

reported its task as international "crisis management... in the strategically key area of energy."

This added dimension of Maier's attack on Trilateralism is of special significance due to his past public advocacy of a "new method" of triangular economic cooperation among the socialist and capitalist sectors of Europe and the Third World as a step-stone to a new world economic order. His perspective, presented in a September 1976 paper for the International Peace Institute in Vienna, identifies Maier with the outward-looking Eastern European current most anxious to see the socialist sector's transferable ruble trade-financing proposals functional. It should not be missed in Western Europe and North America that the most sophisticated attacks on the Trilateral administration come from such a spokesman.

The Soviet party paper, *Pravda*, however, has gone to new lengths to maintain the public profile of seeking peace assurances through a SALT II agreement with the "soft" side of Trilateralism. Vitalii Korionov, one of the paper's top commentators, followed the scenario of a

staged debate when he wrote Feb. 13 that opposition to Trilateral Commission soft cop Paul Warnke's confirmation as chief arms negotiator is aimed solely to wreck SALT.

The opposition to this still dominant "soft" facade, and the SALT negotiating concessions it implies, is increasingly apparent in Moscow as well and has not escaped all Western observers. Syndicated columnist Victor Zorza, for instance, called attention to an on-the-air reference by Soviet TV commentator Yuri Zhukov to "some impatient comrades" who call partial SALT agreements a useless pursuit at best. But Zorza's supposition that the hardliners, particularly in the military, are merely holding out for a "more substantial" agreement misses the mark. Time gained would be used not essentially for quantitative buildup — "more strategic missiles" — and not for "bargaining chip" accumulation. Time means opportunity for Soviet development of a qualitative military technological margin of advantage, while in the U.S. the corresponding R and D capabilities are dismantled by the administration's policy of deindustrialization.

## Triangular Trade Advocate From DDR Institute Exposes Trilateral Commission Policies

*The following is excerpted and condensed from Prof. Lutz Maier's article "Monopoly Strategy in a Dilemma," from the weekly paper Horizont, 1977 issue No. 7.*

...None of the measures which were supposed to bring about an upswing in 1976 succeeded....Investment activity is being expanded only very slowly and hesitantly and is mainly a matter of rationalization....The result of this is that raw materials and above all labor-intensive production activity is increasingly sent abroad. This means also that the products of these branches of the economy will tend to be imported and a growing part of domestic production of them will be liquidated....

The world economic position and activities of the Council on Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and its members are more strongly affecting processes in the capitalist economic system. The growing participation of the socialist countries in international trade and exchange of services as well as in the international division of labor is generally developing, in close connection with the developing countries, into a motive force which limits the influence of the international concerns and cartels, and stimulates and strengthens the discussions for new international economic relations on the basis of fairness and mutual advantage.

### *Collectivity and Contradictions*

The governments of the imperialist states are presently strengthening their joint efforts to alleviate acute manifestation of crisis. This appears on several

levels, such as:

- in U.S. ruling circles, especially in connection with the presidential election, a discussion is going on concerning the global strategic priorities of the U.S., in which the place of "Western partnership" would be redefined;
- on U.S. initiative a sort of summit-level government commission of the "big seven" — the U.S., Canada, Japan, BRD, France, Great Britain, and Italy — was formed and met first in 1975 at Rambouillet and then last year in Puerto Rico;
- the "Trilateral Commission," formed in 1973 of representatives of monopoly capital, government circles, and politicians from the U.S., Western Europe, and Japan. Its stated task is to study relations and differences of the three imperialist centers. The initiator of this commission was the U.S. policy expert and now security advisor to the new president, Brzezinski;
- the long existing military and economic organizations such as NATO, the OECD, etc.;
- institutions for special areas, such as the International Energy Agency (IEA), which are supposed to provide a sort of "joint crisis management" of the industrialized capitalist countries against the actions of the developing countries and coordinate long-term plans in such a strategically crucial areas as energy.

The U.S. especially pursues a revitalization of its leading role in the capitalist system and protecting the worldwide profit interests of the American multies; Western Europe and Japan seek their own economic and political zones of influence and to strengthen their

“equal” place in the “Trilateralism” of imperialist centers.

Western press organs refer in connection with the visit of Vice President Mondale to an American “double tactic,” of both coordinating Western unity and presenting hard demands to Western Europe and Japan. The reaction of the British trade minister Dell was more drastic: “...setbacks for Great Britain on the world markets in competition with the U.S., Japan and the BRD would have an effect like losing a war...”

Today there remains in the essence of imperialism a tendency to seek an exit from its difficulties through aggression and expansion. The crisis processes are the

basis for activities by imperialist forces against détente....

The product of the contradictory combination of the imperialist push for power and a certain realism is the formation of a sort of “imperialist concept of détente.” Without détente being attacked frontally, the new conditions are to be used for imperialist class goals. Using the expanding relations between the capitalist and socialist states, it is to be attempted to organize economic, ideological and political pressure on the socialist countries, in order to exact more concessions...gain time for stabilization and maneuvering room and new opportunities for offensive actions.

## Triangular Economic Cooperation Required

*In September 1976, Prof. Maier contributed a paper on “Aspects of Economic Cooperation between European and Developing Countries” to a symposium held in Vienna under auspices of the International Peace Institute. Condensed excerpts follow.*

How should the question of Europe’s relations to the Third World be approached? Do there exist possibilities to link the further development of all-European relations with a contribution to a new world economic order?

### *Interrelation of Economics and Politics*

A first aspect is the interrelation of politics and economic. Although at various international meetings, especially under U.N. auspices, representatives from Western and from certain developing countries have spoken of a “depoliticization” of economic problems, the facts indicate that there is actually an objective connection. Deliberate utilization of it is an important factor for implementation of progressive development processes. This understanding was clearly formulated by Mrs. Bandaranaike at the Non-Aligned Summit in Colombo, where she said that “... any separation of political problems from economic ones turns the developing countries in the wrong direction.”

What has been accomplished in the process of détente requires economic underpinnings. From this stems the necessity for expanding international economic cooperation on the basis of new, democratic principles. In this basic context, questions of Europe’s relationship to the Third World and the associated problems of a new world economic order should be posed.

There is an objective motivation for the development of economic cooperation between Europe and the Third World. We can identify certain moments of this:

- first of all, there is a growing tendency toward internationalization of production and economic life;
- the international division of labor is increasingly complex, and its sensible exploitation is today a precondition for economic progress of any country;
- presently new sorts of problems are evolving which

are international in nature and involve the interests of all countries. This applies to questions like the environment, energy, and raw materials exploitation.

The forms of international cooperation are already many-fold....What must be stressed next is this: the connections of European economic cooperation with relations to the Third World will only be able to be developed in the framework of the already existing multi-level of economic relations between the European states and the developing countries. This involves bilateral relations of socialist countries and of capitalist countries, between socialist and capitalist countries, between capitalist countries and developing ones; and multilateral relations between the CMEA and the developing countries, and the EEC and the developing countries. As is known, proposals are on the table for further development on the multilateral level through CMEA-European Economic Community ties.

The strengthening of the objective tendencies of internationalization tends toward the further development and complex growth of this multi-leveled system, and for this the appropriate political and other conditions have to be created. In this process, one must locate, it seems to me, the so-called triangular level (socialist countries — capitalist countries — developing countries, or conceivably CMEA — EEC — developing, or organizations of the developing countries....)

The nature of the task here demands especially flexible forms and methods, to supplement the present system of economic relations and contribute to the development of truly fair international cooperation to the advantage of all participants.

This area of problems rightly attracts growing attention, since it corresponds to the economic interests of many forces active in today’s world economy and could be an essential element for making firm and expanding the détente process.

### *On A Possible Mechanism For International Cooperation and the Western Model Of An ‘International Market Economy’*

In the leading Western countries in government circles and many research centers the “market economy” is propagandized as the indispensable basis for world economic relations. Many slightly varying Western ideas

have this as a common denominator. Among the reasons I will mention for this model's not being suited to our present and future, is the fact that it represents one essential cause of the glaring inequality of the industrialized and developing countries; furthermore, a "world market economy" means freedom and protection for the operations and machinations of international concerns and goes counter to the UN Charter of Economic Rights and Duties.

Moreover, an "international market economy" is posed as an alternative to a "world planned economy," such as would supposedly be cooked up through the demands of the developing countries for a new world economic order. Of course one can entertain one's own thoughts about the possibility of international planning measures. But the "world planned economy" waved like a scarecrow in this case is not on the agenda. What is at issue, and this is the main idea I have to express, is the necessary search for a mechanism which corresponds to the specifics of the real situation and can serve as a basis for linking European East-West cooperation and relations to the developing countries.

Practice so far provides certain tendencies in this direction which require examination, testing, and further expansion.

For example there is the practice of governmental agreements in East-West cooperation, which is ap-

plicable not only for bilateral, but also for multilateral relations. Here the basic principles of cooperation and the important goals for the medium and long-term could be established, and concrete measures and certain forms and methods ascertained. In close relation with this, mixed commissions have a growing role. Bringing together representatives from the governments, from the economy, and scientists, they create an authoritative basis for a stable and dynamic development of cooperation. Such commissions already exist on a bilateral basis, and also on a multilateral basis, for instance between the CMEA and Mexico.

A further element is what is called triangular *industrial cooperation* (or tripartite) among the socialist countries, Western industrial countries and the developing countries. Our acquaintance with this still young form of international economic cooperation is fairly spotty.

Through triangular cooperation it is possible to attain a lessening of the monopolistic positions of Western concerns, with their effects on prices and terms of delivery. It can protect the socialist partners from the immediate influence of inflationary processes and so stabilize cooperation. Properly applied, triangular cooperation can make a contribution to the struggle for a new world economic order.