

*Economic Integration within the Framework of CMEA in
Relation to Agriculture*

1. BACKGROUND

Experiences of both socialist and capitalist countries prove that integration processes have objective and supra-institutional character. Processes of economic growth occurring in conditions of especially rapidly developing technical progress constitute the basis for international integration.

International economic integration is determined by internationalisation of economic and technical life in a sense that certain solutions in productive techniques may be applied in different countries. The facility of their transfer and popularisation caused a specific imitation effect in the field of production and technique, contemporary economic integration is a process taking place mainly in Sector II, that is in the manufacturing sector.

This fact assured the course of changes for integrating national economies and explains the rapid internationalisation of technical and organisational progress.

Development of modern technique and its efficient application in economic life overstep national boundaries, especially in the case of small and middle-sized countries. Contemporary development assumes and makes inevitable the use of large scale production, especially since technological development enlarges that scale significantly; contemporary technical progress is not only universal but also unusually expensive. This, in turn, makes common scientific research inevitable and requires the assurance of the possibility of those researches being applied in production. The further consequence of this is the development of co-operation in economic activities in different countries which contributes to specialisation and international division of labour. The result of these processes is an increase in economic and technical interrelations between different countries.

However, what relationships occurs in the contemporary integration process between Sector I and Sector II? The most general relationships between these sectors are as follows. The bigger the share of Sector I in the economy – with the level of economic development of the country or the integrated group thus relatively low – the bigger the significance of this Sector for the

* Warsaw, Poland.

economy. On the other hand, if the share of Sector I in the process of creation of national income and employment is relatively small, the interest in Sector I — which means mainly agriculture — is mainly of social and political character; the economic aspect is much less important. Thus the harmonious development of Sector I in the economy as a whole is in the first case a *sine qua non* for economic growth and in the second case is only an important social factor, protecting against the existence of underdeveloped sectors causing social tensions. These differences are of great significance for integrational processes. Contemporary international economic integration concerns first of all Sector II. Nevertheless, if the process starts in conditions of a rather low level of economic development of integrating countries, the integrational processes cannot exclude agriculture. They determine, on the one hand, the field for integrating process and, on the other, they define the use for integration purposes of different tools and mechanisms of an economic and administrative character.

These general remarks will be considered in detail below from the point of view of socialist integration with CMEA countries.

2. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SOCIALIST AND CAPITALIST SITUATIONS

Though the general basis for economic integration in present conditions is the same for socialist and capitalist countries, there are differences which are significant enough to make the principles of socialist and capitalist integration differ. Because of the lack of time, I will concentrate on the different features of both kinds of integration so that their common features will not be discussed.

The feature that creates socialist integration is social ownership of the means of production. That fact that the means of production are social property has certain consequences. The most significant are the macrosocial and macroeconomic characteristics of the task of economic activity. That means that, independently of particular solutions in different CMEA countries, the macroeconomic and macrosocial approach is typical for development processes in these countries. These conditions have a direct influence on the harmonious development of the economic structure, both as a whole and seen in its different parts.

The problem of appropriate proportions between different sectors is an essential feature.

The macroeconomic and macrosocial approach to the processes of development is followed by a specific approach to the economic calculation. The macroeconomic approach is essential to the economic calculation.

Although the economic calculation should not be seen separately for the enterprise, branch and the whole country, the differences are significant. They also appear when we consider the national economy in conditions of isolation, that is, when we study economic activity and socialist economic growth of one country. They also appear when we analyse integrating groups

of two or more countries. Thus it should be remembered that macroscale is not synonymous with the sum of microscales.

The next specific feature is connected with the time horizon in which we analyse the function of objective. In the socialist economy, and also in the integrated groups, the objective is maximised in a longer run than in the capitalist economy, because of two conditions. Firstly, under the conditions of social ownership of the means of production the economic surplus can be transferred from one field to another as well as from one branch to another relatively easily and without causing any social tensions. It also means that the effects of economic activity because of those redistribution mechanisms can be gained in a longer period.

Secondly, in the socialist economy the relations between social and economic activity are much more direct than in the capitalist economy. In the conditions of socialism the social aims are equal, if not superior, to the economic aims. Since the economic effects created by the fulfilment of social aims may be achieved in a longer period than the realisation of purely economic aims, so in estimating the results of economic activity in socialist countries and effects of an integrated group a longer period of time should be considered.

In the present state of economic development, economic integration of socialist countries assumes sovereignty of different national economies. So far, in the process of socialist integration, the dominating role of supranational institutions has not been accepted. Those institutions play a much less significant role than in the case of, for example, Common Market countries, and their main function is limited to branch co-operation. This aspect of economic sovereignty was explicitly accepted in the Complex Program of Socialist Integration during the conference in Bucarest in 1971: In this sense the concept of economic sovereignty and the principle according to which all basic problems have to be discussed and all solutions accepted by participating countries contrast with the so-called institutional or authoritative concept of integration, which assumes the existence of supranational organisations having the right to force certain solutions upon its members. What are the reasons for which the domination of national aims and sovereignty of those aims are specially firmly emphasised these days?

I believe this may be explained in two different ways: one concerns social ownership, which is untransferable, the second is related to the level of economic development. A developed formula of those rules may be expressed as follows:

All integrating activities are to serve further development of all participants of the integrating community, also none of the integrating countries should pay for the success of others. In this sense the transfer of national income between countries is not accepted.

Similarly, capital "means" may not be transferred in the case of the developed internal needs of the capital exporting country. This is a result of the above mentioned macrosocial motivations. Although in socialist countries the transfer of production factors is not excluded, the internal interest has been – so far – of a dominating character. Is the superior character of national interest going to be a permanent phenomenon in the process of socialist

integration? It seems that it is a rather temporary rule. Assuming a temporary character for that rule it is difficult to estimate for how long it is going to be obligatory in the activity of an integrating group.

3. INTEGRATION IN SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

A great deal of literature on integration problems shows that the concept of integration is neither precise nor convertible. Generally we may distinguish three points of view.

Integration is defined as a state that is a certain final model of integrated national economies in which the integrated economies create a new value as far as the level of mutual adaptation and interrelation is concerned.

Integration as a state is at present only a hypothetical – although an important – model since it is the destination state for integrating national economies.

A modification of the concept of integration understood as a state is a concept which sees integration as an aim. This approach stresses mainly the quantitative aspects that are the basis for integration – whereas, in the case of integration treated as a state, it is mainly the character of structural relations between integrating national economies which is considered.

A different point of view, and most probably a much more significant one, is represented by a concept which treats integration as a process. In this case not only the final plans but also ways of achieving certain aims in the transition periods, leading to integration as a state or aim, can be seen. It is particularly important since in these stages a new type of co-operation between different national economies is created, new relationships appear, and gradually a new international division of works – mainly in Sector II – comes into being and, speaking more precisely, interbranch specialisation is developed. The adaptation processes are here important not only in the field of economy or technique in a broad meaning of this word, but also in the behaviour and value systems.

It may be clearly seen from experience, documents and programs of CMEA countries, that integration is understood first of all as a process, and aims in the different stages of development are being modified or even changed. Generally it may be said that in each case the tasks, on the one hand represent the economic policy of the member countries of the integrating group and, on the other hand, they result from the level of development and character of the national economies of the countries concerned.

Those tasks are each time formed by policy of the country and by the objective state of the national economy of the integrating group. Accordingly to the changes in these factors the tasks of integration are changed or modified.

In the history of CMEA different kinds of tasks have been performed and it is impossible to describe them precisely. I will concentrate on the tasks, accepted by the Complex Program of Socialist Integration, resolved in 1971 in Bucarest during XXV Session of CMEA countries. These tasks are as follows:

- (1) Accelerated development of productive capacity of all member countries and achievement of the highest level of technical and scientific development;
- (2) Improvement of the structure and enlargement of the scale of production according to the rules of scientific and technical revolution;
- (3) Fulfilment of the increasing need of the national economies for fuel, energy and raw materials, modern equipment, agricultural products, foods, and other consumer products, mainly by increased production and national use of resources of the member countries;
- (4) To increase the material and cultural level of living of the people in the member countries;
- (5) Gradual unification of the levels of economic development of member countries;
- (6) Development of absorptiveness and stability of the world socialist market and protection of the proper place of the CMEA countries on the world.

These tasks show, first of all, that there are many of them; secondly, they have different time horizons; and thirdly, they can be achieved with the help of different mechanisms, methods, and so on.

In this sense they have, or more precisely they may have, in the short run, a competitive character. For example, where there are difficulties or growth is limited, most important are tasks which protect the present functioning of the national economy and the longer run tasks must be postponed. In this context, special attention should be paid to the following fact: though all the tasks of Complex Program represent the interests of all countries in the community, some of them tend to favour the national interest, some the interest of the whole community. In the long run there is no contradiction, but in the short run, some differences may and, indeed, do appear.

4. METHODS IN SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Mechanisms in a system of socialist integration vary but roughly may be divided into two groups: direct mechanism — that is planning, and indirect mechanism — that is goods/money mechanism.

The basic mechanism of socialist integration within CMEA is the planning mechanism which, however, should not be understood as one universal plan but, firstly, as a group of undertakings, in co-operation and co-ordinated with the planned development of different national economies; and, secondly, as a common planning undertaking, for example common international planning. This sort of activity has been recently undertaken on the wider scale. International planning must not contradict national plans of economic development, that is because of the previously mentioned principle of national economic sovereignty.

As direct mechanism we can classify: long term prognosis, economic consultations, co-ordination of economic development plans, international co-operative relations, bilateral and multilateral specialisation relations, and long

term trade agreements. Direct mechanism has administrative and state sanctions.

The money-market mechanism in the integrated group of CMEA countries is inferior to the planning mechanism both in the sense that it cannot contradict the planning mechanism and also that its effects are mainly included within the relations of plan of social and economic development. However, this mechanism has its own independent functions. First of all some attention should be paid to the creation of prices.

The price system in the integrating group of CMEA countries has a dual character. There is a difference between home market prices and foreign market prices and there is a lack of relation between them. They are set according to different rules. We may neglect the home price system.

I would only like to stress that in different countries they are set in different ways. Thus prices for individual goods are not comparable.

On the other hand prices that are obligatory in foreign trade exchange between CMEA countries have, and had, an objective base in world market prices. World prices are the starting point for creation of prices in the CMEA market. However, they are not exact world market prices. Modification not only implements stabilisation over a longer period – usually five years – but also the smoothing of conjunctural fluctuations, and above all there is the fact that these prices are only a base for negotiations between individual countries.

In exchange between CMEA countries up to the end of 1974 so-called “stop prices” were obligatory. This means that for the five year period a price was set which was the average world price in the previous five year period. For example, in the years 1971–1975 only up to 1974 the bases were corrected contract prices from the 1965–69 period. Modification of the “stop price” system took place in March 1975 when all CMEA countries accepted the so-called “walking-price” system. The idea of this system is that for each year average world market prices from the last five year period are obligatory; for example: average prices from the period 1971–75, for the year 1975; average prices of 1972–76, for the year 1977; and so on. This system is, and will be, a base for price setting for all agricultural and food products exchanged between CMEA countries. In spite of some advantages – price stability – this system has also some faults, for example it is not very flexible. Some exporters of agricultural products think the home prices are a better base since world prices do not secure enough profit for their country – for example, due to poorer technical equipment. The formation of a proper price system still remains one of the most important tasks for socialist countries, integrating in CMEA.

One of the specific features of the present stage of socialist integration of CMEA countries is a lack of transferable currency. None of the internal currencies is transferable, that means they function only within national economies, and none of the currencies fulfil functions indispensable for an international currency. The base for the calculations between CMEA countries is the transfer rouble, established in 1964 by International Bank for Economic Co-operation between CMEA countries. This unit is used in calculations

between CMEA member-countries and actually only in the case of articles exchanged within quantity or value quotas established by bilateral agreements. On the other hand, the surpluses exchanged are calculated on a different basis – sometimes even a transferable currency is used. The lack of transferable currency is a significant shortcoming in the integration processes. According to integration plans formulated in the basic document, transferable currency is going to be introduced in the future.

In the present stage of the socialist integration of CMEA countries the economic institutions and multinational enterprises do not play a really significant role; multinational enterprises especially have only a marginal role. In the process of integration multinational enterprises play only a subsidiary role because the basic decisions are made in the central decision centers at the whole country level. Multinational organisation, similarly to multinational enterprises, are controlled – either directly or indirectly – by central decision centers in individual countries. This, among others, also differentiates socialist and capitalist integration. For capitalist integration, from the very beginning, develops together with supranational organisation and enterprises. However, in the future a more significant role for those institutional forms is planned; though at present it is very limited.

5. AGRICULTURE IN SOCIALIST INTEGRATION

Having in mind the above conclusions I would like to discuss the place and role of agriculture in the socialist integration of CMEA countries. There are three factors determining the function of agriculture. The first is connected with the achieved development level of the integrated group; the second is a result of the minimal economic complex in the national economy – and similarly in the integrated group; and the third is formed by the present and long term tasks of the integrated group.

CMEA countries have already achieved a high level of development, measured by GNP per capita, but agriculture still plays an important role in the economy of those countries, and this fact has a significant meaning for our considerations. Let us take a few data that show the role of agriculture.

TABLE 1. *The share of agriculture and forestry in production of national income (material product) in CMEA countries*

Country	1960	1970	1974
		per cent	
Bulgaria	32.2	22.6	20.7
Czechoslovakia	14.7	10.1	9.8
German Democratic Republic	16.4	11.6	10.6
Poland	30.3	17.5	14.5
Romania	34.9	19.1	16.4
Hungary	30.8	17.7	16.6
Soviet Union	20.7	22.0	18.3

From: *Statystyczny rocznik krajów członków SEW 1975*, Moscow 1975 page 42

Table 1 leads to the following conclusions. During the last 14 years the share of agriculture in the creation of national income decreased significantly. The strongest downward trend appeared in the less developed countries. The decrease in the share of agriculture in national income creation, however, was not proportional to the GNP per capita. The differences, measured in points, in 1974 were much smaller than in 1960. The dispersions decreased from 20.2 points to 10.9 points, but still were large. Actually the share of agriculture in the creation of national income was somewhat higher than the figures included in Table 1 suggest, for in CMEA countries prices of agricultural products are relatively low compared to industrial products. If we add some additional points to give an indication of the share of agriculture in the creation of national income, then the significant role of agriculture in the economy of CMEA countries becomes clear.

An additional argument for the above conclusion may be provided by the Table 2 showing the share of agriculture and forestry in employment.

TABLE 2. *Employment in agriculture and forestry as a proportion of employment in CMEA Countries*

Country	1960	1970	1974
		per cent	
Bulgaria	55.5	35.7	30.1
Czechoslovakia	25.9	18.3	15.7
German Democratic Republic	17.3	13.0	11.5
Poland	44.2	34.7	31.4
Romania	65.6	49.3	40.0
Hungary	38.9	26.4	23.3
Soviet Union	38.7	25.2	23.4

From: as for Table 1, pages 393, 395–396.

The comparison of employment in agriculture and forestry with the share in the creation of national income clearly shows a significant difference between individual CMEA countries. Only in the case of the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union is there a correlation between the share of agriculture in the creation of national income and the share of this sector in employment; in all other cases – and especially in Poland – the differences are significant. This comparison shows the level of technical equipment in agriculture compared with that in other sectors. This indicates a very general task; that is, intensification of agriculture mainly by increasing the supply of industrial investment goods for this sector.

The share of agriculture products in the total spending of people is large, although during the last few years significant changes have taken place. If we take the share of foods in total sales – services excluded – as a measure, we will see that for the year 1974 this was: in Bulgaria – 43.6 percent; Czechoslovakia – 47.4; German Democratic Republic – 47.4; Poland – 43.1; Romania – 49.6; Hungary – 45.5 and Soviet Union – 54.2.

Though these figures do not show precisely the share of food in the total

spending of consumers, they are characteristic enough to show the weight of this group of products in peoples' spending in CMEA countries. So one of the main tasks of CMEA countries, both for individual countries and for the whole integrated group, is to provide a sufficient supply of foods and food products both as to quantity and quality.

Though in CMEA countries both production and consumption of foods per capita is much higher than the world average, it still does not meet the desirable needs. This to some extent determines the production policy and even economic policy in the field of agriculture in individual CMEA countries and within the whole group.

6. DEGREE OF SELF SUFFICIENCY IN CMEA COUNTRIES

Agriculture in CMEA countries is relatively homogenous and significant differences appear only in the case of some districts in the Soviet Union. Agriculture in CMEA countries does not produce tropical products. There are, of course, some differences between agriculture in countries like Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary and countries like Poland, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic but they are not very significant since in all those countries agriculture is of the same climatic type.

Although the agriculture in CMEA countries reaches world average levels, the supply of agricultural products does not meet the existing demand for non-tropical products.

CMEA as an integrating group is a net importer of agricultural products — both in the form of raw materials and of food products. The figures in Table 3 relate to only two years, 1960 and 1974, but they show the trend characteristics for the 60's and 70's, since there is no reason to expect any changes until the end of 70's. CMEA as an integrating group will not become a net exporter of foods.

TABLE 3. *Import and Export of Agricultural Products — Raw Materials of Agriculture, Forestry and Breeding, and Products of Agriculture and Food.*

	Import		Export		Balance	
	1960	1974	1960	1974	1960	1974
Bulgaria	105.5	666.1	331.8	1127.2	+ 226.3	+ 461.1
Czechoslovakia	673.3	1675.0	200.7	644.6	- 472.6	- 1030.4
G.D.R.	843.8	2367.4	130.3	803.1	- 713.5	- 1564.3
Poland	506.8	2129.3	305.0	1115.0	- 201.8	- 1014.3
Romania	119.2	965.1	256.4	1317.3	+ 137.2	+ 352.2
Hungary	277.7	1199.5	239.5	1315.0	- 38.2	+ 115.5
Soviet Union	1333.8	6380.4	1518.7	5026.2	+ 184.9	- 1354.2
	3860.1	15382.8	2982.4	11348.4	- 877.7	- 4034.4

+ surplus of export over import

- surplus of import over export

From: Author's calculations based on: *Mały Rocznik Statystyki Międzynarodowej 1975* Warsaw 1975, pages 182-3, 188, 191.

Although the integrating group as a whole is a net importer of agricultural products the situation in individual countries differs significantly. In 1960 three countries (Bulgaria, Romania and the Soviet Union) were net exporters. The situation in 1974 was similar except that Hungary became a net exporter and the Soviet Union a net importer. The value of the deficiency increased on the scale of the whole group five times but on the other hand the share of agricultural products and food products in the total trade turnovers decreased from 26 percent of total foreign trade turnover in 1960, to 20.2 percent in 1974. Simultaneously the deficit caused by import of agricultural products, which in 1960 reached 6.7 percent of total imports, decreased in 1974 to 6.0 percent.

7. TRENDS IN THE INTEGRATING PROCESSES

The above considerations concerning agriculture, concentrate mainly on the role of agriculture in the national economy, less on the integration processes. Of course, the trends of the integrating processes will be described here very briefly since the description of total activities of CMEA is impossible within one paper. To begin with, I would like to present a general thesis, namely, that the processes within CMEA concern branches complementary to agriculture, much more than agriculture itself.

Michael Kalecki, many years ago, said that foreign trade always constitutes a base for integrating processes. That is because, firstly the structure of exchange shows the possibilities of future specialisation, and, secondly, foreign exchange strengthens certain potential development trends. Because of that, the description of the present exchange of agricultural products and prognosis prepared for this field should be useful. Table 4 shows the share of agricultural products in the total exchange between CMEA countries in the years 1960 and 1970 and the prognosis for 1980.

TABLE 4. *The Share of Agriculture and Food Products in Total Exchange between CMEA countries in 1960-1970 and Forecast for 1980*

	1960	1970	1980	1960	1970	1980
	percent					
CMEA	12.5	9.7	5.4	12.5	9.7	5.4
Bulgaria	5.3	5.4	1.7	48.5	39.7	22.3
Czechoslovakia	22.1	11.1	7.8	3.3	1.6	1.0
G.D.R.	23.9	11.9	8.5	0.7	0.8	0.4
Poland	11.6	9.4	4.6	5.2	4.3	4.2
Romania	4.4	4.5	1.8	18.0	12.7	9.4
Hungary	5.7	4.3	1.9	15.6	18.7	12.6
Soviet Union	8.3	10.8	5.6	17.2	8.7	4.3

From: M. Bogacka, I. Cieniuch, T. Leszek, K. Soczewica, *Foreign Trade in CMEA countries in the years 1950-1980*.

8. FOREIGN TRADE IN CMEA COUNTRIES IN THE YEARS 1950–1980

The common feature of foreign exchange in agricultural and food products between CMEA countries is the fact that the share of this group of articles in total exchange is decreasing. The forecast for the year 1980 also shows that exchange of this group is going to be relatively small. However, Table 4 shows that for some countries this kind of export is going to play a significant role – for Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary. Similarly, import of this group of articles will be of significant value for the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia. The data showing the shares for some countries show a certain specialisation in this field. Though, for the whole integrating group this specialisation cannot be well developed, in the case of individual countries it could be of a great significance. Also the possibilities of agricultural import from the integrating group may be important for some countries.

As I mentioned above, the planned activities are the main mechanism for the integration processes. Among them, co-ordination plays an essential role. In the present development of the integration of CMEA countries, co-ordination of plans took place in the periods: 1961–65, 1966–1970, 1971–1975, and 1976–1980.

For the latter period the main tasks to be achieved by co-ordination of plans are: protection of demand for selected seeds, cattle for breeding, veterinary preparations, biological herbicides, special vehicles for agriculture, fertilizers and some mechanical equipment.

For agricultural food products the most important need is the creation of an international cold storage system and an international system for other forms of protection of food products. In the machinery industry, the base for co-ordination of plans is the demand forecast for tractors, agricultural mechanical equipment, amelioration machines, forestry machines, etc.

Forecasts for the agricultural demand for chemically and biochemically improved breeding stock have been prepared. For the food industry the forecast concerns development of, amongst others, meat, dairying, tinned food production, sugar manufacturing, and the tobacco industry.

In the present practice of co-operation within the CMEA group the most steps have been related to supplies of selected wheat varieties, cattle for breeding, and so on. In the years 1971–75 agreements concerning supplies of selected seeds (78 kinds) were signed. Supplies of cattle for breeding increased significantly – by more than 6 times – compared with 1966–1970 (pigs, almost 5 times; sheep over 5 times) etc. Over 200 different kinds of plant protection preparations were introduced. Another extremely significant form of activity is standardisation of agricultural and forestry mechanical equipment. The first international standards for machines was accepted in 1961. It consisted of 1103 typical sizes of machines. A second one, accepted in the years 1964–1965, consisted of 1133 typical sizes of machines for agriculture and forestry and the third system, accepted in 1971, presented over 700 types of machines and 1750 typical sizes.

Multilateral specialisation agreements relating to veterinary preparations and 12 most important preparations for agriculture were signed too.

An important, although subsidiary, role is played in agricultural development by common scientific research. For example, recently 6 multilateral agreements concerning food research were signed. Apart from common scientific research there is also a highly developed system for the exchange of the results of research carried on in individual countries. The most important results achieved in one country are demonstrated to the others.

9. CONCLUDING REMARKS

CMEA countries are a great producer of agricultural products; especially wheat, root crops, industrial plants and meat products. Although CMEA is never going to be self-sufficient in agricultural products, there is a possibility of ensuring, in these countries, a sufficient supply of those basic products that can be produced in the climatic zone. This fact has certain consequences, both for state policies and policy of the whole CMEA group.

Economic policy in agriculture for CMEA countries may be described by a few main features. Firstly, because of the developed demand for agricultural products in the home market, agricultural and agricultural policy are going to play, in the long run, not only a social role — for example protecting against undue disproportion between sectors — but also an economic one. Therefore, in the integrational processes agriculture must be concerned from the point of view of agricultural intensification and growth of agricultural product. That means attention must be paid to activities for increasing the productivity per ha and per employee. This is an internal task of each country and also a task of the whole integrating group.

Secondly, since CMEA countries have developed productive possibilities in the field, then of course more attention will be paid to agriculture in state programs than in the programs of the whole group. This is because integration at present concerns mainly Section II, and intrabranh specialisation. It is also because the possibilities for specialisation in CMEA agriculture, apart from the Soviet Union, are limited. Thus agriculture to a large extent will remain in the sphere of state activity (economic organisations) which deals with minor economic complexes, producing mainly for the home market, and, what is more important, having the proportions and connections determined by an internal economy.

Such conclusions can be reached to the present economic policy of CMEA countries. Most probably the present character of the policy will remain for the next two years, that is over time horizon that we may now rather precisely define.

Thirdly, integrating activities will take place mainly in branches complementary to agriculture (science, development research, agricultural machinery industry, chemical industry and so on). In these spheres integrating processes will be much stronger than in agriculture itself. Integrating processes appearing in agriculture will play only a subsidiary role, while the main responsibility for protecting the supply of agricultural and food products as thoroughly and for as long as possible will be that of the food and agricultural sector of each country.