

against Soviet appeals for a solution of the question of West Berlin and demonstrated the military preparedness of the United States. However, he reconciled himself with the measures taken by the Government of the German Democratic Republic on August 13, 1961. He reconciled himself with these measures in spite of the fact that these measures expressively limited the possibilities of the Federal Republic of Germany to instigate the economic and political disintegration of the German Democratic Republic and in spite of the fact that they confirmed the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic. The United States takes no measures to liquidate the Berlin wall, but it takes steps to freeze the Berlin problem.

Informative negotiations between the USA and the USSR led to no result. The United States does not show any willingness for far-reaching concessions to the Soviet Union and, in spite of it, it has been continuously attacked in the Federal Republic of Germany. It can be deduced from parallel negotiations on NATO nuclear armaments (Paris, Athens) and their results as well as from further development of the NATO nuclear crisis that the ruling circles in the Federal Republic of Germany apprehended that the topic of negotiations between the United States and the USSR was not only the question of Berlin, but also the question of nuclear armaments of the Federal Republic of Germany. Thus in the course of the Berlin crisis they were able to persuade themselves that the Western Powers did nothing to keep open the border with the German Democratic Republic and thus to maintain hopes of an internal disintegration of the socialist regime in the German Democratic Republic and that they even continue to reckon with the military inequality of the Federal Republic of Germany and that they make it an object of international compromises of a greater extent.

An assessment of these aspects of the relations of Western Alliance and of the Federal Republic of Germany from 1961 to 1962 is of exceptional importance for understanding the ensuing stage of French-West German relations, the disputes between so-called „Atlantists“ and „Gaullists“, for understanding Schroeder-Erhard eastern policy and for analyzing the possible development of West German policy at the present stage of the NATO crisis.

INFLUENCE OF AMERICAN CAPITAL ON THE PROCESS OF REPRODUCTION IN WEST EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

MIROSLAV NIKL

The foreign investments became an organic part of overall long-term strategic interests of the given monopoly group or of the given state in connection with the new method of internationalization of capital in the form of penetration of the production machinery of certain national monopolies into the economy of other countries. Under such circumstances, the motives of foreign investments consist in the fact that foreign investments are a part of overall strategy and not only of economic strategy.

The present stage of US economic expansion abroad is at the same time characterized by a transfer of the core of foreign investments into advanced West European countries where the processes of integration have no doubt played their role.

From the standpoint of the influence of US capital on the reproduction process of West European countries, the state exports of capital from the United States had primarily an influence in the period of European postwar recovery. As to the influence of exports of private US capital, the penetration of the production machinery of the American monopolies into the national economies of West European countries became typical along with the predominance of direct investments. These investments involve the key and most prospective branches of the national economies. The specific features of US capital investments in the individual West European countries are connected with the specific features of the structure of the national economies of the countries in question.

The analysis of the influence on the technical progress is one of the most important problems in evaluating the influence of US capital on the process of reproduction. This influence is considerable and is connected with the circumstance that American capital is concentrated in the most prospective and thus technically most prosperous branches.

The influence of US capital in the sphere of currency of West European countries is primarily apparent in the linking up of US capital with the systems of credits and finances of the countries in question.

The influencing of the development of the balances of payments of these countries is one of the most common phenomena of the influence of US capital on the process of reproduction. As a result of the well-known development away from difficulties in the balances of payments towards a certain stabilization in this sphere, the original indulgent attitude of West European countries to US investments alters into an effort to control these undertakings. The balance of payments is affected even by such processes as the exports of products from US enterprises into third countries. The share in the exports of the country in question is again connected with the participation of US enterprises in the production and exports of key products.

There is a danger for West European countries that some of the exports of their goods became part of the long-term economic strategy of the largest US monopolies. It is, therefore, understandable that under such circumstances there are considerations about the necessary defensive reaction which are particularly apparent in the effort to govern the above mentioned international movement of capital by the control of the economic policy of the countries concerned. It is also necessary to bear in mind that the attitude of the Governments, though important, is only one of the factors influencing the international movement of capital.

DU PROBLÈME DE LA SÉCURITÉ EUROPÉENNE

LADISLAV LÍSKA

Malgré tous les changements intervenus et les grandes modifications ayant résulté du développement après la II^e guerre mondiale, l'Europe continue à détenir, dans une certaine mesure, une position-clef, notamment quant au maintien de la paix mondiale.

Sur le continent européen, deux groupements militaires, les plus grands au monde, s'affrontent directement, disposent d'armées équipées par une technique militaire la plus moderne dont les armes nucléaires constituent la partie substantielle.

Les possibilités potentielles du déchaînement d'un conflit armé en Europe augmentent essentiellement le danger et les risques résultant des problèmes politiques non résolus, des foyers de tension existants et de la politique de certains Etats.

Les efforts visant à assurer la sécurité en Europe s'étirent comme un fil rouge à travers toute l'évolution d'après-guerre. Jusqu'ici l'on n'a pourtant pas réussi à jeter des bases solides d'une sécurité européenne. C'est avant tout la question allemande représentant en quelque sorte le problème-clef de la sécurité européenne qui n'est pas définitivement résolue.

Au cours des dernières années, le problème de la sécurité européenne se met au premier plan de l'intérêt des pays européens non seulement à l'Est, mais aussi à l'Ouest. Les raisons principales de ce fait consistent dans l'intérêt des deux parties à éliminer ou au moins à diminuer les risques d'un conflit atomique et à déployer largement les relations mutuelles en reconnaissant généralement la réalité que pendant une période relativement longue, des Etats aux systèmes sociaux différents co-existeront en Europe et en considérant les conclusions en découlant pour la nécessité pratique d'une politique de coexistence pacifique.

A l'heure actuelle, la question s'il vaut la peine de tenter de renforcer et de déployer la sécurité et la coopération paneuropéennes ne constitue pas le problème cardinal, c'est plutôt la question, comment procéder pour résoudre ce problème et quelle voie suivre. Dans cette connexion, beaucoup de questions complexes se posent. Deux semblent en être avant tout les principales: Quelle est la dépendance actuelle entre la question allemande et le problème de la sécurité européenne? Quel système choisir pour assurer la sécurité européenne?

Quant à la première question, le point de vue continue de prendre le dessus qu'il est vrai qu'une sécurité paneuropéenne stable ne peut pas être assurée d'une manière durable sur la base de la division de l'Allemagne, mais que ce problème ne pouvant pas être résolu, vu sa complexité, dans la période actuelle ne doit pas empêcher la