
By means of their colossal propaganda machines and their huge armies of diplomats and agents, the two superpowers try to convince the world that the theories of «détente», «balance» and «bipolarism» are basic to «the solution of all the problems preoccupying mankind today».


Certainly, each superpower tries constantly to present itself as the most authentic force that interprets the will of the peoples and staunchly defends their interests and, in this quality, advocates the theories of its foreign policy. You have only to listen to the American propaganda and the statements of the representatives of American diplomacy from the tribunes of international forums, from the UNO to Geneva, to see that their aim is to create the impression as though American imperialism is deeply interested in the «lowering of tension», «peace», «international stability», etc. The propaganda of Soviet social-imperialism and the representatives of its diplomacy seek to create the same impression.

SHABAN MURATI — Publicist

All this happens in the «context» of their rivalry. However, the fact is that, regardless of the fierce struggle for hegemony American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism carry out in different zones of the world, a rivalry which is also reflected in their propaganda media, when it comes to the theories of «détente», «balance», and «bipolarism», both the American and the Soviet theoreticians and politicians pose as ardent supporters and advocates of these imperialist theories, regardless of the odd alteration the theoreticians and propagandists of one or the other superpower make to their formulation. This occurs, first, because in this theory both superpowers find a convenient theoretical basis for a bipartite dialogue and collaboration of mutual practical advantage to their policy and diplomacy, as well as a basis for the co-ordination of their activities as international gendarmes against the other countries and peoples of the world. Second, this happens because both American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism are interested in creating among the peoples of the world a psychosis of capitulation and submission to their policy and dictate which they strive to create by spreading these theories.

By means of their colossal propaganda machines and their huge armies of diplomats and agents, the two superpowers try to convince the world that the theories of «détente», «balance» and «bipolarism» are basic to «the solution of all the problems preoccupying mankind today». Of course, in this context, each of them seeks to present itself as the promotor and implementor of these theories intended «only for the good and progress» of present international relations. However, these declarations and others of this kind are only disguises to cover up the true reactionary essence of these
theories, on which both Washington and Moscow base their bargaining to the detriment of the interests of the peoples and sovereign countries. The theories of «détente», «balance», or «bipolarism» which, «despite some nuance in form, are identical in content, are intended to guarantee the mutual spheres of influence to raise the dictate of superpowers in world affairs, the complete and unconditional submission of other countries to the two supergreat and abandonment of their national interests and sovereignty.»

A «DÉTENTE» WHICH INCREASES TENSION

The easing of international tension is one of the conditions for the normal development of international relations. That is why the peoples who want freedom and independence fight for a real easing of tension. On the contrary, the bourgeois-revisionist theory of «détente» is opposed to this process in its content, requirements and aims. It runs counter to the requirements of a real easing of international tension.

The theory of «détente», which reduces the easing of tension only to the relations between the great powers, and in particular the superpowers, in fact rules out the possibility of its extension to the whole sphere of international relations. According to this theory, the easing or mounting of tension must be seen exclusively from the angle of the relations between the superpowers, because relations between them allegedly determine the easing or mounting of tension in all international relations. «The 'détente' trumpeted by the Soviet revisionists and others», says Comrade Enver Hoxha, «is nothing but the old imperialist theory of balance and harmony among the great powers.»

By reducing the possibilities of the easing of tension to their direct relations only, the two superpowers give themselves the right to exercise their policy of hegemony and plunder, of aggression and intervention, in all the regions of the world. The use of force, as a basic means of their imperialist foreign policy, the brutal interference in the internal affairs of other countries, the organization of coups d'état, the stirring up of conflicts among different countries, the sending of armies or mercenaries or warships, or the setting up of military bases all over the world, in their opinion, are not actions which raise tension.

However, the fact that the two superpowers consider easing of tension their policy and strategy of the actual raising of tension in international relations, is only one aspect of the question. The other and more dangerous aspect is that they want to impose on the peoples a concept of «détente» according to their own way of thinking and acting. According to the American and Soviet theory of «détente», the peoples and sovereign countries should not oppose the manifestations of arbitrariness and arrogance of the superpowers and the other imperialist powers, because their opposition may allegedly cause a mounting of tension in international relations among these powers. According to this theory, the peoples and sovereign countries are, at the same time, called on to approve all the deals, intrigues and plots of the superpowers, indeed to accept all the consequences deriving from them. In this manner, the theory of «détente» deprives the peoples in the independent countries of the right of taking independent stand and independent actions.

The dangerous nature of the theory of «détente» is revealed especially by the fact that it links the easing of tension in particular with American-Soviet relations which the bourgeois and revisionist policy presents as the only regulator of international relations in the economic, political and social fields. The collaboration and dialogue between Washington and Moscow is given as the main factor of the easing of tension whereas all their activities from the positions of dictate, pressure, blackmail, threats and aggression towards other countries are glossed over or passed in silence. Attributing miraculous power to this type of «détente», the Soviet revisionists
go to such lengths as to raise it to an absolute principle, putting the development of the productive forces in the same footing as the character of the relations of production itself. The authors of the book «Materialization of the Easing of Tension: Economic Aspects», Moscow 1978, present the easing of tension as «an objective necessity arising from the requirements of the development of productive forces». In this manner, the theory of «détente» is a catch-word to rule out the need for the social revolution and to lead the peoples and the proletariat not on to the road of the revolution, which is the road of the solution of the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production in the bourgeois, capitalist or revisionist world, but to the «easing of tension», and this only in the relations between the two superpowers.

In fact preachings about the so-called easing of tension, which the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists are after, are intended to create an international atmosphere in which the peoples stay, put and do not rise in struggle to win «and defend their freedom and independence», but abandon their affairs and fate to the wishes of the superpowers. So, in the name of the easing of tension the peoples are called on to renounce their revolutionary and liberation struggles, to give up their independent development and even their national identity.

It is obvious that this kind of easing of tension advocated by the theory of «détente» is very convenient to the two superpowers to realize their imperialist and hegemony-seeking policy. And regardless of the fact that at this or that moment one or the other superpower, one or the other of their allies, lays the stress more or less on «détente» in the slogans of its foreign policy, the truth remains that the imperialist-revisionist slogan of the easing of tension is a weapon in the arsenal of the policy and diplomacy of the superpowers. Despite their disagreements in the way of the implementation of «détente», both the Americans and the Soviets are interested in their type of easing of tension. The mouthpiece of the American big monopoly bourgeoisie, the newspaper «New York Times», wrote in one of its issues that the lowering of tension is inextricably linked with the common interests of both countries, which, translated in plain language, means with the interests of mutual agreement between the two superpowers, despite their rivalry, to the detriment of the freedom and independence of the peoples.

And many facts show that their common interest is, in the first place, to suppress the revolutionary and liberation struggles everywhere in the world, to check the advance of the revolution and socialism. This is what the so-called easing of tension, advocated by the theory of «détente», tries to cover up, while at the same time justifying the taking of joint actions of a political and even police character in different regions of the world on the part of the two superpowers in the name of maintaining international stability or «détente». Hence, this is a theory with an extremely dangerous demagogical content, a weapon of the hegemony-seeking imperialist and social-imperialist foreign policy.

UNBALANCEABLE «BALANCE»

That the foreign policy of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism develops with an emphasis of its aggressive character, this is a fact proved by the whole activity of the United States of America and the Soviet Union in different countries and regions of the world. The two superpowers seek to justify their dangerous strategic advance in all directions, from armaments to invasions, with the theory of «balance», which is the favourite word in the theoretical arsenal of the policy and diplomacy of the superpowers at the present time. At the 8th Congress of the PLA Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out: «Up till now the superpowers have tried to preserve a certain equilibrium between themselves, to ensure respect for their mutual spheres of influence, and to keep pace with each other in the arms race. They have made efforts to avoid a direct war between them, but now, as a result of the crisis and unequal development, this equilibrium is tending to fall apart.»

The American and Soviet theoreticians' idea of balance is a very broad one. It does not consist in the armaments alone, although the balance of power or terror, as they call it, is among the basic concepts of the theory of balance. Balance as American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism put it means their domination of all the world on the basis of balancing their imperialist interests. This strategic balance, which has both its military and political aspects, not only places the hegemonic interests of one or the other superpower at its centre, but also calls on the peoples to sacrifice their national interests for the sake of maintaining the balance between the two superpowers. The head of American imperialism, Reagan, in two interviews given in October and November last year, declared openly that the relations between the two superpowers are such that they may entail the sacrificing of the interests of the respective allies, even allowing for a limited nuclear war. This limited nuclear war, according to the political-strategic conceptions of the Americans, need not upset the strategic balance between the two superpowers. For his part, the head of the Soviet social-imperialism, Brezhnev, in an interview he gave the West-German magazine «Spiegel» on November 2, 1981, calls «the exemplary balance between the United States and the Soviet Union a factor for the preservation of peace».

When they advocate the reactionary theory of «balance», both the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists intend to justify their policy of aggression and war, their bandit-like interventions and unjustified presence in the different regions of the world, their arms race and
their colossal war expenditure. To them, maintaining the balance means that neither side should gain an edge on the other in its military power and in its zones of influence in this or that region of the world. In this manner, in order to maintain this so-called balance, they arrogate to themselves the right to brutally intervene with their tanks, aircraft and missiles wherever their imperialist strategic interests call for it.

The imperialist theory of «balance» blames the upsetting of balance mainly on the peoples who fight for freedom and independence, the peoples who want to live outside the oppressive burden of tutelage of imperialism and social-imperialism. The imperialist and social-imperialist theoreticians link the maintenance of balance with the occupation of countries and whole regions, with the enslaving of the peoples and the denial of their freedom. The imperialist strategic balance calls for the whole world to be divided into spheres of influence between the imperialist superpowers, and to achieve this, they seek by all manner of means and embark on criminal adventures to stamp out the revolutionary and liberation struggles of the peoples. The superpowers spearhead their main attacks against the peoples, because the struggles of the peoples for freedom and independence, for national and social emancipation upset their plans for hegemony, upset their imperialist balance. So much so that when it comes to opposing revolutionary and liberation movements they even take joint actions and approve of the actions of each other in those countries or regions in which their bargainings over maintaining a balance have reached a conclusion about drawing the dividing lines between their spheres of influence. Mutual recognition of each other’s interests is an indivisible part of the theory of «balance», which has also been sanctioned in official documents between the two superpowers.

Justification of the aggression by the imperialist superpowers is the basic element of their theory of «balance». Either under the pretext of re-establishing the upset balance or under the pretext of intervening to prevent it from being upset, the superpowers do not hesitate to embark on aggression in order to establish their domination. A typical example in this direction is the aggression of the Soviet social-imperialists against Afghanistan, which was undertaken under the pretext of preserving the balance between the Soviet Union and the USA. To this the Americans replied with actions of their own. And so the circle of aggressive claim actions of the superpowers against the peoples has kept widening.

The same has happened in the field of armaments, in which the definition of the balance has always been a bone of contention and the basic pretext which has led to major initiatives that have raised the arms race to an unprecedented degree. Each superpower claims that it is arming and producing new means of extermination in order to re-establish strategic parity. Under the same pretext they have increased their troops, bases and nuclear missiles in Europe and other regions and, as a result, their attempts at dictating their policies to others have increased everywhere. The theory of «balance» is one of the more evident indicators of the aggressive character of the policy of the imperialist superpowers. It paves the way for and justifies armed confrontations, regional clashes and wars up to a general imperialist war.

«BIPOLARISM» AS A MEANS OF WORLD DOMINATION BY THE GREAT TWO

The United States and the Soviet Union are clashing with each other in fierce constant rivalry which is the main source of current international conflicts. But this has not prevented them from striking deals and entering agreements of various character. «The efforts to come to terms to the detriment of the peoples have always been, the response of imperialist to the tendency towards inter-imperialist clashes and conflicts,» Comrade Enver Hoxha points out. The imperialist theory of «bipolarism» which lays down most blatantly the right of the two superpowers to lead and rule the world according to a bipolar system, has emerged on this basis and is actively advocated by the two superpowers. Certainly, this theory emerged out of the need each superpower has for the other, as well as out of their calculations of each other’s potential, which is considered as the most effective means to «pacify» the world and put it under the domination of the supergreat. The theory of a bipolar world was raised in the American and Soviet policy at the time of the presidency of Nixon and his frequent high-level talks with Brezhnev, when official documents sanctioning bipolarism as the basis of development of Soviet-American relations were signed. This theory is widely advocated even now, with the advent to power of Reagan who is operating along the political concepts and theories worked out formerly by Nixon’s republican team.

It is evident that both American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism accept bipolarism not out of their readiness to make concessions to each other, but in order to pull themselves free from the complications and difficulties in which they have landed as a result of the grave crisis and the revolutionary and liberation struggle of the freedom-loving peoples everywhere in the world.

Of course, bipolarism must not be identified with alliance. The theory of «bipolarism» presupposes joint domination of the two superpowers on the basis of preservation of their respective spheres of influence and, at the same time, of intervention, even jointly, whenever and wherever their dictate is at stake. Eugen Rostow, a member of the Reagan team, talking about American-Soviet relations, declared openly that «peace is the result not only of agreements, but also of police actions». For his part, in a letter ad-
dressed to Reagan on May 25, 1981, Brezhnev wrote about the need for recognition of the legitimate interests of the United States and the Soviet Union.

The theory of «bipolarism» not only recognizes but also justifies the international police actions to make the peoples submit to any decision of the supergreat. It is evident that the theory of «bipolarism» does not exclude the fierce rivalry between the two superpowers, as each superpower seeks in this binome. But, no matter from what standpoint it is considered, «bipolarism» means an escalation of the hegemony-seeking activity of the two superpowers in international relations and the raising of their domination to an obligatory norm in the political life of the world.

* * *

It is clear from the very assertions made by the politicians and theoreticians of the two superpowers that the theories of «détente», «balance» and «bipolarism» are implements of the policy and diplomacy of the superpowers to establish a procedure in international relations under which the United States and the Soviet Union make the law. According to them, «détente» means that the freedom-loving peoples should not rise to oppose imperialist intervention and aggression and should accept peace in the terms of the Americans or the Soviets. As the United States and the Soviet Union see it «balance» means maintaining parity in the build-up of military stockpiles and, what is more important, to the degree both sides consider sufficient to blackmail the peoples. «Bipolarism» is an immediate expression of the ultra-reactionary political philosophy of the two superpowers according to which both of them have the right to lead and dominate the world. Hence, an evident link exists in the content and character of these imperialist theories which are intended to give the arrogance of the two superpowers the force of a law with which all must reckon.

This is even more glaring in the attempts of the American and Soviet politicians and theoreticians to work out an international code of behaviour for all states, under the tutelage of the two superpowers, which the American and Soviet political schools consider as one of the component of the Soviet-American relations for the current decade. In their book «Soviet-American Relations in the 80’s», published in New York in 1981, the American theoreticians Lawrence Coldwell and William Dibold write: «In the conditions of the new strategical and political realities, the two superpowers must work out a code of behaviour which must proceed from the recognition of their global balance.» This means that the two superpowers must come to an agreement over the boundaries of their respective spheres of influence in the different regions of the globe. This is also made clear by Brezhnev when he declared that «the two sides must place the principle of equal balance and security at the basis of their concrete commitments.»

In the present situation, in which the imperialist-revisionist policy of aggression and war has come up against the resistance of the proletariat and the peoples and the multi-million mas-
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