



THREAT FROM THE EAST?

Fred Halliday

Pelican, 1982 pbk£1.75

014022448

After his valuable studies of social and political change in the Arabian peninsula, Iran, and Ethiopia,¹ Fred Halliday takes up the question of the impact made by Soviet foreign policy on events throughout this Arc of Crisis that curves from Afghanistan through

the Middle East to the Horn of Africa. As the title indicates, he builds his analysis round an examination of Reagan's extravagant claim that 'The Soviet Union underlies all the unrest that is going on. If they weren't engaged in this game of dominoes, there wouldn't be any hot spots in the world'.

I thought Halliday's polemical device of 'knocking down an aunt sally' cramped his analysis considerably. Even though the reds-under-the-bed claim is a standard propaganda line against any attempt, foreign or domestic, to change the established order, it does not form the substance of serious foreign policy analysis by the US administration, let alone by experienced West European governments which are more realistic in their assessments. True to character, this aunt sally is not a worthy target for sustained attack. Moreover, by assembling his arguments to 'knock down' the view that the Soviet Union is a threat to Western interests, he is diverted from developing a more rounded and positive critique of 'the connection between regional political developments and Soviet policy in the area' which he claims as his central theme.

The book is, however, a rich cornucopia of firsthand information on events and policies in a part of the world which has become a focus of the new 'cold war'. It is, of course, a great pity that Halliday was not able to draw on a study of the Palestinians, similar to his

¹ *Arabia without Sultans*, 1975; *Iran: Dictatorship and Development*, 1979; *Revolution in Ethiopia*, 1982.

extensively researched studies of the four Arc countries 'that are normally singled out as cases of Soviet instigation', in view of their crucial role in the area. From his empirical analysis Halliday concludes that, although the Soviet Union acts in its own interests as a major world power, it cannot be regarded as a threat to Western interests; firstly, because domestic factors have been the main cause of political upheaval in the Arc and, secondly, because the Soviet Union has largely failed to win reliable allies there. He further concludes that, on the contrary, it is the United States which is the chief external catalyst of popular explosions of 'unrest'.

Though Halliday views the Soviet Union's role in the Arc of Crisis more sympathetically than that of the United States, he tends to equate the role of the two superpowers both in attempting to extend their influence in the region and in dangerously exaggerating each other's influence. Certainly he does not see the source of conflict as basically a confrontation between imperialism and national liberation within the capitalist world system, on the one hand, and between imperialism and socialism, on the other. Indeed, he is critical of 'vulgar Marxist explanations of American foreign policy in terms of a quest for raw materials and markets' and of 'persistent left wing and Third World exaggeration of the role of the United States', and he seems uncertain whether 'the USSR is a 'socialist' country in any precise sense of that word'. This lack of theoretical definition weakens his analysis, in my opinion, though it is understandable in view of the paucity of up-to-date Marxist analysis of neo-imperialism and 'actually existing' socialism on which political writers like Halliday can draw.

While it is true that policy decisions in the Arc now have a predominantly national basis, the context in which they are taken has been historically shaped by imperialism which still exercises immense economic and

military power through the role played by Western governments and multinationals in the production, purchase, and sale of oil, the recycling of oil funds, technology exports, arms sales, and military bases. Their support for reactionary regimes has been and still is a key factor adversely affecting the domestic balance of class forces. The creation of Israel in Palestine, as a direct consequence of anti-semitism in Europe, and its development as an economic and military strongpoint for neo-imperialism has been a determinant factor impeding the Palestinians' right to nationhood, in particular, and Arab national independence, in general. Thus, imperialism is still a fundamental cause of conflict in the Arc.

To be sure, a new historical element of nationalist conflict between nation states and within nations has now emerged in this region, as in other parts of the Third World, as the Pax Imperialistica has become weaker in the 1970s. This represents a stage of development comparable to that of 19th century Europe but exacerbated by the existence of the two world systems of imperialism and socialism.

In the basic confrontation between imperialism and national liberation, the Soviet Union as a socialist country is a natural ally against imperialism and yet Halliday asserts, correctly, that it has won few permanent allies. This, however, misses the fundamental point that the Soviet Union has at times been able to give crucial assistance to those fighting to achieve national liberation, from Nasser's Egypt to the Palestinians. In this sense, the Soviet Union *is* a threat — to imperialist interests — from the East! Certainly some Soviet acts of intervention in Third World affairs have alienated potential allies for socialism, but the main reason why the Soviet Union's alliances have proved temporary or limited is because the Arc countries have in the end opted for continued incorporation in the capitalist world system rather than for socialism.

The expulsion of the Palestinians from Lebanon by Israel with the passive acquiescence of the Arab states and the negotiation of at least a temporary solution to the crisis by the United States to the total exclusion of the Soviet Union has marked the end of an era of postwar hopes — and in too many cases illusions — that the rising tide of national liberation would lead to socialism. To my mind, the persisting strength of imperialism is well demonstrated by Britain's ability both to accommodate aspirations within the capitalist world system — example, Carrington's initiative on recognition of the PLO — and to mount a show of strength — example, the successful Falklands exercise in organising a 'rapid deployment force' as the modern instrument of gunboat diplomacy.

Perhaps the Arc will cease for a period to be a focus of the new cold war? International tension has only developed when conflict within the capitalist world system has also involved a clash between imperialism and socialism in active alliance with forces opposed to imperialism, and has only reached the state of threatening a third world war when there has been a 'defection' — or the perceived possibility of one — from capitalism: Korea, Nasser's Egypt, Vietnam, Cuba. Quite evidently, there has been no such state of tension over the Israeli invasion of Lebanon — nor, indeed, over the Falklands. (There is no symmetry between the systems, it appears, since East-West tension did not become critical when internal political developments in Poland in 1981 could have led to the restoration of capitalism if martial law had not been imposed.) Now that the process of national liberation has largely run its course, with the important exceptions of Palestine and Namibia, the new stage of political liberation and economic development will present new challenges to imperialism and capitalism and to Soviet foreign policy.

Jenny Warren

THIRD WORLD VACANCIES

UNA International Service is looking for a variety of skilled, and experienced people to work in projects in French and Portuguese speaking Third World countries. Sees for two years with basic pay and expenses covered.

- Business Adviser for women's co-op in Mali;
- Nurses for the Amazon, and Nurse/Midwife and Physiotherapist in W Africa;
- Youth Worker for pilot inner city centre;
- EFL Teachers for university level courses;
- Fisherman and Diesel Mechanic for small fishing boats and public works garage;
- Agriculturalists and Agricultural Engineers for rice irrigation;
- Economists and Social Statistician.

UNAIS itself needs a Field Officer to run its Madagascar programme.

For details of these posts, conditions of service and application forms, contact:

UNA International Service, 3 Whitehall Ct, London SW1A 2EL (01-920 0679)



Imaginative new badge and sticker, with eye-catching design (mushroom cloud incorporating CND logo)

NUCLEAR FREE IN 83

Published and distributed only by SCOTTISH CND

prices badges 20p
4" stickers 25p
discount for bulk orders

420 Sauchiehall Street Glasgow G2
tel. 041-331 2878



Threat from the East? book. Read reviews from world's largest community for readers. Threat from the East?: by Fred Halliday. Other editions. Want to Read saving... Error rating book. Refresh and try again. Rate this book. The book you hold in your hands is Russia's first in-depth study of the ISIS phenomenon. From this book you will learn: Why and how ISIS appeared? How ISIS structure allows coexistence of archaic and ultra-modern features? What are specific threats of ISIS for the region, for Russia and for the entire world? Can you defeat ISIS, or better to leave the Middle East alone? What are the possible scenarios of events? The Middle East: From Violence to Security. The East Baltic Sea Region is of strategic importance since it provides a transit route for shipping and the off-loading of cargo in Northwest Europe through its many ice-free ports. It is a connecting link via air, land, and sea with Northwest Russia and is close to Belarus and Ukraine—two segments of the former Soviet Union whose near-future will have a dramatic impact on the spread of democracy in the European half of Eurasia. But at the same time, a strong case can be made that Lukashenko's greatest threat is not from the West but from the East, for in a Russian union with Belarus, Lukashenko will be a marginal figure at best.