocate common or close world-view aims, to the ideological struggle which governments (or systems of governments) with opposed social orders conduct against one another. And although the ideological struggle is by no means confined within this framework (it is also conducted between the capitalist countries and the developing ones, between the developing countries themselves and within generally known limits as well within the capitalist world), it is precisely this struggle of two world systems and the two ideologies embodied in them that exerts a determining influence on the nature of the ideological conflict in the modern era.

The ideological struggle in the international sphere is subject to the same conformity to law as the struggle within antagonistic societies. At the same time, the dynamics of the development of the ideological struggle within a country predetermines to a great degree the external ideological activities of the government, its ideological strategy, the methods employed and so on. And just as a basic contradiction of an antagonistic society can not be resolved within the sphere of ideology and by means of the ideological struggle within the society, the contradictions between the subjects of international relations can not be resolved within the sphere of ideology and by means of the ideological struggle in the world arena. The forced speeding up of the struggle of ideas does not make it possible to do away with problems whose solution lies in the end in the material sphere. This is why ideologists and politicians, standing on Marxist positions, come forward with criticism of the attempts at forced ideologization of foreign policy (which is accompanied by the heating up of international tension) undertaken by certain circles in the West.

At the same time it is impossible not to take into consideration the differences existing between the ideological struggle within capitalist society and the ideological conflict in the international sphere. In bourgeois society the ideological struggle of antagonistic classes, in the long-term prospective, can not be combined with their peaceful coexistence. As one of the forms of class struggle it is directed at the repression of one part of society by another. The ideological struggle between the two world systems is another matter. It can, as Marxists suggest, be combined with their peaceful coexistence and with the relaxation of international tension.

What is the ideological struggle in the world arena really? Strictly speaking, this is a clash (and mutual negation) of ideological and intellectual values, views and positions shared by conflicting sides, which takes place in the form of an open, honest debate and a discussion between opponents, striving not only to defend their own right to have their own position, but also to prove to the other side their own historical case and to induce the other side to change its own convictions and consequently its behavior. Such a discussion, even an extremely sharp one, is completely compatible with non-hostile relations in the fields of politics, economics and culture under the conditions that neither side disrupts the standards and principles regulating relations between them.

Bourgeois critics frequently reproach Marxists for the fact that the latter, while fighting for peaceful coexistence and the relaxation of tension, allegedly tie this course with the setting up of purposeful aggravation of the ideological struggle in the world arena. Similar reproaches are based on the identification of such essentially different phenomena as the stirring up of external ideological activities (for which, indeed--and they do not try to hide this--the socialist countries are striving, desiring to acquaint the broad circles of the world community with their own achievements, with the principles of their own policies and with the fundamentals of the Marxist-Leninist world view) and the aggravation of the struggle in the sphere of ideology, which is not at all the purpose of the socialist countries' propaganda efforts.

Marxists proceed from the principle incompatibility and ensuing irreconcilability of the communist and bourgeois ideologies and from the inevitability of their struggle. But at the same time, they do not predetermine the form and scale of the ideological conflict, suggesting that this will depend on the course of the class struggle, both within the capitalist countries and in the world arena, and on the nature of specific relations between the East and the West. Therefore, when speaking about the strengthening of the struggle in the sphere of ideology, they merely state the real state of affairs, which forms as a result of the attempts of certain circles of the ruling class in the capitalist countries to intensify disruptive activities against World Socialism and to mount a "crusade" against it.

Marxists invariably emphasize that the ideological struggle must be differentiated from so-called psychological warfare, which, in contrast to the former, is incompatible with a policy of relaxation of tension and with the setting up of stable relations between countries with varying social systems. (Footnote 6) (See, for example, V. L. Artemov, "Psikhologicheskaya voyna v strategii imperializm" [Psychological Warfare in the Strategy of Imperialism], Moscow, 1983.) If one compares the ideological struggle with psychological warfare in accordance with such parameters as objective, goal, methods of influencing the recipient, then it becomes obvious that we are faced with two differing phenomena, the identification of which involves serious consequences of not only a theoretical nature, but also of a practical nature.

Let us begin with the /objective of influence/ and those direct goals in the name of which it is undertaken. In the ideological struggle such an objective is the ideological opponent who may hold other views and may have opposing positions, but with whom there is a /dialog/ in accordance with the rules of an "honest game," i.e., in accordance with the standards of international law, as well as with the positions of agreements existing between the countries in conflict. The goal of the ideological struggle is to persuade the opponent or change his mind, to induce him to change his own opinion on one or another matter, and to shift to other positions under the influence of stronger arguments. In psychological warfare the objective of influence no longer appears as an ideological opponent, but rather as "the enemy." And the direct goal of this influence is not to get the person to change his mind but rather (in war, as in war!) to completely suppress and destroy him, only not physically, but morally and psychologically.

Essential differences are also seen in the /methods of influencing/ a recipient. Although, as has already been noted, the methods of psychological influence are being used in the ideological struggle, it appeals to reason to a greater degree. In psychological warfare the priorities are reversed. Here the accent is placed on emotional and psychological influence and on intrusion into the sphere of subconsciousness for the purpose of suppressing the enemy's ability to make a sensible evaluation of events and to induce him to accept solutions which, on an objective basis, contradict his interests. It is also designed to awaken in him such feelings as fear, hate and so on.

Psychological warfare can be carried out using a greater or lesser part of the arsenal, along a more or less broad front, to a greater or lesser "depth." In other words, it has its own degrees of escalation, reaching its apogee under the conditions of the conducting of military activities. And this means that even today it is not enough to simply state one side is conducting psychological warfare against the other. It is necessary, whenever possible, to define accurately, without under- or overestimating the danger, what the level of its escalation, its dynamics and its prospects for evolving further are. Only when there is such a specific and sensible approach is it possible to develop effective countermeasures which make it possible to counteract not only the psychological warfare being conducted, but also to deprive its initiator of the opportunity of raising this war to a new level.

The imperatives of the peaceful coexistence of the governments of the two systems urgently require the renunciation of the forced ideologization of foreign policy and of the transfer of the ideological struggle into the sphere of international relations. As Academician G. Arbatov notes, "ideologies constantly clash with one another on a global scale and within many countries. This fact has not been concocted by us and it is impossible to ignore it... But, as soon as the ideological struggle is transformed into a 'crusade' or a 'witch-hunt,' it immediately acquires a capacity for causing and aggravating conflicts." (Footnote 7) (G. Arbatov, V. Oltmans, "Vstupaya v 80-e..." [Entering the Eighties], Moscow, 1983, p. 238) Consequently, the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist commonwealth oppose such ideologization of international relations and acknowledge an honest and open struggle of ideas under the conditions of peaceful coexistence between governments with differing social and political orders.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Obshchestvennyye nauki", 1986

12752

CSO: 1807/332

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

RACIST, NATIONALIST, OTHER ASPECTS OF NEOCONSERVATISM EXPOSED

Moscow KOMMUNIST VOORUZHENNYKH SIL in Russian No 10, May 86 pp 83-87

[Article by Prof T. Kondratkov, doctor of philosophical sciences:
"Neoconservatism--Reaction All Along the Line"]

[Text] A stimulation of conservative forces and ultraright currents and groupings increasing the counteraction to progressive changes in the world has been observed on the political scene of the leading monopoly capital countries in recent years. The assumption of office more than 5 years ago of reactionary circles of the far right in the United States is confirmation of this. True-believing Atlantic allies pushed off along the same track in the wake of them and under their influence. The conservative epidemic spread to other capitalist countries also.

The ideological-political expression of the shift to the right of the monopoly bourgeoisie is neoconservatism. It focuses, as it were, the aggressive essence of imperialism. And the more severely its positions are undermined, the more hostile to the interests of the peoples the ideology and policy of the reactionary, conservative forces of monopoly capital become. "Imperialism," the new version of the CPSU Program emphasizes, "is putting up bitter resistance to social progress and attempting to halt the course of history, undermine the positions of socialism and exact social revanche on a worldwide scale."

The stimulation of conservative forces is convincing testimony to the ideological-political bankruptcy of the imperialist bourgeoisie, which is attempting unsuccessfully with the aid of modern weapons to replay history in order to conserve capitalist practices and establish world domination. This dangerous reactionary utopia forms the credo of modern conservatism.

Conservatism arose as the ideological-political current of the feudal-aristocratic reaction which opposed the bourgeois revolution in France in 1789. Since then it has passed through three basic stages in its development. The first was feudal-aristocratic conservatism aimed against the bourgeois revolutions in European countries. It proved powerless to impede the revolutionary processes in the first half of the past century. The second stage was bourgeois conservatism. It also was unable to prevent the

development of a new formation and hold back the birth and victory of socialism. This was shown by the defeat of the reactionary, conservative forces which had attempted to "rectify" history in the years of the civil war and foreign intervention in our country and the smashing of fascist Germany and militarist Japan during the Great Patriotic War. And, finally, the third stage is modern conservatism, which has been adopted by the most reactionary imperialist circles and political parties--the spokesmen for and defenders of the interests of monopoly capital.

In order to delineate the present conservatism with its authoritarian trends and past traditional forms and impart to it a certain degree of attractiveness its disciples pinned on it the publicity tag of "new" conservatism or "neoconservatism". But, perfectly naturally, this could not have changed the reactionary class-political essence of modern conservatism, which conceived the idea of turning back the wheel of history. It was and remains an implacable enemy of social progress and revolutionary transformations in the world and a champion of the reactionary past. However, as the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress points out, flight into the past is no answer to the challenge of the future but rather an act of desperation.

The ideology of neoconservatism shaping the ideological-theoretical basis of the policy of parties and governments of the right is being elaborated by an influential group of bourgeois philosophers, sociologists and political scientists (I. Kristol, D. Bell, N. Podhoretz and R. Nisbet) and politicians (D. Moynihan, Z. Brzezinski and J. Kirkpatrick) closely linked with the leading upper stratum of the United States and other NATO countries. Numerous institutes, universities, press organs and international organizations are engaged in this also.

Neoconservative ideology represents a motley set of old-fashioned, reactionary philosophical, political and economic ideas and concepts alternating with futurological forecasts and flights of imagination and also with religious mysticism. It rejects the objective regularities of society's progressive development, history is portrayed as "prolonged chaos" (Z. Brzezinski), everything new is discredited and old practices and values are extolled.

Neoconservatives declare as their main enemy communism, experiencing a pathological fear of it. The book "Neoconservatism in the United States and its Influence on the Atlantic Alliance," which was published by leading American and West German neoconservative ideologists, emphasizes that the capitalist West "is in a titanic battle with an implacable enemy--communism." Blinded by class hatred, conservative ideologists and politicians have, following the example of German fascism, declared a "crusade" against communism, are inciting antisocialist hysteria and are speculating in every possible way on the "Soviet military threat" myth. Not averse to lies and slander and guided by neoconservative precepts and ideas, imperialist propaganda is launching concentrated ideological and psychological attacks on socialism, on the policy of the socialist community states, on Marxist-Leninist ideology and on the international communist and workers movement to

at least somehow discredit the forces of social progress. All components of the machinery of state of the United States and its allies operating in close interaction with the military-industrial complexes and also all means of influencing people's minds have connected up with the anticommunist "crusade".

Simultaneously with the concentrated attacks against socialism the neoconservatives are shamelessly embellishing capitalist reality, publicizing bourgeois democracy and extolling the Western way of life. In special favor with them is the United States, which is exhibited as the standard for all bourgeois states. The true state of affairs in the country--the citadel of international reaction--is ignored here. It is fitting to point to the following fact of note here. (L. Peykoff), professor at New York University, gave his book on the United States a highly eloquent title: "Ominous Parallels: End of Freedom in America". Contrary to the fallacious assertions of the neoconservatives, the author of this book candidly acknowledges that present-day America, "like the Nazi Reich in the past, is becoming a military-police state, a war state." In fact it is such, to whatever propaganda dodges the neoconservative apologists of "American freedom" and the American way of life may resort.

An inalienable component of the ideology of neoconservatism is the biologization of social phenomena and policy and the undisguised and impudent preaching of racism and nationalism. Particular assertiveness in the implantation of this pernicious ideology, which collapsed in WWII, is being manifested by the most unbridled section of the neoconservatives--the "New Right". Its views are expounded in the opus of the American neofascist R. Viguerie "The New Right: We Are Ready for Power," in the books "Conservatism in the United States" and "Conservatives and the New Right" published in the FRG and also in numerous other publications in the West. The overwhelming majority of the New Right is connected with the U.S. Republican Party, which is currently in office.

Neoconservatives of the far right are attempting to update and put at the service of reaction racial-nationalist ideology and underpin it with a pseudo-scientific base by means of use of the data of bourgeois psychology and also ethnology, which deals with study of the comparative behavior of people and animals. Instead of the racism of the Hitlerites, who considered people's physical properties attributes of racial "superiority," a more refined, subtle and scientifically disguised racism is proposed. Its proponents, particularly the West German ethnologist J. Ebel-Ebelsfeld, insist that not people's physical but "intellectual" capabilities be taken as the basis for a division of the races. Such a "classification" represents, according to the French ultraconservative A. Benoit, "educated racism," which is allegedly different from racist ideology of the past.

The proponents of neoracism attempt to make a sharp distinction between the white and black races and erect an impassable barrier between them. Neoconservatives claim that not only the color of the skin but also the "internal structure of the brain," which is allegedly "less accomplished" in blacks

than in whites, serve as determining characteristics dividing the races. Citing tests of the mental capabilities of people of different racial groups, the New Right neoconservatives emphatically oppose a mixing of the races since this will lead, as the FRG neoracist P. Leyhausen, for example, vainly tries to prove, to "destruction of peoples' biological essence." In accordance with such views, the main task of the "biopolicy" proposed by the neoracists is rapid and efficient limitation of population growth with the aid of birth control. As under fascism, today's neoconservative racists are intimidating the West European peoples with the danger emanating, they claim, from the "Afro-Asian hordes" and cultivating among the population of the NATO countries racial hatred towards immigrants, heaping onto them the blame for unemployment and other social flaws of capitalist society.

Racist nonsense is being expressed in the rightwing conservative forces' political platforms. For example, (M. Kerru), chief ideologist of the National Socialist White People's Party of the United States, declared: "Our party is based on the teaching of Adolf Hitler.... The main task is self-determination of the Aryan white race and creation of an independent white republic. We will strive to achieve it any way, armed, if necessary." Such is the fanatic, misanthropic essence of the ideology of neoracism increasingly permeating the ideological-political atmosphere of the United States and in other NATO countries and poisoning the minds of the population of these countries, particularly officers and soldiers of the Western powers' armed forces. This pseudoscientific ideology is being used by imperialist reaction to justify a policy of racial discrimination and apartheid, pogroms and every conceivable persecution in respect of immigrants. The incessant outrages of racists against the black majority population in South Africa perpetrated with the connivance of ruling circles of the United States and its Atlantic allies are convincing testimony to the inhumanity and extreme reactionary nature of such a policy.

The emphatic exposure of the racism being implanted by the neoconservatives is a most important area of the ideological struggle. Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, emphasizes in his book "Fight Against Racism": "Racism is an 'ideological drug' which is poisoning people's minds, turning them into irreconcilable enemies and splitting the working class and is being used as a most lethal weapon of imperialist ideology." The facts testify that racism in the United States has manifestly switched to a counteroffensive in recent years.

The experience of the building of socialism in the Soviet Union, whose peoples are racially heterogeneous, proves convincingly the utter groundlessness of the false "higher" and "lower" races concept propounded by contemporary conservatives. The antiscientific nature of this concept is also confirmed by the economic, S&T and cultural successes of other socialist countries and the successes of Asian, African and Latin American developing countries, whose population belongs to different races.

The racism revived by the forces of the right is closely interwoven with nationalism, to which the neoconservative ideologists also aspire to impart

an appearance of newness. This is being done primarily by way of the proclamation of nationalism as the "fundamental principle of social order". "Territorialism," in other words, the demand for an expansion of "living space," is declared the political expression of nationalism. The brochure of the West German neo-Nazi M. Reder, "We Front-Line Soldiers on the Future," says: "It does not bother us if the entire West and all its allies shudders at the words 'living space'." War here is portrayed as a forcible extirpation of the "territorial taboo". Infected with nationalism, the West German revanchists and their transatlantic patrons are insisting on a revision of the results of WWII and a change in the postwar borders of a number of European states and urging the FRG's conversion into an American springboard for the preparation of a "limited" nuclear war against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Simultaneously with the promotion to the forefront in the ideology of nationalism of territorial attributes the neoconservatives are attempting to alter its form and frontiers of its dissemination. Its cosmopolitan variety--"European" and "Atlantic" nationalism, which allegedly takes account of the interests not of individual countries but of a whole group of bourgeois states united in military-political blocs--is being proposed in place of the former nationalism, which is confined to a framework of individual nations. G. Waldman, a conservative sociologist from the FRG, writes in the work "Comparative Research and Policy" that present-day nationalism is not a continuation of the diverse forms of nationalism of individual nations contending among themselves but embodies the "ideas of European nationalism" allegedly serving as the ideological basis of the unification of "Europeists" for the defense of "Western civilization" against the danger of the spread of Marxism-Leninism.

Thus ideas of "territorialism" and "Europeism" supplemented by the ideas of "Atlantism" constitute the main content of the "new nationalism". Such are the paths of the neoconservative modernization of the ideology of nationalism, with which the imperialist bourgeoisie has prepared and unleashed two world and numerous local wars. It is now being assigned the role of ideological foundation designed to consolidate primarily the aggressive NATO bloc, which, in the estimation of the American theorist of neoconservatism I. Kristol, "threatens to disintegrate," and other military-political groupings of imperialism.

The "Europeism" and "Atlantism" ideas prepared for the "new nationalism" are being employed extensively by imperialist propaganda for expunging national self-awareness among the West European peoples and personnel of the NATO armed forces and for their ideological indoctrination in a spirit of "Atlantic solidarity" and loyalty to the leader of the bloc--the United States. These ideas simultaneously serve as a means to incite chauvinist sentiments in broad strata of the population and soldiers, sailors and officers and for introducing to their consciousness fallacious ideas of "intellectual" superiority to other peoples and for moral-political preparation for unjust wars.

An element of conservative ideology of considerable importance, and this is stated openly in the book "Neoconservatives and the New Right," is "religious fanaticism". It is imbued with the world outlook and doings of conservative figures calling for a "revival of religious and moral values" and the unity of the bourgeois state and the church for an intensification of the fight against "Godless" communism. Religious-clerical ideology attracts the neoconservatives primarily by its irreconcilability to everything new and progressive and its zealous defense of capitalist practices, which are allegedly "pleasing" to God himself. The clerical fanatics, for their part, portray the contemporary struggle of the two world sociopolitical systems in the form of a global duel of polar-opposite forces: "God" and the "devil". Malicious anticommunist and anti-Soviet propaganda is conducted under the cover of this mystical proposition. Inveterate anticommunism distinguishes such rightwing religious organizations in the United States as the Moral Majority, Christian Voice and others conducting malicious propaganda against the socialist countries.

The central place in all varieties of the ideology of neoconservatism is occupied by the concept of war as an instrument of aggressive policy. To justify it neoconservatives make active use of the huge military-theoretical legacy of past eras. They are reviving, updating and propagandizing the views of reactionary philosophers and politicians and military figures of the past who depicted war as an ineradicable phenomenon of human society, and peace as an exception and chance occurrence in the unending line of armed confrontations.

The book "Violence in History," which was published in the FRG, may be indicated as an example. Citing military authorities of the past, its authors characterize war as a "transitional and essential component of our being" and a manifestation of the general "natural law of struggle". The book quotes pronouncements by the fanatic German militarist H. Moltke to the effect that war represents "an element of the divine world order" and that without war, according to him, "the world would be wallowing in materialism." Also carried here are the absurd arguments of the reactionary German historian (G. Treychke), who claims that attempts to eradicate war from the life of human society are "not only pointless but profoundly immoral." Woven into this sumptuous bouquet of militarist maxims is also the big talk of the present Pentagon boss C. Weinberger. Shielding the militarist policy of the United States and the brigandly actions of its armed forces, he accuses the Soviet state of "aggressiveness," heaping onto it the blame for the exacerbation of the current international situation. Such is the perverted logic of the past and present defenders of armed violence from the conservative camp.

Simultaneously with the reanimation of the theory of "violence," which was in the past subjected to the withering criticism of the founders of Marxism, a whole group of neoconservative ideologists has throughout recent decades been engaged in a persistent quest for arguments and reasons aimed at justifying the use of the most dangerous type of weapons--nuclear. They have elaborated the concept of the "acceptability" of nuclear war and the possibility of

"winning" it. Thus, for example, the reactionary American sociologists K. Gray and K. Paine advanced in an article entitled "Victory is Possible" the cannibalistic idea of the "decapitation" of the Soviet Union in a nuclear war and victory over it. This fanatical idea has been "substantiated" in weighty works of such prominent ideologists of neoconservatism as H. Kahn, R. Aron, E. Teller and many others.

Their economic program is based on the ideological postulates of neoconservatism also. In the above-mentioned book "Neoconservatism in the United States" this program is identified with "Reaganomics," whose main mission is rearmament and the material preparation for war. Some 150 government plants and approximately 4,000 major enterprises of private companies are engaged in the production of arms and military equipment in the United States. The arms which they produce swallow up the lion's share of the budget. More than one-third of American scientists and engineers and many universities and colleges have been enlisted in work of a military nature. The U.S. economy, like a cancerous tumor, is being infected increasingly deeply by militarism--this, as the 27th CPSU Congress emphasized, ugly and dangerous monster of the 20th century. It is being turned by the neoconservatives into an assembly line for an increase in the production of nuclear, space-based and conventional weapons and a broad-based "business of death" fraught with a most serious threat to mankind.

In foreign policy the neoconservatives have put the main emphasis on the use of force or threat thereof. They see policy and force as two sides of the same coin.

The cornerstone of the foreign policy of American imperialism and its allies is the conservative concept: "The USSR is the enemy of the United States". In the article entitled "The Future Danger" the transatlantic neoconservative ideologist N. Podhoretz declares with the utmost impudence: "The conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union is a clash of two civilizations, more precisely, it represents a clash between civilization and barbarism." And peace between these opposite forces, the author goes into hysterics, is possible only on the basis of "mutual intimidation" in the form of a global confrontation of "good," the exponent of which is declared, of course, the United States, and "evil" in the shape of the Soviet Union.

The particular danger of the neoconservative concepts presenting a distorted picture of the development of international relations is that they are being made the basis of the official foreign policy and strategic aims of the United States and its partners oriented towards the weakening and elimination of socialism as a social system.

Neoconservative anti-Sovietism also determines the nature of the present military strategy of the United States and NATO, the basis of which is the "intimidation concept" aimed at a buildup of nuclear, space-based and conventional weapons and the preparation and waging of a global and "limited" nuclear war and various "nonnuclear" and "space" wars.

Guided by neoconservative concepts, American and NATO militarists set great store by the new round of the strategic nuclear arms race which they have started, its transference to space and the conversion of outer space into a "star wars" arena. Together with the creation of a broad-based ABM system the Pentagon is simultaneously engaged in the development of the weapons it needs to punch holes in another's "antimissile umbrella".

The military arsenal of the United States and NATO is also being reinforced with neutron, chemical and other types of weapons of people's mass annihilation. Imperialist circles intend in this way to break up the current military-strategic balance in the world and achieve unilateral military superiority. But such calculations, as Soviet leaders have declared perfectly clearly and definitely, are doomed to inevitable failure. The Soviet Union will not permit a disturbance of the existing military-strategic parity.

In contrast to the United States and NATO which are pursuing an aggressive policy fraught with the danger of a devastating nuclear war, the USSR and its socialist allies are struggling consistently and firmly for peace and social progress and doing everything to remove the military threat and achieve general security and disarmament. This policy ensues from the human nature of socialism, a society free of exploitation and oppression and without classes and social groups with an interest in war. The historical dispute between the two opposite social systems into which the modern world is divided can and must be solved peacefully. "The CPSU," the new version of the CPSU Program says, "firmly and consistently defends the Leninist principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems."

The USSR has put forward a wide-ranging and constructive program of measures aimed at a halt to the arms race and disarmament, peace and the security of the peoples.

The unbending resolve of the Soviet Union to abide by the proven peaceable course is expressed also in its military doctrine, which is of a purely defensive nature. Our doctrine fully corresponds to the goals and the peaceable foreign policy of the socialist state and differs fundamentally from the aggressive military doctrine of the United States and NATO, whose realization is pushing mankind toward nuclear self-annihilation.

While consistently pursuing a peaceable foreign policy aimed at curbing the arms race and ensuring for the Soviet people and the majority of the world's population a peaceful life the CPSU and the Soviet state keep constantly within their sights questions of strengthening the country's defenses. They have made and will continue to make every effort to ensure that the USSR Armed Forces be at a level precluding the strategic superiority of the forces of imperialism and that the defense capability of the land of Soviets be comprehensively upgraded and that the combat collaboration of the armies of the fraternal socialist states strengthen. The Soviet Armed Forces must display high vigilance and always be ready to put a stop to the hostile intrigues of imperialism against the USSR and its allies and to smash any aggressor.

COPYRIGHT: "Kommunist Vooruzhennykh Sil", 1986

8850

CSO: 1807/384

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

BRIEFS

NEW GENEVA UN REPRESENTATIVE--Moscow August 29 TASS--The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet appointed Yevgeniy Makeyev the Soviet Union's permanent representative to the U.N. Office and other international organizations in Geneva. Yevgeniy Makeyev worked as head of the second European Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR between 1968 and 1971, deputy permanent representative of the USSR to the U.N. in 1979 and head of the Department of International Economic Organizations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR from 1980 to 1986. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet relieved Mikhail Sytenko of his duties of the permanent representative of the USSR to the U.N. Office and other international organizations in Geneva in connection with a transfer to another job. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 29 Aug 86 LD] /6662

CSO: 1807/393

UNITED STATES AND CANADA

SOVIET-AMERICAN CONFERENCE IN YURMALA DESCRIBED

Media's Role Discussed

PM291437 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Sep 86 First Edition p 5

[Report by own special correspondent T. Kolesnichenko and TASS special correspondent B. Grishchenko: "Against Lies and Lack of Trust"]

[Text] Yurmala, 19 Sep--Participants in the meeting of the Soviet and American public in Yurmala devoted the whole of yesterday to the crucial role of the mass media and their importance in shaping public opinion.

It would seem clear to everyone that in the nuclear age, in conditions of a relentless arms race, the responsibility of the press, radio, and television to disseminate truthful and objective information is increasing. Now, when mankind is faced with the choice of surviving, or perishing in nuclear catastrophe, the struggle against the approaching threat has become a noble cause which should unite all representatives of the mass media in our countries, notwithstanding all the diversity of sociopolitical systems. Both Soviet and American journalists must beat the drum, calling for an end to nuclear tests and the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. This was precisely what USSR special envoy B.V. Lomeyko and other Soviet representatives said in their contributions.

Yes, the word is a powerful force in our age, particularly when it is spread in publications whose circulation is in millions. It must be honest and serve a just cause. The mass media must shape their countries' public opinion in a spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation rather than a spirit of hatred, mistrust, and suspicion for one another. That must form the basis of journalists' professional ethics today. And no references to so-called "freedom of speech" can justify those people who use the slogan as a cover for psychological warfare and setting one people against another. That is not press freedom but self-interested manipulation of public consciousness in the interests of the military-industrial complex and extremely reactionary circles in the United States.

There, unfortunately, proved to be representatives of just those circles among yesterday's American speakers. B. Wattenberg, chief editor of the extreme rightist PUBLIC OPINION MAGAZINE, openly preached hatred of the

Soviet Union and socialism. He contended, for example, that Soviet people, you see, are completely deprived of objective information and basic freedom. He made gross attacks on the socialist countries, charging the Soviet Union, without any evidence, of a desire for world domination.

The third-rate American propagandist's speech, couched in the spirit of the darkest days of the cold war, strikingly recalled the inflammatory broadcasts put out by the subversive radio stations. And the similarity is no coincidence. The explanation was quite clear. Wattenberg at the end of his speech bombastically declared that he was a member of the board of Radio Free Europe, and proud of the fact. The hall burst out with cries of indignation when Wattenberg began explaining that he and like-minded people in the United States...do not consider Latvia to be part of the Soviet Union and broadcast to our country to that effect. The chairman also had to try to calm down the indignant audience when that same speaker attempted to justify the American atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Soviets and Americans gathered together in honest and frank discussion to outline ways toward better mutual understanding, peace, and detente had in no way expected such blunt cynicism.

After Wattenberg's speech many Americans present in the hall approached Soviet participants and begged them not to identify them in any way with Wattenberg and his ilk. But, as it emerged, the American representative's speech, embodying such a primitive level of thought, even proved...useful.

"I just did not think that there were such low-grade propagandists in America," a Latvian student said as he left the hall. "It is now clear why some people in the United States have the wildest ideas about us. It is clear where the lies and brazen propaganda come from."

There were many other participants in the session too who were not averse to expressing the same opinion.

Two interesting, noteworthy events occurred right at the end of the day. A question for Mr Wattenberg personally came from the hall: Radio Liberty has just broadcast that the Americans taking part in the meeting have been given a poor welcome in Riga, that they are being prevented from mixing with Rigans, have been poorly accommodated in hotels, and so forth, and so forth. All the 300 Americans filling the first rows of the hall already had a smile on their face.

And second. An American put a question about whether the representatives of the American public who had come there had changed their idea of the Soviet Union for the better or the worse. When the question was put, there was a sea of hands indicating a change for the better, whereas only two or three hands were raised to indicate a change for the worse.

After answers had been given to numerous questions the hall greeted with long applause the Soviet representatives' appeal to all journalists to help in every way to strengthen peace and trust among people. Today the

peoples of our countries find themselves in the same global boat, sailing in the fathomless sea of outer space. And if we are to help this boat avoid destruction it is essential that journalists form a united front against the common enemy--war. And not simply war, but a nuclear apocalypse.

Results Summarized

PM300917 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 86 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Article by political observer V. Matveyev: "Yurmala: After the Discussions"]

[Text] The participants in the meeting of representatives of the USSR and U.S. publics in Yurmala have gone home after 5 days of joint work. This is now an opportunity to consider unhurriedly all that has been heard and said. Soviet Latvian land greeted us with early frosts and the final session was accompanied by a double rainbow. During those days the weather showed us what it could do. We had cold spells, downpours, sunshine, and fog--just like the meeting itself: polemics, animated discussions, and general alarm for the fate of the planet.

Indeed, it could have been no other way, bearing in mind the nature of the U.S. participants in the meeting. The U.S. delegation included people who considered it their duty to act in such a way as to please official Washington. The Western radio stations covered those speeches but ignored much else, in particular the fact that in content and tone the discussion in Yurmala was not accompanied by an exchange of salvos in a verbal "cold war" but was actually a businesslike dialogue on a jointly coordinated agenda.

All those who came to our country from across the ocean (in addition to the official delegation there were 250 U.S. tourists in Yurmala) for the sake of better mutual understanding--and those people were clearly in the majority--had a full opportunity for broad contact. Each day the "Dzintari" concert arena, the largest building in Yurmala, was full to capacity. The 2,000 people were not simply an audience but active participants in the discussion, putting questions to the speakers and commenting on their speeches.

This was true of both sides. In the parks, on the streets, and on the embankment in Yurmala the discussion continued in the recesses between sessions and after they had finished. They attracted hundreds of people.

"Traveling the route of public diplomacy" was the slogan the Americans used to describe their trip. This was in keeping with the tradition of the Chautauqua Institute, which organized the Yurmala meeting in conjunction with our USSR-United States society. The institute was set up over 100 years ago. U.S. Presidents Garfield, Grant, Hoover, McKinley, T. Roosevelt, and F. Roosevelt, scientists, artists, and journalists have taken part in its work. The first conference of representatives of the USSR and U.S. publics was held at Chautauqua last year. This year the second meeting was held at Yurmala.

IZVESTIYA readers who have followed the course of the meeting can form an opinion on the confrontation which occurred there at times. Soviet-U.S. relations, the disarmament problem, and the role of the mass media in the modern world--when discussing such questions, of course, differences of opinion were bound to occur. Suppose everyone agreed--and that was that? What would be the point in organizing the meeting at all?

We have things to discuss. "We must support the process of contacts even at the worst times...." You would think that anyone with a modicum of common sense would subscribe to those words from the speech by U.S. envoy M. Palmer.

No differences in ideology or world outlook characteristic of states with different social systems can or ought to serve as justification for defending one's viewpoint by force of arms. It has now become as clear as day to everyone that the old ideas of war as a means of achieving political goals are obsolete. Since that is so, politics, ideologies, and opposing world outlooks must "prove themselves" in the field of peace, not the arena of war. Hence the justification for the thesis on the need to maintain contacts and dialogue.

However, having put forward approximately that thesis in its general form, the U.S. official representative and his colleagues actually adopted a different stance and contradicted themselves when they tried to preach to our country and judge its conduct. We were told that several Americans had refused to come to Yurmala because they felt that the "USSR's conduct" was unsatisfactory. And was Washington's policy entirely satisfactory to us, the Soviet participants in the meeting? Of course not. In view of that fact we would not consider it correct to avoid direct, frank discussions with the Americans. Quite the reverse!

The matter did not concern just those people missing from Yurmala. The meeting went ahead without those Americans. It was not Yurmala but themselves that they boycotted. Nevertheless, the question must be broached, since the U.S. side is trying to apply that "approach" to other spheres, too.

For example, at the very time that the public meeting was being held in Yurmala, two delegations from the USSR Union of Journalists were supposed to be setting off for the United States at the invitation of their U.S. colleagues. On the eve of departure telegrams were received from the United States announcing that the "invitations have been postponed." The question is: Can those people who, for one reason or another, are reconsidering the question of contacts proceed from the view that only one side needs contacts, not both?

The speeches by certain Americans who claim the right to "judge" other countries and peoples showed once again that this one-sided way of thinking seems to have become second nature to some Washington figures. Nevertheless, it is not achieving its goal but is meeting with resistance, including

among the U.S. public. Some Americans who had gone to Soviet Latvia publicly dissociated themselves from those who had expressed such views in Yurmala.

The U.S. delegation also included people who, when entering someone else's home, enjoy their hospitality but have no qualms about disregarding the rules of decency and state: We are your guests but we do not acknowledge you!

Such deviations from civilized norms and the rules of conduct were regrettable, to put it mildly, but not typical of the Yurmala meeting. In general its atmosphere was characterized by mutual understanding and mutual respect. That is the main thing. We did not deal with one another's beliefs. That was not the aim. And anyway, it is not necessary to hold the same beliefs in order to live in peace and cooperate in a business-like manner.

One of the Americans rightly said: Nuclear weapons do not recognize who is in front of them--either communist or capitalist... The hall applauded. The idea is clear. But the conclusions? During the discussion of the disarmament problem, Americans putting forward the official line stated with a dilligence worthy of better application that the ending of nuclear tests is in the interests of the USSR but not the United States, that the United States has "lagged behind" in its military potential, and so on and so forth.

"Do we really need a second Hitler to unite us in the face of the threat of the destruction of civilization!" Academician N.N. Blokhin, head of the Soviet delegation and president of the USSR-United States society, said, addressing the U.S. delegation.

One evening I was sitting having a cup of coffee with Suzanne Eisenhower, granddaughter of the late President of the United States. She was in the U.S. delegation. She has three children, her oldest daughter is 14. S. Eisenhower knows about World War II only from books, movies, and stories. She rates highly the joint cooperation between our countries in the struggle against the common mortal foe. But what about now, in peace time? Is cooperation between our countries necessary in the face of the common threat created by the most destructive means of annihilation in mankind's history? Of course--Suzanne Eisenhower has no hesitation in answering affirmatively just as millions of her fellow-countrymen and women have no hesitation in answering the same way.

We have things to think about and discuss together. That is why the Yurmala conference was held. There will be new meetings of this kind, prompted by the great and urgent task of ensuring the integrity and preservation of our "azure globe," which is how it appears from the depths of space and how it must remain, not changing its blue for the color of flames.

/9604

CSO: 1807/12

UNITED STATES AND CANADA

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR QUOTED ON RADIO LIBERTY, RFE

PM151115 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 1

[YASS report: "Millions of Lies"]

[Text] New York, 14 Sep--In expanding the scale of psychological warfare against the socialist countries, the U.S. Administration gambles by no means as a last resort on motley "radiosubversives." This is stated by THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, reporting on the subversive radio stations "Liberty" and "Free Europe."

Rightly describing these radio centers as an "arm of U.S. foreign policy" and "tools of the 'cold war,'" the newspaper draws attention to the fact that in order to increase their subversive actions on the airwaves former VOA Director E. Pell has been named chairman of the joint board of Radio Liberty and RFE.

Radio Liberty alone, a report by the anticommunist "Helsinki Watch" grouping states, conducts 497 hours of broadcasting a week to the Soviet Union in 12 languages around the clock. There are 1,750 people on the staff of Radio Liberty and RFE--the leading posts being filled by Americans, while the roles of editors, commentators, and presenters are filled by professional anticommunists, mainly drawn from fascist hangers-on and emigre rabble who have fled from East European countries.

As the newspaper admits, the exposure of the subversive operations of Radio Liberty and RFE by O. Tumanov, a former staffer at these radio centers who returned to the Soviet Union, caused a commotion among the radio provocateurs. But instead of learning a proper lesson from this failure, the Washington administration, proclaiming an anticommunist "crusade," is financing the psychological warfare centers with increasing generosity. Whereas at the administration's advent to power the Radio Liberty and RFE budget amounted to \$80.4 million, in fiscal 1987 the administration asked Congress for \$167.5 million for the "cold war" on the airwaves.

/6662

CSO: 1807/395

WESTERN EUROPE

GREEK VETO OF U.S. NUCLEAR MODERNIZATION PRAISED

LD171158 Moscow in Greek to Greece 1630 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Station commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners: Athens has rejected the U.S. request for permission to modernize the installations housing stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Announcing this, the official Greek Government spokesman, Miltiadhys Papaioannou, stressed that Athens made this decision within the framework of its objective to completely rid the country's territory of nuclear arms. Our commentator says the following:

As far back as the fall of 1981, the PASOK government announced in the National Assembly that nuclear weapons would be removed from Greek territory as soon as possible; it would appear, however, that it is not as easy for this to be carried out as their statements would imply. Nevertheless, despite U.S. pressure, Athens, as before, is determined to implement its decision. All the more so as the Greeks are acquiring increasingly more data about how their country is being turned into a nuclear hostage of the United States.

Here is the latest example of such information. Recently the minutes of the hearings of the Subcommittee for Military Construction Projects of the House Appropriations Committee of the U.S. Congress were published. There were references to the new U.S. military budget for 1987. It emerged that on the territory of Greece, in one of the U.S. bases, bombers with nuclear weapons have been on war readiness on a 24-hour basis for 20 years now. There is no need to explain here the threat that the presence of these nuclear slings on Greek territory poses for Greece. In the event of a conflict breaking out these weapons would attract, like magnets, the full force of a retaliatory strike.

The very existence in Greece of the U.S. war bases contradicts not only the demands of the Greek people but also the peace-loving foreign policy of the PASOK government, our commentator continues. As is known, the agreement between Athens and Washington that came into force in 1983, provides for the abolition of the U.S. bases in the country by 1988. The government's intention to see this agreement honored has been repeatedly confirmed by Greek official including Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou. This is precisely

what the Americans do not want. Their tactics involve emasculating, at all costs, the contents of the agreement and achieving one way or another, the preservation of their bases on Greek territory. This means that American GI's will remain in Greece as before and the nuclear bombers will continue to be ready to appear in the azure Greek skies at all times.

All this, our commentator underlines, is not a hypothetical invention. Of late, statements by certain U.S. officials and remarks in the American press have started to contain hints that the Pentagon bases in Greece will, in the end, be preserved. Thus, for example, at the end of last month the organ of the U.S. business circles, WALL STREET JOURNAL, wrote that according to reliable sources a formula will be found that will allow the Americans to preserve their bases. And then comes the veto exercised by Athens to Washington's demand to modernize its nuclear stockpile installations in Greece. It is a step that serves the true interests of sovereign Greece, a step that confirms the devotion of Athens to its declared peace-loving line, our commentator concludes.

/6662

CSO: 1807/392

WESTERN EUROPE

FRANCE RENOUNCES INDEPENDENCE, ALIGNS WITH U.S.

LD012243 Moscow in French to France and Belgium [no GMT given] 1 Sep 86

[Vsevolod Mikhaylov commentary]

[Text] Didier Bariani, secretary of state for foreign affairs, told LE FIGARO that France intends to restrict [words indistinct] Nicaragua. Our observer Vsevolod Mikhaylov writes that this decision reveals that France is abandoning an independent approach to a solution to the Central American conflict, and that it is aligning itself increasingly with Washington's point of view.

For many years France has been on good terms with the revolutionary government of Nicaragua, giving it, despite pressure from the United States, moral support and material aid. After the right-wing coalition came to power Paris reconsidered its independent approach--not only with regard to Nicaragua. [Words indistinct] a greater [word indistinct] of the independent foreign policy of France and a more marked alignment with Washington.

The current authorities present themselves gladly as being in favor of an independent policy, even continuing in the line of General de Gaulle, and this (?applies particularly) to the main party in power, the RPR, which still claims to be Gaullist. In its election manifesto the RPR confirmed on many occasions that its [words indistinct] its attachment to defense, national independence and the struggle for the grandeur of France. In face of the concrete steps by the authorities in international policy make this independence even more precarious, while stressing pro-American orientations.

There is no longer any question, as in the past, of France taking care to preserve its independence from the military organization of NATO. Paris is building its military policy by conforming increasingly with the strategic arrangements of the United States and NATO. This is what particularly emerges from a new military program law being examined by the government, as well as the draft military budget for 1987, which is directed at greater collaboration with the forces of NATO, and first of all with Washington's main ally in Europe, the Federal Republic of Germany. [Words indistinct] the defense minister, Andre Giraud, France intends to take part, with the FRG, in the so-called initiative for European defense, which would be a

regional [words indistinct] of the American SDI. The military program also makes provision for the purchase of American AWACS planes, which would increasingly link France with the military structure of NATO.

More and more often French forces take part in NATO military maneuvers, including those which are currently taking place, by welcoming operations on French soil. For the first time this summer a flight of the West German Air Force was stationed for 9 weeks on the French base of Colmar in the Hatu-Rhine department. For many years American warships were forbidden to enter French ports and American planes were forbidden to enter French airspace. (?Eventually) American nuclear submarines enter French ports and American planes [words indistinct] exercises in the skies over France.

The (?many-sided) rapprochement with the military organization of NATO [words indistinct] in such a way that French defense is subordinated to the Atlantic Alliance, instead of being an instrument of an independent policy. The activities of this right-wing diplomacy in the Third World do not seem to be independent either. The current government has in fact moved away from the independent line with regard to the Middle East problem, by taking the side of Washington and Tel Aviv against the creation of an independent Palestinian state and the recognition of the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Palestine. Paris and Washington act together increasingly against liberation movements in Africa, in Chad, for example, and in southern Africa. The current French Government, despite the decision of the United Nations to boycott the terrorist Pretoria regime, has again sent an ambassador to South Africa--he had been recalled by the previous government. [Words indistinct]. France was the first West European country to follow the United States by adopting economic sanctions against Libya [words indisinct].

According to the RPR's election manifesto France will only have [word indistinct] when it can ensure its independence. [Words indistinct] Is it possible to fight for the grandeur of France by renouncing its own policy and aligning with the position of the American administration?

/6662

CSO: 1807/392

WESTERN EUROPE

FRG SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY CONGRESS REPORTED

Policy Platform Outlined

PM051000 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Aug 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov dispatch: "SPD Congress Guidelines"]

[Excerpts] Nuremberg, 29 Aug--...From Monday to Friday the capacious Frankenhall Hall at the Nuremberg Exhibition Center was packed. There were some 400 delegates and as many, if not more, representatives of foreign parties, trade unions, and other international organizations. The congress of the Social Democratic Party [SPD], the largest FRG opposition party, was being held there.

A considerable amount, if not the bulk, of the congress' work was taken up by the discussion of issues linked with the problems of ensuring security, peace, and disarmament. Both the main speakers (J. Rau and A. von Buelow), as well as the Bundestag deputies who spoke during the debates--E. Bahr, H. Scheer, K. Fuchs--and other speakers expressed concern that the situation in the world is more alarming than ever and that peace is threatened. They spoke of the need to urgently take active steps which could help to repel this threat.

To sum up what was said on the congress rostrum and ratified by the delegates in a separate resolution, the SPD supports, as is formulated in its documents, a so-called second phase of detente, which envisages a number of urgent measures. In particular, the SPD advocates that the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles in the FRG be stopped and that all previously deployed Pershing 2 and cruise missiles be removed from FRG soil. At the same time the SPD also talks about the need to reduce the number of Soviet medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, bringing them back to the level of 1979. On coming to power an SPD government would promise to annul the agreement with the United States on participation in the so-called "strategic defense initiative" and oppose the European version of SDI.

The SPD advocates a summit between Soviet and U.S. leaders at the earliest opportunity and hopes that it would achieve concrete results. The party

advocates an agreement on a total ban on nuclear weapons tests, an agreement on medium-range missiles, and the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Europe and a chemical weapons-free zone.

On the basis of the conviction that a war "would destroy the basis of everyone's existence" and that Europeans can only avoid war together, and guided by the fact that the inviolability of borders and the independence and sovereignty of states are decisive in maintaining stability in Europe, the congress ratified the concept of "security partnership" with the East, a concept worked out by a special SPD panel of experts.

The congress rejected the U.S.-NATO offensive doctrines of a combined nuclear, chemical, and conventional weapons strike deep behind the Warsaw Pact countries' lines. And it demanded that henceforth only weapons which are "structurally unsuitable for attack," that is, unsuitable for aggressive purposes, be created.

The congress delegates repeatedly stressed the importance of the Soviet initiatives in the disarmament sphere, particularly the importance of M.S. Gorbachev's 18 August statement extending the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear weapons tests to 1 January 1987. An agreement on ending all nuclear tests could make it easier to reach disarmament accords concerning both so-called conventional weapons and nuclear weapons, the document adopted by the delegates notes. And many delegates sharply criticized Washington's negative approach to the USSR's constructive proposals.

Congress Ends

LD291759 Moscow TASS in English 1441 GMT 29 Aug 86

[Text] Nuremberg August 29 TASS--TASS correspondents Viktor Borodin and Vladimir Smelov report:

The congress of the Social-Democratic Party of German, the biggest West German opposition party, has closed here today. The delegates to the congress discussed for five days topical issues pertaining to a cut in the military arsenals, putting an end to the nuclear weapons race on earth and preventing it in outer space. The congress has borne out that the Social-Democratic Party of Germany is committed to the policy of detente, strengthening of peace and international security. The delegates have also devoted much attention to the SPD's strategy in connection with the preparation of the Bundestag elections scheduled to be held in January 1987.

Summing up the results of the discussion of security issues, Horst Ehmke, deputy chairman of the party's parliamentary group, told the TASS correspondents that the Social Democrats welcome the USSR's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts announced by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He highly appreciated the

Soviet Union's preparedness for a new Soviet-American summit meeting and expressed confidence that it would result in concrete accords on curbing the arms race, the way to which can be opened only by putting an end to all nuclear tests.

This stand is mirrored in the main document on questions of the security policy adopted at the congress. It stresses that the Social Democrats declare for strengthening security in Europe, for the withdrawal of medium-range nuclear missiles deployed in Europe, including on the territory of the FRG, for the creation of zones free from nuclear and chemical weapons, for broadening East-West cooperation. The delegates have unanimously declared for cancelling the agreement between Bonn and Washington on the FRG's participation in the "Star Wars" programme. Amelioration of the international atmosphere is to us more important than a militarisation of outer space, Johannes Rau, SPD candidate to the office of FRG chancellor, told the congress.

The delegates have criticized the policy of the current right-wing conservative government of SDU/CSU-FDP of flouting the democratic rights of citizens and cutting social programmes. They have adopted a programme of SPD actions in the socio-economic field, whose main objective is to reduce mass unemployment in the country. Willy Brandt, who has been again elected party chairman, stressed in his concluding address that the congress had been an important milestone in the fight of the Social Democrats for the return to power in Bonn.

The forum was attended by representatives of a number of Social Democratic, communist and working class parties, including an observer from the CPSU, Viktor Rykin, head of a sector of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee.

/6662

CSO: 1807/391

WESTERN EUROPE

COMMENTARY VIEWS WESTERN PERSPECTIVE ON BERLIN

LD041427 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 3 Sep 86

[Text] Fifteen years ago on 3 September an agreement on West Berlin was signed between representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and France. Viktor Giazunov has these details:

There is reason why this date should be recalled, for the past experience itself has confirmed the importance of the agreement on West Berlin. It was important for improving the situation in Europe, for if we look back at the fifties and sixties we'll see that West Berlin played the role of a European troublemaker, so to speak, at the time. West Berlin was referred to as an advanced cold war post and the cheapest atomic bomb. Anyway people of the older generation probably remember how so-called Berlin crises erupted there one after another, making the entire situation in Europe feverish.

The four-sided agreement when reached in 1971 paved the way for the situation when West Berlin was expected to stop to be a source of tension. A special political and juridical status was outlined for it. As the agreement stipulates, West Berlin is no component part of West Germany and is not governed by it. Experience shows that both the city residents and Europe, in terms of its stability, benefit from West Berlin's special status. Attempts to violate it lead to complications and such attempts are made in Bonn all the time. Its officials cannot put up with the thought even 15 years after that West Berlin is no domain of theirs. They try arbitrarily to draw the city in West Germany's state and political system. They hold in particular various official campaigns in West Berlin up to meetings of West German parliamentary bodies.

Bonn besides claims itself the role of a representative of West Berlin in world affairs. This all runs counter to the provisions of the 1971 agreement. Regretfully this happens with the connivance of the three Western powers, the co-signatories of the agreement. The Soviet Union stands for the strict and absolute observance of the agreement on West Berlin. The past 15 years have confirmed its importance as an instrument of stability.

/6662

CSO: 1807/391

WESTERN EUROPE

SOVIET DELEGATE ADDRESSES NORDIC COUNCIL ENVIRONMENTAL MEETING

LD082246 Moscow TASS in English 1912 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Stockholm September 8 TASS--TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov reports:

An international conference on the problems of transborder air pollution opened in the Swedish capital today.

The forum which is being held on the initiative of the Nordic Council--the consultative body of the parliamentarians of Nordic countries--is being attended by representatives of many countries, among them the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, and by a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Speaking at the opening of the conference, Anker Jorgensen, president of the Nordic Council, former prime minister of Denmark, emphasized the need to increase joint efforts to prevent the pollution of the air space of various countries, including that caused by industrial wastes which are discharged into the atmosphere and which result, in particular, in so-called acid rains which inflict a serious damage upon the environment and are a hazard to human health.

"In the USSR, Measures to regulate interaction between man and the environment are taken on a planned basis," Vasilii Grebenyik, the leader of the Soviet delegation, chairman of the commission for the conservation of nature and rational utilisation of natural resources of the soviet of nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said in his speech.

"Well aware that the protection of the atmosphere from pollution is not only a national problem," he said, "the Soviet Union attaches much importance to broad international cooperation in solving regional and global problems connected with this."

"International cooperation in the field of environmental protection," the Soviet representative pointed out, "can develop successfully only under conditions of lasting peace on earth. Such cooperation is inseparable from the work to prevent a nuclear catastrophe."

"The Soviet peace initiatives contained in this year's January 15 and August 18 statements by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, indicate a clear and realistic way to lasting peace without weapons and, first and foremost, without nuclear ones.

"The Soviet Union's decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear explosions till January 1, 1987, has given yet another historic chance to end the arms race.

"A renunciation of the conduct of nuclear tests not only in the USSR but in the United States as well would be a real breakthrough towards slowing down the nuclear arms race and a catalyst of the elimination of nuclear weapons.

"The realisation of these proposals would be of immense importance for the release of resources for creative purposes, including those for a solution to the problem of the environment," the Soviet representative pointed out.

Speakers at the conference emphasize all countries' great responsibility to the present and future generations for the preservation of the environment, and speak out in favour of elaborating effective and radical measures aimed at preventing the pollution of the earth's atmosphere.

/6662
CSO: 1807/392

WESTERN EUROPE

SAXONY ELECTION'S IMPLICATIONS FOR FRG CDU GOVERNMENT WEIGHED

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 86 p 5

[Article by Yuliy Yakhontov under the rubric "Commentator's Column": "Signal for Bonn"]

[Text] Bonn--No elections for the FRG Landtage (Land Parliament) have aroused such great interest here for a long time as the voting which has just taken place in Lower Saxony. In truth, the results have enabled not only the leaders of the Land Christian Democratic Union but also the entire leadership of the ruling CDU/CSU-FDP [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union-Free Democratic Party] coalition as a whole to breathe a sigh of relief. Thanks to the election results, the CDU not only have retained power in Lower Saxony, but the previous alignment of forces has been preserved in the second chamber of parliament, the Bundesrat, where the majority belongs to the CDU/CSU.

Here are how the results look: the CDU has taken 44.3 percent of the votes (69 seats)--a loss of 6.4 percent compared with the 1982 elections. The number of votes cast for the SPDG [Social Democratic Party of Germany] has taken 36.5 to 42.1 percent in the current elections. Now the SPD will have 66 seats. At 0.6 percent, the number of those voting for the "Greens" is insignificant, but has nonetheless increased, while the number of those supporting the Free Democrats is 0.1 percent. From now on they will have 11 and 9 seats respectively in the Landtage.

A situation has taken shape in the parliament of Lower Saxony that does not permit the CDU any longer to form a government on its own. Having lost an absolute majority, this party will now enter a coalition with Free Democrats here as well.

The success of the SPD in the elections is significant. Although Social Democrats have not achieved their goal of removing the CDU from power, the increase in their votes is extremely important. Moreover, it was achieved despite a wide campaign to malign and intimidate voters with "red-green chaos," which, as the Christian Democrats maintained, would ensue if the SPD prevailed.

As F.Y. Strauss, head of the Bavarian Christian Social Union, said, the voters gave "serious notice" to the ruling coalition for the 6 months before general parliamentary elections in the second Federal Land election by area and the fourth by population.

In fact, these elections, as well as recent voting in North Rhine-Westphalia and Saar, demonstrate the steady growth of dissatisfaction in the FRG population with both domestic and foreign policy of the conservative right CDU/CSU bloc. High unemployment, a reduction of government appropriations for social needs, encroachment on constitutional rights of citizens and simultaneous growth of military expenditures linked with FRG participation in the arms race, including space weapons and American first-strike missiles on West German soil are, in brief, the reasons that have led to the current election results in Lower Saxony, which can by no means be called successful for the ruling party.

12976/6662

CSO: 1807/328

WESTERN EUROPE

BRIEFS

DANISH PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION--[TASS report under general heading: "In an Atmosphere of Good Will"] A meeting between A.E. Voss, chairmen and members of standing commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers, and the [Danish] Folketing delegation took place 27 August. The guests were briefed on the measures being taken by the supreme organ of state power for the further improvement of socialist democracy, the mobilization of work by soviets at all levels, and the broad and creative participation of working people in decisionmaking on the most important questions of state policy. The Danish parliamentarians were also given answers to questions of interest to them, concerning in particular the Warsaw Pact Organization. Considerable attention was given to problems of environmental protection, including the peaceful use of nuclear power and international cooperation in this sphere. Taking part in the conversation were Deputies L.B. Yermin, V.V.Zagladin, Yu. A. Izrael, L.N. Nersesyan, other officials, and R.A. Thorning-Petersen, [Danish ambassador to the USSR]. [Text] [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 4 PM] /6662

GERMAN CP DELEGATION--[TASS report: "FRG Communists in the USSR"] A delegation of German Communist Party (DKP) ideological personnel, headed by (V. Gerns), member of the Presidium and Secretariat of the DKP Board, was in our country from 24 through 31 August at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. The delegation had conversations at the CPSU Central Committee International Section and Propaganda Section, met with eminent Soviet scientists and specialists, and acquainted itself with progress made in the implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions in the sphere of social and political life and in the economy. FRG communists, the delegation leader said, are following with great fellow feeling the Soviet Union's vigorous and consistent implementation of the course of reorganization and acceleration of socioeconomic development. The USSR's successful advance along this path and its persistent actions in the international arena to avert the nuclear threat are at the same time a powerful prop for all the people in the FRG and other Western countries who are struggling for peace and social progress. [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Sep 86 First Edition p 4 PM] /6662

CSO: 1807/391

SOVIET MEDIA SHOWS POSITIVE ASPECTS OF CHINA-USSR RELATIONS

Beijing Mayor Interviewed

PM141258 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Sep 86 p 3

["Today's Interview" with Beijing Mayor Chen Xitong by A. Platkovskiy in Moscow on 6 September: "Beijing's Skyline"--first paragraph is a KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Excerpts] A delegation of the Beijing People's Government recently visited our country at the invitation of the Moscow City Soviet. Our correspondent met with delegation head Chen Xitong, mayor of Beijing.

We met in the hotel. It was Saturday evening. Cups of traditional "lu cha," the aromatic green tea, were on the small table, offering an invitation for a leisurely conversation. But the time allocated to the interview in the mayor's schedule was extremely short. His movements were energetic, even impatient, like those of a man to whom the "office" style is alien and who is used to utilizing every minute. Chen Xitong lit a cigarette and leaned back into the armchair, ready for questions.

[Platkovskiy] Tell us, please, about the most urgent tasks with whose solution you began your activity as mayor of China's capital?

[Chen Xitong] Many problems had accumulated in the city three years ago, when I took office. Some of them were very acute. We were seriously concerned with the state of public order. It was necessary to "cleanse" the city of all kinds of shameful phenomena, from breaches of sanitary norms and rules of street safety to all possible economic and criminal felonies. An energetic struggle was launched in this direction. It has already produced good effects.

Large-scale work was also launched to improve the city's amenities and parks.

The solution of the housing problem was actively undertaken. Some 22 million square meters of housing have been built in the last five years. Thus the pressure in this sphere is gradually easing. At the same time, efforts have been made to develop the trade network. Unfortunately, proper attention had not been given to it previously. Construction work was being done primarily on housing, while trade projects were being postponed until later. Some

80,000 new stores and trading stations have opened in the city in the recent past.

In this respect, incidentally, we studied with great interest the experience of Moscow and Kiev. What I have in mind is the comprehensive approach toward the development of urban rayons, when housing construction must be accompanied by development of the consumer services sphere. In my view, this practice is very useful.

[Platkovskiy] How do young people help in solving Beijing's problems?

[Chen Xitong] Young people love their native city and have enthusiastically joined in its development. We would have hardly achieved any success without their help. Beijing is now green, clean, and beautiful. Young men and women regularly get out in the streets with brooms and shovels, taking part in subbotniks. Young people carry out inspections of road safety and the promotion of cultured behavior on the streets.

Educational work with young people in China today is more important than ever before. As you know, we are following an open foreign economic policy. As its implementation progresses, infiltration by bourgeois ideology is inevitable. This is why there are greater demands on the ideological, spiritual, and moral character of our young people. We want to ensure that they are purposeful, moral, disciplined, and highly skilled.

[Platkovskiy] What are your impressions from meetings with Soviet people and youth?

[Chen Xitong] During our stay in the Soviet Union we visited Moscow, Volgograd, Kiev, and Leningrad. We were warmly welcomed everywhere. We met with leading workers and ordinary people. Every time we were convinced of their friendly feelings for the Chinese people. This leaves an indelible impression. We also had opportunities to get to know Soviet young people. Their energy, optimism, and persistence in achieving set goals deserve every praise. In my view, these qualities are particularly valuable in our time. We were also pleased to note the Soviet young people's sincere desire for friendship with the Chinese people. For my part, I can assure them that our young people also want to develop the friendship between our peoples.

I wholeheartedly wish KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA's readers and all Soviet young people great successes in their labor and study. May the young grow strong and healthy. I also want to express the wish that the friendship between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union will develop daily.

PRC Visit Favorably Evaluated

LD151907 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 15 Sep 86

[From "The World Today" Program Presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] A step forward has been taken in the development of relations between the Soviet Union and China. This is how Comrade Talyzin, candidate member of

the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, evaluated the results of his visit to the PRC, which has ended. In the course of the visit the Soviet delegation had talks with Chinese leaders, visited major industrial centers and signed documents which provide for a deepening of all-round cooperation between the two neighbors.

A new impetus for the further development of good-neighborly cooperation between the two major socialist states was given by the fundamentally new tenets expressed in the July speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Vladivostok. In recent years, appreciably positive changes have taken place in Soviet-Chinese relations. They are marked by the development of mutually advantageous links and contacts in the most varied fields, and by the progressive growth of trade and economic cooperation.

During the Soviet delegation's visit to Beijing, the Chinese side expressed interest in expanding the Soviet Union's participation in the technical reconstruction of Chinese industrial enterprises, especially in their northeast areas. As you know, more than a year ago an agreement was signed in Moscow between the USSR and PRC governments on economic and technical cooperation in the construction and reconstruction of China's industrial enterprises. This agreement provides for the construction of 7 new works, and the reconstruction of 17 works in such important fields as power engineering, ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, machine building, and others.

The Soviet Union and China have similar tasks, connected with stepping up the social and economic development of their countries. This opens up opportunities for expanding cooperation and exchanging experience in socialist construction. [Video shows Talyzin and other unidentified officials at the talks.]

/12913

CSO: 1807/6

CHINA/FAR EAST/PACIFIC

JAPAN'S DEFENSE FORCE REPORTEDLY TO RECEIVE NUCLEAR SUBS

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jul 86 p 5

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent S. Agafonov under the rubric "Sensation from Abroad": "Nuclear Project of the Japanese Navy"]

[Text] Tokyo -- A front page article in MAINICHI has become a real sensation in Japan: the Directorate of National Defense (UNO) is examining the question of accepting nuclear submarines in the armaments of the Japanese navy.

According to the newspaper, the UNO proposes to equip the navy with nuclear submarines at the beginning of the next decade. At the present time, the "self-defense forces" of Japan have 14 diesel submarines. Two more ships will come off the building slips during the next five years. However, in the opinion of the UNO leadership, the capabilities of submarines of the conventional type are limited, and for all practical purposes they have exhausted themselves. But submarines with nuclear engines will significantly increase the effectiveness of submarine operations: there will be an increase in speed, radius of operations and the length of stay in a submerged state.

As MAINICHI writes, the UNO made inquiries to the Pentagon through unofficial channels, informing the ally of its intentions. If the OK is given from abroad, the nuclear project of the Japanese navy will be given the green light. The issue, however, rests not only on the position of the American side. A law exists in Japan which restricts the use of nuclear energy to peaceful purposes. Its application to combat ships will denote a radical departure from legislative restrictions and the movement of the "self-defense forces" to a qualitatively different level.

It is noteworthy that MAINICHI links the prospects of the nuclear project with the recent victory of the conservatives in the parliamentary elections.

I asked for an explanation at the Directorate of National Defense. It seems they studied the MAINICHI article there in the minutest of detail and, therefore, there was not the slightest doubt in the voice of Mr Uenaka, deputy chief of the information section of the military department, who kindly agreed to answer my questions. "The article in MAINICHI," he told me, "is a typical journalistic speculation. We did not make inquiries anywhere, and the report of the newspaper will be refuted at a press conference of the UNO chief of staff."

I went from UNO to MAINICHI. A Japanese colleague, with whom I got to speak, asked that his name not be given. "WE DID NOT EXPECT ANY OTHER ANSWER FROM THE MILITARY," he said. "BUT THE EDITORIAL STAFF STANDS BY ITS WORDS. WE DO NOT RETRACT THE PUBLICATION AND WE HAVE THE FACTS."

We will follow the development of events. The nuclear project is not a needle in a haystack. And the subject is too sensitive to be restricted to a simple, albeit a public, denial.

13052/12795
CSO: 1807/347

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

PAKISTAN'S POLITICAL UNREST VIEWED, U.S. SUPPORT FOR ZIA HIT

PM291507 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by V. Skosyrev: "Pakistan 1986. Staring into a Machinegun Barrel"]

[Text] The impressive mausoleum of M.A. Jinnah, founder of Pakistan, stands tall in the center of Karachi. Even when it is stifling outside, it is relatively cool inside the building. When you survey the burial vault, which embodies the traditions of ancient Muslim architecture, you automatically reflect on the legacy of Jinnah, who dreamed that his country, an offspring of the partition of India, would acquire tranquillity and stability.

Alas, the dream of the "father of the nation" has not yet come true. In its 39-year existence Pakistan has seen two major wars, three periods of martial law, and 22 years of state of emergency. And recent weeks in this state's political life have been marked by tragic events. We are referring not only to the arbitrary arrests of hundreds of prominent opposition figures. The "security forces" dealt even more savagely with ordinary supporters of the Movement for the Restoration of Democracy (MRD) in rural localities and in the slums of Karachi and Lahore.

A correspondent for the U.S. BOSTON GLOBE newspaper visited Sind Province and went to a small village flying the opposition's red, black, and green flags. The adobe walls of the huts were covered with indentations made by bullets. This was the result of a raid by some soldiers who had turned up in two vehicles. They had opened fire, and a few seconds later two men and an eight year old girl who had been playing nearby lay dead. Several more people were seriously wounded. The soldiers took 45 people away and no one knows what became of them.

Similar scenes could have been seen in other settlements. It is true that in the poor areas of cities centers of resistance to the terror did arise spontaneously. But the forces were ill-matched. When the trouble had died down President Ziaul Haq (he is also chief of staff of the ground forces) decided to make a "magnanimous gesture." Prominent opposition figures were released from jail in early September. This, Islamabad believes, ought to pacify the regime's critics in the West.

How does one assess the recent round of confrontation? (It is particularly important to answer this question in view of the fact that the opposition is

currently regrouping with the intention of relaunching the struggle for early democratic parliamentary elections). In a sense, both sides lost. The August events swept away the false veneer of "liberalization" from the Islamabad regime, clearly demonstrating that even since the lifting of martial law in 1985 the reins of government remain in the hands of the military bureaucracy and the civilian government of M. Junejo is still no more than its pale shadow.

At the same time, it is obvious that the opposition is not yet extensively enough organized. Activists of the Pakistan People's Party (PPP), which is headed by B. Bhutto, presumably hoped that the arrests and the provocations staged by the authorities would cause extensive unrest, like that which led to the fall of dictator Ayub Khan in 1969. This did not happen, in particular because the actions were local and took place mainly in Sind--the province where Bhutto was born. However, the most densely populated and economically developed province, Punjab, which provides most of the officers and men for the army, basically remains aloof from the antigovernment movement, although there is sympathy for its slogans.

It must also be borne in mind that the MRD is by no means a monolithic movement. There are differences among the leaders of the 11 parties in the alliance, and not just on grounds of personal rivalry. Many MRD leaders openly and directly condemn Islamabad's pro-American foreign policy course. They quite rightly point out that by enabling the United States to wage an undeclared war against Afghanistan from Pakistani territory the ruling clique is acting against national interests. Other alliance figures prefer to say nothing at all on these matters, obviously reckoning that Washington will bow to the pressure of international public opinion and will not hinder the replacement of the odious general by a popular politician at the helm of the ship of state.

The truth is, however, that the Reagan administration is even more willing than its predecessors to prop up the most reactionary and cruel leaders--be it in Asia, Africa, or Latin America--as long as they contribute to the implementation of U.S. strategy. The U.S. position at the very height of the August political crisis is a graphic illustration of this. Washington merely expressed hypocritical "concern" at the mass arrests, while at the same time making it clear that Ziaul Haq would continue to enjoy its patronage.

This U.S. line is embodied primarily in the fact that dollar injections enable the Pakistan ruling clique to spend vast sums to maintain the army--the regime's chief prop. It is U.S. aid that allows more than 40 percent of the budget to be spent for military purposes. And that in a developing country where the mass of people are still living in indescribable poverty!

Pakistan's military potential is growing and, consequently, tension is also growing on the South Asian subcontinent, which has been an arena of bloody conflicts on more than one occasion in recent decades. The U.S. delivery program typically includes F-16 fighter-bombers, helicopters, tanks, and various types of missiles. All these modern types of combat equipment are intended primarily for offensive operations, while the F-16S can also carry nuclear charges. When you consider that at the top-secret complex in Kahuta

work is nearing completion on the creation of a nuclear bomb, then the fact that Islamabad has these aircraft assumes ominous significance. This was pointed out again the other day by Indian Prime Minister R. Gandhi.

It cannot be said that no one in the United States is aware of the potential consequences of the accelerated arming of Pakistan. From time to time there is criticism in Congress of U.S. South Asian policy, which could lead to the formation of a new seat of nuclear danger. Especially as the U.S. legislators once approved the "Symington amendment" prohibiting aid to countries engaged in developing nuclear weapons.

But U.S. government leaders ignore the warning voices, just as they do the provisions of national legislation. In an effort to get Pakistan even more deeply involved in aggression against the DRA, the United States recently proposed giving Islamabad assistance in building highways and tunnels right up to the Afghan border. Earlier this year Washington began to supply Pakistan with brand new Stinger air defense missiles. Some of them are intended for Afghan counterrevolutionaries.

While taking these thugs to its bosom and training them to use weapons, the Pakistani military is kindling anti-Soviet sentiments in the country and aiding and abetting dushman crimes. It was this atmosphere that made it possible for the heinous act of terror to be carried out as a result of which a Soviet military diplomat was killed in Islamabad.

The logic of U.S. military and economic aid to Pakistan is such that it is being turned into a bridgehead for the implementation of extensive Pentagon plans which reach far beyond the confines of the subcontinent. The fact that Pakistani territory is part of the sphere of action of the U.S. Central Command, which is in charge of the "Rapid Deployment Forces," has long been an open secret. It is clear from items in the U.S. press that Pakistani airfields could be used at any moment for airlifting troops to the Persian Gulf and neighboring areas of the Near and Middle East. In fact, the U.S. military department's acquisition of bases in Pakistan is already in full swing. For this purpose U.S. ships are arranging to call at Karachi and other ports and radio relay stations are being erected in the interior.

The foreign policy of any state is bound up with its domestic policies. This relationship is also pretty obvious in Pakistan. The "special relationship" with the United States is perhaps the chief factor in the preservation of the anti-people system. Having secured a White House promise of total support, Islamabad is now preparing for a new confrontation on the domestic front. Ziaul Haq has warned the MRD and its leaders: "In Pakistan we play cricket, and everything will be find if you observe the rules. But if you start to act as they do in hockey, a rougher pursuit, we will also have to change games." It is clear that the "game" of facing machineguns, which the regime intends to play against the opposition, can only be compared with a liberal dash of cynicism to hockey, let alone to the innocuous game of cricket. But the advocates of the restoration of democracy were not intimidated by the general's threat. At the latest MRD meeting the alliance leaders decided to take further joint action and launch a mass protest campaign on 21 September.

It is intended that MRD activists will avoid direct clashes with the authorities.

It is difficult to predict how the campaign will develop. But there is no doubt that the political crisis Pakistan went through in August was not the last.

/12913
CSO: 1807/7

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

IRAN'S AIMS OF 'ISLAMIC EXPANSIONISM' SEEN IN WAR WITH IRAQ

Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian 25 Jul 86 p 3

[Article by Doctor of History G. Chipashvili: "To Whose Benefit?"]

[Text] Two neighboring countries of the Near East--Iran and Iraq--have now been engaged for six years in a senseless, destructive, fratricidal war, nor are there any signs even yet that it will end soon. The war has cost the two sides about half a million lives, in addition to hundreds of thousands wounded, crippled, and taken prisoner. In regions of military action, over 2.5 million persons are homeless and have had to abandon their native places. The war has forced both warring sides to make huge expenditures. It has inflicted great material losses on the Iranian and Iraqi peoples, greatly weakened their economies, and reduced their populations' already none-too-high standard of living. It is estimated that so far the material loss due to the war in Iran alone exceeds 300 billion dollars. Just to get an approximate idea of the scale of destruction from the warfare, suffice it to note that the losses substantially exceed the country's revenues from oil in the past 15 years. According to official data, during the last Iranian year alone (March 1985 through March 1986) the country had daily war expenditures, out of the state budget, of 222.5 million tumans (a tuman equals 10 riyals).

No single local war since World War II--even the well-known filthy wars conducted by the American imperialists in Korea and Vietnam--has caused as much destruction and slaughter as the Iran-Iraq war has. It has also worsened the already-tense international situation.

Our press has published considerable material concerning the causes and motives of the Iran-Iraq war. They consist of the usual disputes over borders and other matters between two neighboring states, disputes which could easily be resolved at the negotiating table.

In the summer of 1982, a year and a half after the war began, when Iranian troops liberated the City of Khoremshahr from Iraqi military units that had invaded Iranian territory, the country's progressive, democratic forces demanded an immediate end to the bloodshed and called upon the warring sides to make peace. The Iraqi Government also called for a truce. But the leaders of the Iranian Islamic Republic categorically rejected a cease-fire--in fact, they saw the moment as a chance to implement their illusory ideas of exporting

"Islamic revolution" and creating a "world Islamic government." They publicly declared their intention to seize Iraqi territory, overthrow Baghdad's Baathist government headed by President Saddam Husayn, and establish Islamic rule there on the Iranian model. After that, Iran's Islamic circles spoke nearly every day of creating a "unitary world Islamic system" and "a world Islamic army." But these expansionist strivings of the Iranian leaders were based on other, deeper motives.

The fact is that way back during the antimonarchic, anti-imperialist revolution of 1978-79, the Shiite leaders managed, through demagogic slogans of egalitarianism and "social justice," to entice the massed millions of the lower, oppressed strata over to their side and seize power through them. Later on, however, when it came time to make good on their promises to the people, when society's progressive forces demanded radical social-economic and political transformations and improved living conditions, the clerical circles--because of their narrow class interests--failed to satisfy the interests of the toiling masses or, consequently, to carry out their promises. This is why the revolution's political stage failed to develop into its social stage. As a logical result, the class struggle in the country erupted with new force, threatening to sweep away the political authority of the Islamic clergy. Naturally, this development frightened and still frightens the Khomeinites, who have grasped at any chance to halt or slow down new revolutionary demonstrations by the people. It was for this purpose that they tried to make use of the military actions that broke out with neighboring Iraq. Their idea was for the war to lay the groundwork to implement their conceptions of a mythical "Islamic unity" and "Islamic omnipotence." Islamic Shiite circles are doing everything they can to subordinate the country's public opinion and the people's revolutionary energy, which are geared toward the struggle for social justice, to the aims of the war. They are trying to shift the epicenter of the people's wrath onto an imaginary enemy supposedly located outside the country's borders. Askar Avladi, a dedicated propagandist of Islamic ideas, has even "proved" that the war is "a great boon" conferred by God upon the Iranians in order to "establish the Islamic order in the world." The Islamic leaders' whole effort now is aimed at broadly propangandizing, in the name of the Almighty, their insistent slogan of "final victory in the war." They preach the essential necessity of "Shahid" (martyrdom for the cause). The people's every demand for radical transformations in the social-economic sphere has been submerged in the psychosis of war propaganda. Ali Hoseini-Khamenei, the president of the Iranian Islamic Republic, declares openly that until the war is settled, he deems it impossible to serve the interests of the "mostazafin" (that's what the poor and destitute are called in Iran) as the Islamic Republic promised,

On the other hand, according to reports in the Iranian press, the country's clergy, who have been traditionally closely allied to the merchant bourgeoisie, grant complete freedom to the latter with regard to the sale of locally-made and imported goods. High prices, speculation, and usury are helping them get rich. According to official data, normal profits in trade and services rose from 40 to 58 percent between 1977 (before the war) and 1985. In trade and middleman transactions, moreover, profits are 3.5 times greater than in industry and 7 times greater than in agriculture. This is why not only millionaires but even billionaires have proliferated in Iran during the war's recent years.

At the same time, living and working conditions for 5 million workers and 1 million employees have worsened. Over 3 million able-bodied citizens are without jobs in the country. More than half of Iran's peasantry (1.31 million households) have little or no land.

Hence, as a result of policies following the Islamic leaders' revolution, the country's rich have got richer and the poor have got poorer, and the process has sharply worsened owing to the dragged-on war with neighboring Iraq.

Islamic leaders have replied to the Iranian people's struggle for peace and social justice with reprisals against democratic forces. Hameshi Rafsanjani, the chairman of the Islamic Parliament ("Majles-e shurai-e eslami"), has even charged that the Iranian People's Party (Tudeh) includes in its program the question of eliminating wars from social life. In February 1983, the party's leadership nucleus and activists were imprisoned and declared to be "agents" of the Soviet Union. More than 100,000 political prisoners are now suffering in Iranian jails. Most of them have been charged with propagandizing against the war.

The Iranian Islamic leaders' expansionist policies are in full accord with the interests of international imperialism, in particular the American militarists, with regard to the Near and Middle East. The imperialists are utilizing the Iran-Iraq war to foment discord and division in the national-liberation movement of the peoples in the region and to entrench their own military, economic, and political positions. On the pretext of "protecting the vital interests of the West," the Persian Gulf has become a race-course for American cruisers. This senseless war has borne fruit for the benefit of the imperialists and Zionists. There are already signs of preparations to create a cooperation council of the Saudi Arabia-Iraq-Egypt-Jordan axis and the countries of the Persian Gulf, which would form a military group under the American aegis. Already formed and functioning is America's aggressive "rapid deployment force." Saudi Arabia's military-theocratic regime is becoming the mainstay and bulwark of imperialism and reaction in the region. Because the Iran-Iraq war, moreover, has split individual Arab countries and put them in opposition to one another, advantageous conditions have been created for Israel's already unrestrained aggressive strivings.

Clearly, none of this benefits the Iranian and Iraqi peoples; in fact, it brings them nothing but terrible grief. The situation does nothing but provide grist for the American imperialists and their Zionist allies. Unfortunately, Iran's leaders have failed to grasp this fact as they build their domestic and foreign policies on religious, Islamic illusions.

6854/9274
CSO: 1813/26

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

USSR-ALGERIA PROTOCOL ON MUTUAL CONSULTATIONS

Moscow SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SOYUZA SOVETSKIKH SOTSIALISTICHESKIKH RESPUBLIK (OTDEL VTOROY) in Russian No 14, 1986 pp 206-208

[Text] The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Algerian People's Democratic Republic,

moved by the desire to strengthen and deepen the relations of friendship and multilateral cooperation existing between the two countries,

expressing the desire for activating cooperation in the interests of supporting international peace and security in accordance with the goals and principles of the United Nations Charter and calling for, in particular, the creation of an all-encompassing system of international security,

inspired by the ideals of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, Zionism, expansionism and racism in all their forms and manifestations and the unchanging desire to render every kind of support to people fighting for their freedom, independence and social progress and the right to determine their own fate and path of development,

recognizing the significance of cooperation between both countries in the interests of helping to avert war, primarily nuclear war and guaranteeing the condition for the survival of mankind,

desiring the establishment and strengthening of general peace and security of peoples, relaxation of international tension and peaceful settlement of disputes, eliminating from practice in international relations any policy of intimidation, pressure, hegemonism as well as the use of force or threats to use it in international relations,

recognizing the urgent necessity for restructuring international economic relations on a just and democratic basis and establishing a new international economic order, refusing the use, in any way whatsoever, of international economic ties for the goals of putting pressure on or interfering in the internal affairs of a sovereign state,

expressing the firm resolution to strengthen cooperation between both countries in political, economic, trade, scientific-technical, technological,

cultural and other spheres on the basis of principles of equality, respect for state sovereignty, national independence, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of one another,

agree to the following:

Article I. The USSR and the APDR will broaden and deepen the existing practice of conducting regular consultations on important international problems of mutual interest as well as on questions of bilateral relations. With these goals in mind they will conduct periodic meetings between representatives designated by the two Sides.

Article II. Consultations will involve:

important international questions, including problems of disarmament and strengthening international security with the aim of creating a general system of international security and averting war in all of its forms;

questions of decolonialism in order to act, within the framework of the UN and the international community, with the goal of speeding up the conclusions of this process in the world;

international economic problems in order to act with the aim of establishing a new just world economic order;

any serious exacerbation of the situation in the international arena, as well as hot spots of tension which currently exist or which may arise in the world;

international questions of an economic, trade, scientific-technical and cultural character, questions of environmental protection and other questions of interest to both countries;

problems of mutual interest being reviewed in international organizations of which both Sides are participants, particularly in the UN;

any other questions, in relation to which the Sides may find an exchange of opinions to be useful.

Article III. In case a situation arises which creates a threat to peace, violation of peace or development of tension in the world or one of its specific regions, both Sides will quickly conduct consultations in order to exchange opinions on what should be adopted in order to promote an improvement of the situation.

Article IV. Consultations will take place on the basis of mutuality at the corresponding levels and will have a regular character and be held alternately in Moscow and Algiers. The level and date for holding them, as well as questions for discussion will be determined according to mutual agreement. Ministers of foreign affairs or their representatives will meet whenever there is need to, in principle no less than twice a year.

Article V. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of both Sides will arrange, in case of necessity, on ways and means to help enrich and broaden the practice of their consultations.

Article VI. The current Protocol remains in force from the date of its signing and will be extended each time for the next 5-year period unless one of the Sides announces its intention to end the action of the current Protocol 6 months before the expiration of the corresponding date.

Completed in Moscow 27 March 1986 in two copies, each in Russian and Arabic, with both texts having the same force.

For the Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics

E. Shevardnadze

/9599
CSO: 1807/20

For the Algerian People's
Democratic Republic

A. T. Ibrahimi

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

INDIAN WOMEN'S DELEGATION VISITS ALMA-ATA

[Editorial Report] Alma-Ata SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN in Kazakh on 30 May 1986 carries on page 3 a 300-word KazTAG brief entitled "Guests from India." The brief reports on the visit of an Indian woman's delegation to Alma-Ata at the invitation of the Soviet Women's Organization. The delegation, made up of leaders of Indian woman's organizations, was headed by Ashoqa Gupta, president of the All-Indian Woman's Confederation, Svokha Dzhoshi, MP, chief secretary of the All-Indian "Makhime Congress" Organization, Omana Abrakhim, president of the Young Indian Woman's Association and Pritui Barwa, secretary of the Assam State Division of the Indian Woman's National Federation. The delegation was received by local authorities and visited points of interest.

/9274

CSO: 1832/418

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

CONGO PARTY DELEGATION STUDIES SOVIET SYSTEM

[Editorial Report] Alma-Ata SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN in Kazakh on 30 May 1986 carries on page 3 a 400-word KazTAG brief entitled "Congo Labor Party Delegation." The brief describes the recent Alma-Ata visit of a Congo Labor Party delegation headed by Al'fons Fungi, member of the Congo Labor Party Central Committee, chairman of the Party's Kwily Province Committee and province commissary, to Alma-Ata. The visit, an interview with the delegation makes clear, was primarily intended to allow its members to familiarize themselves with Soviet experience, to be applied back in the Congo to Congolese problems.

CONGO DELEGATION FROM ALMA-ATA SISTER CITY

[Editorial Report] Alma-Ata SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN in Kazakh on 7 June 1986 carries on page 3 a 400-word KazTAG article entitled "Cities Which Have Strengthened Their Friendship." The article reports, in the context of a visit by a Congo delegation to Alma-Ata, on sister city relations between Alma-Ata and Brazzaville in the Congo People's Republic since relations between the two cities were first established in 1981. The Congo delegation, headed by the Brazzaville regular secretary of the Congo Labor Party, visited various points of interest, including city administrative headquarters. Particular interest was expressed by delegation chief Ololo in furthering mutual interests in peace and in disarmament. The Kazakh experience and achievement is said to be a valuable model for the Congo.

CONGO DELEGATION CHIEF RECALLS ALMA-ATA VISIT

[Editorial Report] Alma-Ata SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN in Kazakh on 11 June 1986 carries on page 3 a 200-word TASS brief dateline Brazzaville, 5 June 1986, entitled "Unforgettable Influence." The brief records statements made by Al'fons Fungi, member of the Congo Labor Party Central Committee and chief of the Nairi Province Congo Labor Party Organization, and recent visitor to the KaSSR along with a delegation headed by him upon his return to the Congo. Fungi declared himself particularly impressed by how the KaSSR, once a backward part of the Czarist empire, has achieved its present high level of development.

MOZAMBIQUE DELEGATION VISITS KAZAKH CAPITAL

[Editorial Report] Alma-Ata SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN IN Kazakh on 20 June 1986 carries on page 3 a 400-word KazTAG brief entitled "Mozambique Friendship and Solidarity Week." The article reports on the visit by a delegation of the Mozambique Association for International Friendship and Solidarity. The delegation's visit was in connection with the Kazakh celebration of Mozambique Friendship week beginning on 17 June.

/9274

CSO: 1832/418

END