

carrier groups, and scale back «Star Wars» research. He would pursue a test ban, a missile flight test ban and strategic arms cuts with the Soviet Union. Yet he is unwilling to pledge himself to cuts or even to a freeze in military spending. Dukakis was an advocate of the 1982 US—Soviet freeze on nuclear weapons testing, production and deployment. He is deeply skeptical of the eight years of nuclear rearmament under Reagan. He said he would try to negotiate bans on underground nuclear explosions and ballistic missile flight tests needed for weapon development, and he would try to halt the deployment of highly accurate nuclear weapons. Yet, he was against a «no first use» (of nuclear weapons) platform at the Democratic National Convention. He supports upgrading US and NATO conventional forces.

In foreign policy, Dukakis is for a new era of activism. He would reshape America's agenda on problems of debt and conflict in the third world. He would seek initiatives within existing alliances and multilateral partnerships. He is called a pragmatic problem-solver. He feels the US should play a greater role within the UN. However, on many issues, Bush and Dukakis do not disagree as much as they would have liked voters to believe. As for the Soviet Union, Dukakis believes in seizing the initiative from Gorbachev in US-Soviet relations, arms control, regional conflicts, and testing the limits of Soviet «new thinking.» He said he would challenge Soviet intentions with some specific tests on global responsibility, terrorism, emigration and regional conflicts.

On South Africa, he vowed «to lead the fight for South African sanctions and against apartheid from the White House» (*Guardian*, October 19, 1988). But his record on South Africa is uneven. He is vocal in his criticism of apartheid, and has called for negotiations between the Botha regime and the ANC, but he is against military assistance to Mozambique and other frontline states. He is against funding anti-government insurgence in Angola but not in Afghanistan for example. Dukakis says he would break sharply with Reagan's «constructive engagement» approach to the white-ruled South Africa and impose total

sanctions in an attempt to force change. He told Ted Koppel of ABC's Nightline, «Apartheid has to go.» Botha said he feared Dukakis' proposed sanctions. The labelling of South Africa as a terrorist state in the Democratic Party platform was truly enforced by the Rev. Jesse Jackson who refused to compromise on the question of South Africa.

Concerning Central America, Dukakis has consistently opposed contra aid, and as governor refused to send detachments of the Massachusetts National Guard to Honduras for training exercises. He is critical of the administration's fondness for repressive dictatorships, and was against the invasion of Grenada. He would like to call a «hemispheric conference» of Latin American leaders. He supports the lead of President Oscar Arias Sanchez of Costa Rica in seeking to deal with Managua. Dukakis believes that the Rio Treaty and the Charter of the Organization of American States provide the foundation for regional security. He would use US aid to help civilian leaders establish control over their armies, and would impose human rights conditions on military and economic help.

Also concerning foreign policy, it can be said that Dukakis differs slightly from Bush, but in essence the bottom line is the same: a shared interest in protecting US global interests. Dukakis is, however, less inclined towards military interventionism, and his positions on Central America and South Africa are better than Bush's. For these reasons, progressive forces internationally, including the socialist community, would have felt more comfortable with him in the White House. Still, his election would not have meant a radical departure from the international policies followed by the US over the years.

CATERING TO PRO—ISRAELI FORCES

If Dukakis had won the presidential election, he would have followed the same path other Democratic presidents had in supporting 'Israel' - from Truman and the recognition of 'Israel' to Kennedy who cancelled the arms sales prohibition to 'Israel', to Johnson who provided it with modern offensive

arms, and lastly Carter and the Camp David Accords. Dukakis criticized Reagan's «take it or leave it» tactic for stymieing the search for peace, and favors the Carter approach of open-ended negotiations as with Camp David in 1978. An avid supporter of 'Israel', Dukakis blamed «Arab intransigence» for the lack of progress toward peace in the region.

Dukakis went to the pre-convention Democratic platform committee with a formulation stating that the US «maintaining the special relationship with Israel founded upon mutually shared values and strategic interest, should provide new leadership to deliver the promise of peace and security through negotiations that has been held out to Israel and its neighbors by the Camp David Accords» (*Frontline*, September 26, 1988). Dukakis, in an attempt to gain commitment from the Jewish community, issued a 300-page document entitled, «The Concerns of the Jewish-American Community,» in which he announced that he would move the US embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, thus giving an official US recognition of Israeli occupation and sovereignty over Jerusalem. Dukakis also promised never to recognize a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state. According to *Middle East Report* (formerly *MERIP*, November-December) Dukakis' position on 'Israel' went through an interesting series of turns during the course of the primaries, in his attempt to cater to the pro-Israeli forces: In May 1987 in Des Moines, Iowa, he called for a Middle East peace conference between «Israel', Jordan, Egypt and «responsible elements of the Palestinian community.» Then in October 1987 at the Democratic National Committee Forum in Miami, he emphasized rejuvenating the UN's role in resolving international conflicts. The following spring, Dukakis sided with the 30 Senators who had criticized Shamir over the peace issue. But with the New York primaries in sight, he quickly shifted and in an early April speech in Wisconsin, he said, «The first thing that anyone must understand about the Middle East is that we will never let Israel down.» He sidestepped any criticism of Israeli handling of the Palestinian uprising. Additionally, at a