

are eyeing other fields to conquer. Now it appears that the Japanese aerospace industry is preparing for takeoff."

But what is the actual status of this Japanese industry today?

Compared to the U.S., it is downright miniscule. The *Journal* admits that Japan's total output in aerospace for 1979 amounts to only \$1.3 billion. This compares with U.S. sales for the same year of \$24.5 billion, almost 20 times as much.

Moreover, the total Japanese employment force in aerospace is a mere 35,000 compared to 1 million in the U.S. Nevertheless, the *Journal* concludes its article by quoting a U.S. aerospace expert: "If someone is going to compete with Japan in the aerospace industry, he had better be prepared."

This is the kind of polished imperialist propaganda which is calculated to raise the level of chauvinism in this country and to spread it wide and deep until it saturates the entire population.

If one were to assume that the *Journal* article on the Japanese aerospace industry is an isolated example, the June 30, 1980, issue of *Business Week* is a virtual blockbuster. It devotes almost 20 solid pages, including figures and charts, to sound the alarm, as though the entire U.S. capitalist establishment had suddenly become a besieged fortress in danger of collapse as a result of the aggressiveness of its imperialist rivals which has resulted in a loss by U.S. industry of its competitiveness in world markets.

The decline of U.S. industry in terms of sales is not to be contested. It is true, for instance, that in the 1960s U.S. industry accounted for 95.9% of sales in the domestic market, lost some ground in the 1970s, at which time it had 82.8%, and by 1979 it had only 79% of the U.S. market.

By the same token, U.S. exports of motor vehicles in 1962 were 22.6% of the world total. They shrank to 17.5% in 1970 and fell to 13.9% in 1979. (Figures from *Business Week*.)

*Business Week*, however, does not merely single out the auto industry, but goes on to show the decline in steel, apparel, electrical components, farm machinery, consumer electronics, footwear, food processing machinery, all the way down to calculating and adding machines. Again these figures are not to be contested, nor is it to be doubted that the figures *Business Week* gives for the decline of the U.S. market share of exports—

aircraft, motor vehicles, organic chemicals, telecommunications, and so on—are as valid as any that can be obtained from capitalist sources.

## FALSE HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

It is the context in which *Business Week* puts these figures which presents a false historical perspective. In the first place, the impression is conveyed not that this is a **relative** decline of the U.S. share of the capitalist world gross product, but rather that this is an **absolute** decline of the U.S. gross national product in relation to the capitalist gross world product.

Indeed the amount of automobile production in the U.S. had been increasing until the outbreak of the current capitalist crisis. Technological devices and inventions have been increasing on the whole, and the enormous productive capacity of the U.S. industrial machine has not declined, although as a result of normal wear and tear and considerable neglect there has been a considerable amount of obsolescence.

Nevertheless, almost all of industry can today produce as much if not more than it did yesterday. It is only when one views the vast industrial productive apparatus of the U.S. from the vantage point of the ferocious capitalist competition with its capitalist rivals, principally Japan, West Germany, and to a lesser extent Britain and France and some of the smaller European capitalist countries, that one can see clearly the **relative** decline of U.S. industry.

This point can perhaps be easily clarified if one takes into consideration the recent meeting of the seven leading capitalist countries in Venice, Italy. There, these capitalist countries, along with the U.S., concluded what they call an economic summit meeting with a widely heralded commitment to develop sufficient alternative energy sources from coal, nuclear power, and synthetic fuel intended to save them as much as 20 million barrels of oil a day by 1990 and thus cushion them from what they call "being a hostage to the oil exporting countries."

Putting aside temporarily the question of OPEC, this plan or commitment by the seven capitalist countries may be achievable and practical as well as beneficial for the people in the countries involved, provided proper safety and environmental