

EXCLUSIVE

'Democracy According To NATO'

June 5 — The article printed here was made exclusively available to *Nuova Solidarietà*, *New Solidarity's* Italian language co-thinker newspaper, by *Novosti*, the press agency of the USSR.

by Dmitrij Ardamatskij
Novosti Commentator

The recent session of the NATO Council has launched in practice the realization of the new American Administration's plan for the intensification of U.S. presence in Western Europe. There are at least two reasons which impel the United States to hurriedly prepare a mechanism of more rigid control over the ongoing processes in the countries of the Old World.

Above all there is the growing economic and social instability of these countries, a foreboding of political modifications not to the advantage of the United States. In the second place, the growing economic competition by the "Common Market" causes the U.S. to foresee the danger of a more independent political line on the part of the countries which belong to it.

Not for nothing did the U.S. insist so strongly on the concept of "interdependence" during the recent meeting of "The Seven" in London. Nonetheless, it is difficult to believe that by this word the U.S. intends something other than the subordination of the interests of its partners to its own. It is also difficult to suppose that the United States could rely on a mere propagandistic slogan at the moment in which the realization of an important strategic plan is posed. In reality, secure and powerful means of pressure are needed, such as, for example, the Atlantic Alliance.

Carter has specified with extreme clarity that in order to guarantee United States presence in Europe it is indispensable to strengthen NATO. Although it has not been spelled out as explicitly, it can be automatically deduced that such a reinforcement means a more active political intervention by NATO into the affairs of the member countries.

Over recent months the leaders of several Western European countries have expressed their concern over the equivocal interpretation of detente by the new American Administration. In particular, they have expressed the fear that such an attitude could nullify many of the results reached in the area of developing reciprocal understanding.

In individual cases it has been possible to even speak of contradictions between the United States and its Western European partners concerning approaches to detente. Moreover, NATO's demands for the increase of military arsenals correspond increasingly less to the economic possibilities of the West European states, where it is very well understood that new military spending will contribute to aggravating even further their economic and social crisis.

The United States would like to solve the problem precisely with the aid of the Atlantic Alliance: it would like a rigid and lasting "stabilization" of the political situation in the West European countries (something which is only possible at the expense of democracy in these same countries and by chipping away at their autonomy); it would like to impose on them its new opinion of detente and force them to accept new commitments with respect to military spending, ignoring their own desires and their economic possibilities.

"Democracy" According to NATO

The new role of NATO, as it has been laid out by Carter and his advisors, risks leading to dangerous initiatives. The secret services of NATO and the United States, for example, will seek to influence political decision-making in the West European countries much more actively than in the past.

Meanwhile the first examples of the Atlantic Alliance's intention in this area already exist. At the end of last year a document drawn up by the Dutch social democrat Peter Dankert and examined by the NATO assembly at Williamsburg was rejected because it objectively evaluated the positions of the Western communist parties. A different document was instead published in February of this year by the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis at the University of Cambridge (actually at Harvard in Cambridge, Mass. — *New Solidarity* ed.) and the Center for International Research at the University of Miami (both institutions are connected to the U.S. government). It affirmed that the participation of communist parties in the governments of France and Italy could have a negative effect on the integrity of NATO. The "experts" maintain that NATO must avert government participation by communists. The same things are continually repeated by the commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the Atlantic Alliance, General Haig, an American.

Avert it in what way? Perhaps by nullifying the results of free elections? Could even something of this sort occur? At the very least it has been learned that NATO's leaders have prepared a secret plan of "struggle against political disorders," with the aim of suffocating any type of protest in the Alliance's member countries.

This plan was just approved at the session of the NATO council which took place in London last May 10-11. It indicates concrete measures for repressing eventual possible demonstrations of protest, measures of strict surveillance and the "neutralization" of persons who come to be known through their participation in protest movements. It also provides for the transference, "in case of necessity," of the totality of power into the hands of the military, with the suspension of the Constitutions of the Western countries, the use of armed forces to repress strikes — as has already been advised for some

time by the British General Kitson — and to guarantee the functioning of ports and railroads, and finally the participation of military units in the “mass transfer” of the civilian population.

It would have been only odd, if after all this the participants at the last session of the Atlantic Alliance had

not declared in their public communiqué that the NATO organization has as its real goal “defending the ideals of democracy and respects for the rights of man.” This type of rhetoric jibes perfectly with the phraseology of the new administration in Washington, which has dressed itself up as the “guardian of international morality.”

Italian Union Leader Calls For Global Anti-War Drive

ITALY

The secretary general of Italy's largest trade union confederation, Luciano Lama, made an unprecedented intervention into world politics in his address June 6 to the union's quadrennial congress at Rimini, Italy. Lama's speech to the four million-member CGIL confederation constitutes a magnificent example for the international working class on how to deal with the monetarists' threat to plunge the world into a general thermonuclear war.

Dropping all traces of traditional “clean unionism” impotence, Communist Party member Lama identified the volatile Mideast and Africa situations as the potential triggers of general war and called for an *international* united front of pro-development industrialists and trade unions to avert such a danger. The upcoming Belgrade conference on European collective security, Lama noted, is the forum where “resolute” steps must be taken in that direction. Furthermore, Lama located the source of both left and right terrorism internationally in the “vital centers of power” and the “uncontrolled financial centers” who pull the strings.

Lama opened a sharp attack on the anarchosyndicalist, local-control approaches which have long been used to manipulate Italian labor. “A profound and self-critical reflection on the conduct of the trade union is needed...It would be completely inconceivable and vain to raise demands, to develop a struggle and even reach some results on a factory-level program. (But) if these results are coordinated with more general programs of economic development, the clever and gifted entrepreneurs committed to a development policy can find support and directions for pursuing the advance of their activities...”

Broadening the polemic, Lama continued: “It is desirable that in Belgrade the most incisive policies be

formulated to freeze the armaments race and to create instruments of collective security...All unions, internationally, must support this initiative so that the governments of all countries be prompted to reduce military spending and use the savings thus obtained for economic and social development...guaranteeing a flow of capital, of technology and know-how toward the Third World....”

Lama concluded by warning the Lower Manhattan banking interests that the kind of terror recently unleashed on Italy would not stop the fight for a new international economic order. “The subversive forces and their controllers anywhere they are — in the vital centers of power and the uncontrolled financial centers — must know that they are faced with a working class which is not surrendering to their criminal enterprises....”

Cleaning Out the Anarchists

Lama's speech — which followed weeks of intense pre-congress organizing by the European Labor Party under the slogan “from Rimini to Belgrade” — is the culmination of a successful operation within the CGIL to clean up the regional and local union leadership of agents from “New Left” anarchist countergangs. Over the last month, two-thirds of the regional leadership has been replaced with worker cadres, while Lama is moving fast to take hegemony over the national leadership by installing pro-development leaders in the key secretary positions of the CGIL's industrial category unions. Most notably, the Maoist-oriented head of the powerful metalworkers' category, Bruno Trentin, has been kicked upstairs to a figurehead post in the CGIL and replaced by a staunch pro-Soviet labor leader.

These developments in the CGIL prepare the unions to implement the proposals outlined at the last Central Committee plenum of the Communist Party, calling for an education program to prepare worker cadres as leaders at all levels of Communist Party and trade union organization.