

\$10 billion worth of products last year while only \$1 billion worth of planes and parts were imported." (*Business Week*, June 30, 1980.)

The ratio in this exchange of aircraft, the reader will note, favors the U.S. 10 to 1. How much more can one expect?

Nevertheless, for this organ of aggressive finance capital, it is not enough. "U.S. domination is by no means as complete as it once was," says *Business Week*. (Our emphasis.) Indeed, nothing less than complete economic domination is needed to ensure complete political domination.

"America's 58% share of world airplane exports represented a significant decline from the 66% share of a decade ago." Further erosion, says *Business Week*, is almost inevitable as the European airbus attacks the U.S. monopoly of wide-bodied jets. The arrogance and belligerence of this approach can only be understood properly when one considers that 50%, 40%, or even 30% of the market in such a highly sophisticated and research-intensive industry is considered a near monopoly.

EUROPEAN CHALLENGE TO U.S. AIRCRAFT MONOPOLY

It should also be noted that *Business Week* is trying to scare the American public in general and to exhort the so-called captains of the U.S. military-industrial complex to exert themselves more in view of the alleged danger that is posed by the European airbus. The airbus, it should also be noted, is a European attempt to present somewhat of a challenge to the U.S. virtual monopoly of the aircraft and aerospace industry.

The airbus is the product of a French, German, British, Spanish, and Dutch effort to give some competition to the U.S. in a field of technological competence in which the Europeans by no means consider themselves second-best. Nevertheless, despite the near monopoly of the U.S., which holds them down by political, diplomatic, and military means arising out of the results of the Second World War and the defeat of German imperialism, it is mostly a West German effort.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that capitalist Germany's

aerospace industry only has about 50,000 employees, France 100,000, and Britain 200,000, while the U.S. has a million. (Figures from *Barrons*, June 30 and *Wall Street Journal*, June 24, 1980.) In the last chapter we showed that the Japanese aerospace industry has only 35,000.

It should be added, however, that U.S. multi-national aerospace corporations are so intimately linked with the Japanese aerospace industry that it pretty well assures the U.S. that any great leap forward which poses a danger to the U.S. can be monitored quickly and in all probability squelched.

U.S. PENETRATION OF WEST GERMAN AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

So far as the European aerospace industry goes, the most important fact to remember vis-à-vis U.S. industries moaning about the relative decline of their share of the market, is that United Technologies Corporation holds a hefty 26% of the stock in the leading West German combine of the European aerospace industry that is building the airbus.

Of equal significance in relation to the U.S. military-industrial complex is that General Alexander Haig is the chairman of United Technologies Corporation. According to *Barrons*, the West German economics minister, Otto Graf Landsdorf, made a visit last February to his old friend, General Haig, in Brussels while he was Supreme Commander of NATO. "We have the impression," said the economics minister after the meeting was over, "that General Haig understands the problems and goals of our aerospace industry."

What this means, given General Haig's militarist approach and hostility to the USSR, is that he will seek to orient the West German aerospace industry in an anti-Soviet military direction. This, however, is easier said than done, although the West German ruling class is virulently anti-communist and anti-Soviet. This is because they nevertheless would like more elbow room for their own imperialist ventures and would rather not be in a stranglehold dictated by General Haig and his colleagues in the military-industrial complex.