

supplement

ISSN 0201-4297

1987

2

STP

Socialism: questions of theory

Politics and morality •

**Washington's space noose—a threat to
general security •**

SDI—what American scientists say •

Is there an economic crisis in the USSR? •

The Novosti Press Agency

supplement

2



1987

SOCIALISM:
THEORY
AND PRACTICE

Socialism: questions of theory

Published bimonthly in English,
French, German and Spanish

CONTENTS

PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

A. KOZYREV
Outer space and universal security 3

MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY AND ITS CRITICS

V. DENISOV
Politics and morality 13

REAL SOCIALISM AND ITS CRITICS

STP commentary
G. KOBYAKOV
Is there an economic crisis in the USSR? 21

MODERN CAPITALISM

I. MALASHENKO
The Star Wars programme: politico-psychological aspects 26
B. PONOMAREV
Militarism and the working class 34

BOOK REVIEWS

V. LUKOV
SDI: What American scientists say 44

● Abridged articles are marked with an asterisk (*).

Editing completed January 22, 1987.

© The Novosti Press Agency, 1987



I admire your leader M. S. Gorbachev a great deal and I am deeply sorry that our President has shown such mistaken intransigence.

John U. Nattkemper,
USA

I've perceived that it is not you Russians who are looking for world military supremacy but rather the US reactionary forces. I wish the world peace, so I support the USSR who is chanting the song for peace in the world.

Martin Kyei Barffour,
Ivory Coast

Your struggle for peace deserves the highest praise. I only wish the United States would join it too. I support all Soviet peace initiatives aimed at halting the arms race.

Paul Waugh,
Jamaica

● Address: STP Editorial Office, APN Publishing House, 7 Bolshaya Pochtovaya Street, Moscow 107082, USSR

PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

OUTER SPACE AND UNIVERSAL SECURITY

Andrei KOZYREV

The space question is becoming the focal point of the ideological and political confrontation which is at present growing between the two approaches to the questions of war and peace and the two concepts of security. This was especially strikingly manifested during the Soviet-US summit meeting in Reykjavik in October 1986.

In the capital of Iceland the US President continued with fanatic stubbornness to uphold his Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI). The master of the White House insisted that the US should have the right to test everything relating to SDI and not only in laboratories, but outside them, including outer space. In this way the Washington Administration clearly showed that, being confident of its technological superiority, it still hopes to attain the unattainable—military superiority over the USSR by militarizing outer space through SDI. The whole world once again could see that the Washington Administration is subordinated to the US military-industrial complex. It was because of Washington that no agreement was reached at the meeting on the burning problems of our time—cessation of the arms race and a ban on nuclear weapons.

Both in outer space and on Earth mankind is confronted with a choice: either to continue the arms race which poisons the world's political atmosphere and is fraught with a nuclear catastrophe, or to curb it, begin a reduction and eventually the elimination of mass-destruction weapons, lower the levels of military potentials of states

● A. KOZYREV, Cand.Sc (Hist.), specializes in the studies of international problems.

to reasonable limits, and ensure on this basis, reliable international security.

AMERICAN STAR WARS PROGRAMME

The concept expressed in Washington's Strategic Defense Initiative, or in the Star Wars programme, is actually an extremely dangerous attempt to solve present-day problems from the old positions of militarism and selfish imperialist interests. With all its seeming novelty, this only signifies another attempt by the US ruling circles to attain "absolute security", in fact a position of strength for themselves, and place all other countries in a position of "absolute insecurity". What could not be achieved for several decades by ever more spirals of the nuclear arms race, is now intended to be attained by means of the latest space technology.

The objective of the American plan which is officially proclaimed by Washington is well known: to establish a multilayer ABM system by deploying in space the latest weapons systems and making use of scientific and technological achievements. Ultimately, according to the US President himself, the goal is to make nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete". Although he spoke about nuclear weapons in general, obviously he meant only "neutralization" of the Soviet Union's defence potential.

This is above all proved by the United States' stepping up the development of a modernized potential for a first nuclear strike, along with the Star Wars programme. Its most important elements are to be ground-based MX and Midgetman ICBMs, submarine-launched Trident ICBMs, and medium-range missiles sited in several West European states and also designed for high-accuracy destruction of strategic targets in the Soviet Union. Stealth weapons systems are being developed which ensure a secret approach to the target and a surprise attack, as well as air- and sea-based long-range missiles having the same properties.

The statements by the head of the American Administration about the readiness "in due time" to share "wonder technology" with other countries, including the USSR, sound hypocritical. What is real today is Washington's maniacal obsession to prevent any kind of technological cooperation with the Soviet Union under the pretext of "preventing an information leak" which may potentially be of strategic importance. The same pretext was also used to stop the continuing Soviet-American cooperation in several areas to do with the exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes whose signs began to emerge in the 1970s.

According to Soviet and most foreign scientists it is technologically unfeasible for the United States to create a large-scale ABM

system with space-based elements that would reliably protect US territory, to say nothing of the territory of its allies in Western Europe or other parts of the world. But the very setting in the military programme of such an objective as priority and the starting of large-scale work to achieve it only lead to the undermining of international security and the destruction of strategic stability.

A number of factors show that while ABM weapons are being developed and deployed, military strategists, initiators of plans of "limited" or "protracted" nuclear wars may have the illusion of attaining a capability for delivering a first, "disarming" nuclear strike with impunity. In this case the ABM system, although limited in its possibilities, would have the task of "finishing off" the enemy's remaining retaliatory weapons.

Furthermore, as most of the leading strategists admit, the deployment of ABM systems under the Star Wars programme would compel the other side to take appropriate steps to ensure a strategic balance by building up its potential for a retaliatory nuclear strike.

In a nuclear confrontation, even defensive space-based systems cannot be regarded in any other way but as a complement to the offensive strategic potential.

Finally, under the guise of "defensive" weapons the Pentagon is developing space-strike arms which are capable of destroying a wide range of targets. Military experts and scientists all over the world agree that the basic systems being developed for knocking out missiles will also be used for striking satellites as well. A study of projects being developed in the US fosters the conclusion that anti-satellite weapons are being created under the guise of "research".

The US Administration continues testing and later intends to deploy the ASAT anti-satellite system. The latter is, in fact, the second generation of such weapons for the first-generation weapons designed for use against satellites were tested and deployed by the Pentagon back in the early 1960s.¹ What is threatening security and stability is that by developing means for attacking satellites, above all the satellites giving an early warning about missile attacks, the aggressor could count on "deafening" and "blinding" its victim and enhance the efficiency of a surprise "disarming" nuclear strike.

As space-strike weapons are being developed and perfected they will inevitably acquire a capability to hit targets in the atmosphere, such as aircraft and cruise missiles, and then on Earth. In this way the space "shield" will become a space sword in addition to the nuclear

¹ Since the West raised a fuss about the Soviet "satellite threat" it should be pointed out that the Soviet Union was forced to take retaliatory measures to counter the above actions of the US and the USSR began its anti-satellite weapon tests much later; they were suspended in 1983 in connection with the Soviet unilateral moratorium. Since that time they have not been resumed.

sword. According to prominent physicists and US government experts, laser weapons which are being developed in the framework of the "strategic defence initiative" are easier to use for burning the enemy's cities than for protecting the United States from missiles. They came to a conclusion that the fire storms caused by such weapons in vast areas can result in an ecological catastrophe similar to the "nuclear winter". In other words, what is meant is essentially the development of fundamentally new mass-destruction weapons. Furthermore, the discoveries made while developing space-strike weapons will be useful for supplying new types of conventional armaments for the Army, the Air Force and the Navy.

The lower security and destabilization of the strategic situation are also inevitable if both sides develop and deploy large-scale ABM systems. Because of the different volumes of research and development projects and different economic and production potentials it is obvious that the deployment of such systems would entail acute competition, increased suspicion and boost the arms race in all areas. But even in the hypothetical conditions of absolutely synchronous deployment by the sides of all-embracing ABM systems strategic stability would be undermined since the attacking side would, if there were a space "shield", have an advantage. This is explained above all by the fact that it is virtually impossible to create a totally reliable ABM system and, consequently, in case of a massive missile launch the attacking side could expect with a great degree of confidence that at least a part of nuclear warheads would reach their targets. Besides, space-based ABM systems which are rather vulnerable, in the general opinion of specialists, would themselves be tempting targets for a first strike.

An analysis of the destabilizing strategic consequences coming from the development of space-strike weapons under the Star Wars programme convincingly proves the fundamental conclusion made by the 27th CPSU Congress that it is impossible to win the arms race or a nuclear war. The nature of modern weapons leaves no hope for any state to expect full protection by military and technical means, even by putting defensive systems in space, whereas the continuation of the arms race, moreover, its extension to outer space will accelerate the already high rates of stockpiling and perfection of nuclear weapons. While today's balance level of nuclear potentials of the opposing sides spells equal danger for both of them, should weapons be deployed in space, this equal danger will grow even more and reach such levels that even parity will cease to be a factor of military and political deterrence.

Finally, it is the example of space-based weapons that especially convincingly confirms the idea expressed at the Congress of Soviet Communists that the development of new mass-destruction weapon

systems steadily shortens the time and reduces options for making political decisions on the issues of war and peace in case of crises. Indeed, space-based weapons, which act practically instantaneously and can reach any point on Earth in a matter of a few minutes will depend on extremely sophisticated computer systems. Since no more than 200 to 300 seconds will pass between the appearance of missiles in the atmosphere and their destruction, as envisaged in the Star Wars programme (in which time these missiles will have to be detected, identified, distributed among interceptors, aimed at and shot down), the obvious conclusion is that it will be the automatic systems and computers making a decision on the start of a war.

The situation in the world may become such that it will not depend on the intellect or will of politicians, but will be subordinated to technology and military-technocratic logic. Besides, even the most reliable systems which have been tested and checked many times may malfunction, as proved once again by the Challenger and Titan disasters. If space weapons are deployed the result of one such malfunction may be a nuclear catastrophe.

The Star Wars programme would have a destabilizing effect not only in the military-strategic sphere, but also in the spheres of politics and international law. It irreconcilably contradicts the Soviet-American ABM Treaty of unlimited duration. The programme's objective is to do what the treaty bans—the development, testing and deployment of systems and components of a large-scale ABM system, including space-based elements. Such fundamental multilateral agreements on the limitation of armaments and the strengthening of international security, as the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies of 1967 which prohibits the deployment in outer space of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction would be inevitably undermined sooner or later.

Thus, in implementing the Star Wars programme its initiators consciously seek to wreck the ongoing talks and kill the existing agreements on the limitation of armaments.

It does not matter whether the attempts to create a large-scale ABM system are undertaken by the United States alone or jointly with its allies, including the attempts to create such a system for Western Europe. For in all instances they will have destabilizing consequences. In trying to make use of the research and technological potential of its West European partners for implementing its own militaristic programme and at the same time to react, as it were, to the latter's natural suspicions with regard to the possibility that the Pentagon will carry out its plans for waging a "limited" nuclear war on European territory

while protecting itself with a space "shield", the United States has recently announced that ABM weapons are being developed in the framework of SDI not only for the United States, but also for Western Europe.

The militarist circles of the Federal Republic of Germany seeking to have access to the latest military technology and in this way make up for the absence of their own nuclear weapons are also actively pushing through the project of European Defence Initiative (EDI). The West European ABM system, were it created, would be used in combination with the existing offensive nuclear armaments of NATO in Europe. It would not be regarded as anything but a direct complement to the nuclear arsenals deployed in the continent as an "anti-missile umbrella" over the Pershing 2 and ground-based cruise missiles which the US continues to deploy there.

By joining SDI or helping implement the EDI, West European countries are objectively becoming accomplices in the United States' adventurist military plans in outer space. They take their share of responsibility for the grave consequences that will affect the balance of forces, strategic stability and security in Europe and in the world. The security of these states themselves would be undermined above all. As regards the FRG, it is obvious that it grossly violates its commitments to prevent the threat of war from ever emanating from German soil.

An inevitable conclusion suggests itself from what has been said above: should the Star Wars programme be carried out, in the next few years the whole world may find itself in an atmosphere of a totally uncontrollable arms race, strategic chaos, extremely dangerous instability, general uncertainty and the growing risk of a nuclear catastrophe all this entails.

SOVIET STAR PEACE PROGRAMME

The concept of a nuclear-free world advanced by the Soviet Union has convincingly shown the fallacy of attempts to pass off the Star Wars programme as a sort of cure-all removing the nuclear threat. In his January 15, 1986 Statement Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, proposed to mankind the only possible and, which is the main thing, safe road to removing the nuclear threat—a concrete plan for complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. In the period of 15 years which the advocates of Star Wars intend to spend on a new wasteful stage of the arms race in space, the Soviet Union proposes that concrete measures be taken to rid the planet for all time of the Damoclean nuclear sword hanging over it. But the deployment of weapons in space will be a great obstacle to the attainment of this goal. For

nuclear disarmament to become a reality, an agreement must be reached on the renunciation of space-strike weapons. At the first stage this could be done by the Soviet Union and the United States and at the second stage by the other leading industrialized states.

Of course, the most sensible thing would be a strict ban on the development, testing and deployment of space-strike weapons with effective verification, including the opening to inspection of the appropriate laboratories. In other words, the use of force would be banned in space and from space against Earth, as well as from Earth against space objects. In accordance with this, any weapons—conventional, nuclear, laser, particle-beam or any others—intended for use against missiles and satellites, or for destroying targets on Earth or in the atmosphere would not be deployed in space, either in manned or unmanned systems.

Since the United States fiercely resists this radical measure aimed at the renunciation of the entire class of space-strike weapons under the pretext of the "complexity" of working out a clear-cut definition of such weapons, the Soviet Union has expressed its readiness to agree to partial measures that would lead to the ultimate goal. One of these measures is an unconditional ban on anti-satellite weapons. The subject matter of a possible agreement was in large measure defined in 1978, at the Soviet-American talks on anti-satellite systems. Incidentally, these talks were initiated by the American side which was evidently aware of what "anti-satellite systems" meant. Washington also broke them off, obviously afraid of the possibility of reaching accords, a possibility that started to seem likely during the exchange of views. The Soviet Union proposed that testing, development and deployment of new anti-satellite systems be banned and such systems possessed by the sides eliminated.

This covers strike weapons capable of destroying space objects. The communications, navigation and early warning satellites the Soviet Union and the United States have at present are not weapons as such, for they do not pose a threat of direct attack in space or from space. Furthermore, these systems help maintain strategic stability, deprive the enemy of the possibility to make a surprise disarming nuclear attack. The ban on anti-satellite systems should therefore be combined with the ensurance of security, or, in other words, of immunity of such military satellites, as well as orbital vehicles which are used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Guided by these considerations and trying to raise to the maximum the effectiveness of the principle of the non-use of force in space, the Soviet Union proposed at the Geneva Disarmament Conference that an international agreement on the immunity of artificial Earth satellites be drafted. It was taken into account that a number of states, for instance France, had for several years expressed concern over the

safety of satellites and advanced in various forms an idea of ensuring their immunity. The solution of this problem would accord with the will of the world community which was unequivocally expressed in the resolution on prevention of an arms race in outer space adopted by the 40th session of the UN General Assembly in 1985. The resolution calls upon all states to strictly observe the fundamental principle of renunciation of the use or threat of force in their space activities.

As regards the prevention of a proliferation of the arms race to outer space and the cessation of the nuclear arms race on Earth a stop, on a reciprocal basis, to all nuclear weapon tests becomes the top priority task. This would be consonant with the task of strict observance of the existing treaties on limitation of the arms race relating to space.

In the present situation, strategic stability can only be ensured if the Soviet-American ABM Treaty is strictly observed. The Soviet Union has more than once proposed to the US that the two should declare their willingness to adhere to the treaty. To preserve and strengthen the treaty is one of the most important prerequisites for achieving a secure and lasting peace and limiting, and drastically reducing, nuclear armaments. The USSR is ready to move forward in every area and use to the maximum the existing machinery of the talks being conducted between the USSR and the US and on a multilateral basis, primarily at the Disarmament Conference.

The package deal proposed by the Soviet Union at the Geneva talks between the USSR and the US on nuclear and space weapons provides for the liquidation of strategic offensive armaments on reaching agreement on adherence to the ABM Treaty for 10 years. The work on SDI would be confined to laboratory research, that is, to the level which the US has virtually reached.

In proposing mutual renunciation of space-strike weapons, the USSR by no means raises the question of banning fundamental research, including that into lasers. However, if research transcends the bounds of fundamental research and is directly aimed at developing weapons, that is, if it is part of the process of developing means of warfare, it must, no doubt, be banned. If the commitment not to develop space-strike weapons is assumed, it can easily be verified. If one of the sides violates the treaty it will be known for models, prototypes, etc., would appear.

Extra-laboratory tests cannot be avoided either. Besides, respective laboratories could be opened for verification. Thus, if there is a ban on space-strike weapons, the question of research will be settled. On the whole, it is obvious that there are no objective obstacles to preventing the arms race in space. What is needed is only political

will, a realistic assessment of the existing situation in the world, and the desire for security not in word, but in deed.

As stressed in the January 15, 1986 Statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, we should advance towards the third millennium not with the Star Wars programme, but with major projects for the exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes by the efforts of the whole of mankind. The working out and implementation of such projects make one of the most important ways of ensuring progress on Earth and establishing a reliable system of security for all. The letter sent to the UN Secretary General by Nikolai Ryzhkov, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, in June 1986 set forth a stage-by-stage programme for joint practical steps on the exploration of space for peaceful purposes which has been submitted for consideration by the international community. The stages of its implementation would be closely linked with the stages of nuclear disarmament. Both these processes would complement and stimulate each other. Each of them would contribute greatly to improving the international situation and decrease suspicion and mistrust in international relations, and help fill detente with concrete content. A sizable part of the sums released by eliminating nuclear arsenals and the Star Wars programme could be channelled to peaceful exploration of outer space in the interests of all states.

Man's breakthrough in outer space and the harnessing of the energy of the atom prove that the world is an integral whole. But states and nations feel this mainly in the form of the general threat posed by nuclear weapons and the danger of the arms race proliferating to outer space. Large-scale international cooperation in space exploration for peaceful purposes would help unite peoples on a new constructive basis. By channelling their resources and applying material and intellectual potentials for implementing measures to use and explore outer space, the states would learn the science of living in peace and cooperating in solving worldwide problems. Cooperation in space exploration would strengthen trust and mutual understanding on Earth.

Economic considerations also favour such cooperation. Even if we assume that the Star Wars programme will boost the development of science, the price will be the creation of truly suicidal armaments. Peaceful exploration of outer space opens up a fundamentally new, direct and promising way to accelerating progress in science and industry. As shown by the first steps taken by the US to involve its allies in developing space-strike weapons, it is yet another lever which the overseas monopolies want to use to get rid of their competitive partners. West European and Japanese industries are assigned a role of subcontractors for carrying out certain types of work. The Americans are also trying to pump the knowledge of West European and

Japanese scientists in those areas where the latter have made achievements. At the same time the US monopolies retain key branches and areas, so that the dependence of Western Europe and Japan on American technology will grow.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the cooperation it proposes in space exploration, which is open and accessible to all, will be advantageous to all nations. The Soviet Union is prepared to develop this cooperation with all states and on a bilateral basis. Of course, this fully applies to the US. Many American scientists and businessmen think the cooperation between the two countries in space exploration is promising and mutually advantageous.

In advocating cooperation in space exploration, the Soviet Union, in fact, proposes that the resources of human civilization be used rationally. It is hardly sensible for states to duplicate their space exploration efforts. Their rational utilization on the basis of coordination and the pooling of forces would make possible what cannot be done by one, albeit the most developed, country. Practice has shown that the larger the scale of efforts in peaceful space exploration, the more tangible their returns for both developed and developing countries, the greater the access to their results for those states which do not have their own potential for space exploration.

In short, the Soviet-proposed Star Peace programme is one for peaceful exploration of outer space. It is the only alternative to the reckless Star Wars plans, it is a response to the challenge of the space age which is truly worthy of human civilization. The approach to the solution of the space problem proposed by the Soviet Union meets the interests of all the peoples, the interests of social progress; it is in line with the historic task of creating a comprehensive system of international security.

Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya, No. 9, 1986*

POLITICS AND MORALITY

Vladimir DENISOV

Western propaganda claims that communist ideology and politics are incompatible with morality and humanism, that communist politics are dialectically situational and perfidious. Let's see how matters really stand.

"VIOLENCE IS, OF COURSE, ALIEN TO OUR IDEAL"

The history of the communist movement, and the ideology and politics of real socialism disprove the anti-communist concoctions concerning the nature, methods and objectives of communist policies which are based on Marxist-Leninist theory and are essentially humanistic. The founders of scientific communism had always believed, and openly stated that only a principled and moral policy meets the interests of the workers and all toiling people, and is the most effective and practicable. They invariably subjected to severe criticism both the bourgeois policy and the policy of all manner of opportunists as lacking principles and immoral, and fought manifestations of subjectivism, voluntarism and political adventurism.

The charges that Communists conceal their true aims and intentions, that their policies are "dialectically perfidious" do not conform to historical truth. At the dawn of its history the communist movement openly proclaimed its objectives in the class struggle, and the basic principles of its political strategy and tactics. When all powers of old Europe joined forces for the "sacred hounding" of the young communist movement, representatives of its various national detachments assembled in order openly, in the face of the whole world, to publish

● V. DENISOV, D.Sc. (Philosophy), is head of department at the Institute of Philosophy, USSR Academy of Sciences.

in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* "their views, their aims, their tendencies... The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims."¹

Communist ideals and goals embody the vital interests and aspirations of the masses. The communist-led revolutionary movement of working people against all forms of oppression is basically humanistic. Communists do not absolutize violence, they regard it as a forced form of the class struggle against the exploiters and tyrants to attain genuine freedom, equality and democracy. The Communists' aim is to create a society in which there will be no place for social coercion. As Lenin stressed, "violence is, of course, alien to our ideals... the entire trend of development is towards abolition of coercive domination of one part of society over another."²

Communist morality, Western ideologists assert, is only an instrument of political practice. Communists are said to have a twofold view of the world, stemming from their different assessments of the short- and long-term perspectives of development. Therefore, they conclude, the communist line is inconsistent and unprincipled, depending on considerations of the moment and the subjectivist will of individuals.

The untenability of these assertions leaps to the eye. Communists subscribe to the Marxian thesis that "an aim requiring improper means is not proper." The revolutionary humanism of the working class does not imply some abstract and utopian dreams about freedom and peace, but consistent anti-imperialist revolutionary and national liberation struggles and a resolute rebuff of imperialism's aggressive moves. As historical development has shown all sorts of well-meaning "supra-party" or "extra-party" stances on questions of peace, freedom, equality, justice and other general human values do not pass the test of time. They become utopian unless they are based on the communist principles of delivering all people from exploitation, and social and national oppression, of ruling out hegemony in world politics. The Communists, in working to prevent war and preserve peace, uphold universal and just peace, and the equal security, freedom and independence of all nations and states.

Each people has the right to make its political choice and define its own path of social development. Nobody should deny this opportunity. When there are outside attempts to prevent people from implementing this legitimate right, conflicts inevitably arise, growing into a just struggle of the people for their freedom and independence. "Without recognizing every people's right to choose their own path of development there can be no normal international relations,"

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, vol. 1, M., Progress Publishers, pp. 108, 137.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 23, p. 69.

M. S. Gorbachev, CC CPSU General Secretary, said. "Only the people living in this or that country can decide what path to follow, what kind of ideology to embrace and what form of political organization to use. That is its sovereign right."

Analysing the principled policy of the working class and its vanguard party Marx noted that a policy must not be defined occasionally or prompted by transient considerations, but should be based on the people's vital interests and the aims of social progress. Such a policy is projected for a long historical term—as long as its main content and the aims of the mass struggle remain. It is precisely the principal class aims and tasks of the working class that provide an objective foundation for a strictly consistent and principled policy of the communist parties, and define its humanistic and highly moral content.

Marx and Engels formulated the fundamental principle of working class policies in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. "Communists", they wrote, "fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class, but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement."³

AIMS AND METHODS OF STRUGGLE

Marxist theory dialectically views relationships between the aims and means in human activity as shaped by specific historical necessity. These aims and means are analysed in the context of human activity as an integral process. "The revolution must come," wrote the founders of Marxism, "but it can be made more gently. ... This depends, however, more upon the development of the proletariat than upon that of the bourgeoisie."⁴

In contrast to the cynical and immoral view (the aim justifies the means) of the indispensable means of struggle, the revolutionary approach implies that a debatable means is used, as Engels pointed out, "only if the advantage to us is direct or if the historical development of the country in the direction of the economic and political revolution is indisputable and worth while; and provided that the proletarian class character of the Party is not jeopardised..."⁵

Definite social and economic relations provide an objective foundation for any ethical notion and moral standard. The notions of good and evil, moral principles and standards of behaviour of people have changed as epochs pass, but in a class society they have always

³ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, vol. 1, M., Progress Publishers, p. 136.

⁴ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, M., 1975, Progress Publishers, vol. 4, p. 581.

⁵ K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, M., Progress Publishers, p. 387.

reflected the interests of definite classes, their mode of life and thinking, the objective specific historical conditions and social relations, irrespective of people's will and consciousness. As Engels wrote, "men, consciously or unconsciously, derive their ethical ideas in the last resort from the practical relations on which their class position is based—from the economic relations in which they carry on production and exchange."⁶

Marxism has resolutely discarded a subjectivist idealistic approach to the problem of justice and humanism, to moral principles and ethical norms. It proved that these stem from material social relations. The Marxist teaching on society and the laws of its development forms the foundation for investigating problems of justice, humanism and morality. For Marxism is a science that deals with objective facts and material prerequisites of moral principles and norms, something that is precisely needed to solve the above problems, not the sentimental feelings of humanism and charity. Noting the historical necessity of resorting to violence against exploiters in certain circumstances Lenin stressed that "socialism is opposed to violence against men in general. Apart from Christian anarchists... no one has yet drawn the conclusion from this that socialism is opposed to *revolutionary* violence. So, to talk about violence in general, without examining the conditions which distinguish reactionary from revolutionary violence, means being a philistine who renounces revolution, or else it means simply deceiving oneself and others by sophistry."⁷

Rejecting the bourgeois idea of abstract morality and universal ethics in an antagonistic society and criticising the hypocritical preaching of "universal" love and fraternity, Marxism shows the relative, historically transient nature and class content of all ethical principles and moral categories, which should not be metaphysically absolutized. There is a dialectical connection between the social aims and the means for their attainment, which is easy to trace when analysing the policy pursued by definite classes. The progressive and lofty aims of the advanced social class, the proletariat, are in full conformity with highly ethical means for their accomplishment. Inasmuch as socialist transformations are carried out in the interests of the overwhelming majority of society, the policy conducted by the socialist state fully accords with the aspirations and hopes of the broad masses. That is why Communists, striving to carry out these transformations, adhere to an honest and straightforward policy. "Sincerity in politics", Lenin believed, "that is, in that sphere of human relations which involves,

⁶ F. Engels, *Anti-Duhring*, M., Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1962, pp. 130-131.

⁷ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 28, p. 285.

not individuals, but the *millions*, is a *correspondence between word and deed* that lends itself to verification."⁸

A FALSE ASSERTION

Bourgeois ideologists point to some ineradicable contradiction in communist ideology, notably in the communist treatment of problems of world politics and the peace struggle. It is alleged that on the one hand Communists champion peace which they really need for peaceful construction, while on the other, they believe in the ultimate triumph of communism all over the world. The latter, it is said, may only be achieved through force and an armed export of socialist revolution—in the foreseeable future at any rate.

Leaving alone anti-communist falsifications and misrepresentation of the true state of affairs, we see here the clearly metaphysical way of thinking typical of bourgeois theoreticians. They are hard put to grasp that there can simultaneously exist an objective need for ensuring relations of peace among peoples in the nuclear era and the objective inevitability of social development toward communism. Their undialectical, abstract-historical treatment of this issue gives rise to a false contradiction existing between the political struggle Communists are waging for universal and just peace and the theoretical substantiation by scientific communism of society's progress to the highest phase of its development.

A socialist revolution in one country or another can triumph as a result of the people showing their sovereign will. "Today's world is a highly diversified assemblage of sovereign states, of nations with their own interests, aspirations, policies, traditions and dreams. Many of them have just embarked on the road of independent development," CC CPSU General Secretary M. S. Gorbachev pointed out. "It is only natural that each nation should seek to exercise its sovereign right in the political, economic and social spheres. One may like or dislike this policy, but it does reflect the inner processes in each particular country and the interests of each nation possessing that sovereign right."

All attempts of ideological opponents of socialism to prove that violence underlies communist theory and practice are nothing but the falsification of truth. Many unbiased theoreticians in the West also admit this. "Revolutionary ideas travel; revolutions do not," writes R. Barnet, an American historian. "The ideology of anti-communism strips rebellion of legitimacy by stamping it 'made in Moscow' ... and exalts the suppression of revolution as an act of liberation."⁹

⁸ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 24, p. 574.

⁹ R. Barnet, *Intervention and Revolution. The USA in the Third World*. N.Y., 1968, p. 60.

AMORALITY OF THE POLICY OF STRENGTH

Not Marxism-Leninism but bourgeois ideology views the issue of political ethics from positions of moral scepticism and nihilism, admits the possibility of using force in political practice. S. Hook, an influential ideologist of neo-conservatism, substantiates the need for constantly threatening the Soviet Union with a "nuclear Pearl Harbor", and regards this means as "an axiom in US political ethics".

American politologist R. Kolkowicz writes in one of his works that in the new US "realistic policy" increasing prominence is being given not to questions of ethics, but to force effectively to achieve certain aims. Evolution, Kolkowicz concludes, has stripped American political theory of all ethical content.

Many Western theoreticians look upon moral imperatives as some "ideal model", as something obligatory and desirable but which is unrelated to objective reality.

Quoting the English philosopher, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), they assert that the main moral criteria—the principle of self-preservation and fist law—have always been characteristic of mankind in its "natural state", whatever the concrete forms of its social organization. Accordingly, they argue, a politician should choose and use means for attaining his aims on the strength of expediency and effectiveness. A. Schaefer, a West German politologist, thus characterizes the role of morality in bourgeois politics: "Morality teaches us to respect the legal world which is protected by the state via external sanctions of laws. In this way morality is, as it were, in the service of the state which, however, does not place its political actions in the service of morality, taking care only of its own interests."¹⁰ Describing morality as an "ideal guarantor" of the stability and security of the state, he admits at the same time that in modern bourgeois society with its increasing level of civilization the ethical sphere is being more and more divorced from the political sphere.

Disregard for the ethical values at the level of state politics inevitably leads to the devaluation of moral criteria and norms in the consciousness of individual citizens of present-day bourgeois society. It is not accidental that today some Western theoreticians concede that the methods and moral norms the state uses in its political practice may considerably influence the moral climate of society, the prevailing morals and standards of social behaviour and, particularly, the means its citizens use to attain personal success and solve their personal problems. Finnish sociologist, V. Pietila, is right in saying that the principles and traditions of resorting to violence at state level, which are deeply rooted in the social nature and historical practice of

¹⁰ A. Schaefer, *Die Moral in der Politik*, Berlin, 1983, S. 34.

American society, cannot but tell on the way of thinking and behaviour of the citizens of this state who, following the national traditions, seek to use violence for resolving their personal conflicts and problems.

DOUBLE ETHICAL NORMS

English philosopher, David Hume (1711-1776), spoke of two kinds of morality: individual for citizens and a state one for politicians which allows—in the name of supreme interests—for deviations from general human standards and principles. Similar ideas are voiced by contemporary bourgeois ideologists theoretically substantiating the notion of "double ethical norms".

Imperialist powers apply this concept in their political practices. They use totally different criteria when speaking of their loyal puppets—bloody dictatorships and pro-fascist political regimes, of anti-socialist forces and elements hostile to socialism, on the one hand, and the revolutionary forces, freedom-loving peoples struggling for their national liberation and independence, and fighters opposing anti-democratic and militarist policies of imperialism, on the other. They brand the latter as terrorists.

Paradoxically enough, ethics and humanism are mostly discussed by those political leaders who respect the standards of international law and elementary decency least of all, who do not observe even the minimum of propriety in relations among states. They quite often resort to unseemly methods. Using pseudo-moral rhetoric and slanderous insinuations about human rights under socialism and a "Soviet threat to peace", the USA declares its imperialist policy of international brigandage and dictate, of aggression and genocide as a model of morality and humanism.

If we want to judge how "ethical" an imperialist policy is, let's turn to facts, not declarations. And let facts speak for themselves: a secret war against Nicaragua, the occupation of Grenada, the policy of international terrorism in the Middle East, support for the fascist junta in Chile, for the racist regime in South Africa and other anti-popular repressive cliques, expansionism of transnational monopolies plundering the national wealth of many peoples. At home, the United States is applying racial discrimination, political gangsterism, the hounding of differently-minded persons, police reprisals for ideological and political reasons.

* * *

In our age it is only possible to conduct a principled and ethical policy on the basis of scientific Marxist theory, which takes into

account the vital interests and aims of the working class and all toiling masses, the historical necessity of social progress. The dialectics of general human and class interests, of political principles and ethical norms is fully mirrored in the ideology, politics and morality of the working class and its vanguard—the Communist Party, in the day-to-day practice of the countries of existing socialism. The objective historical imperative of mankind's progressive development is embodied in the revolutionary transformation of society along socialist lines, in the liberation of the working people from all forms of oppression and exploitation.

It is socialism and its truly peace-oriented and constructive policy that promotes the practical solution of important and vital general human problems today, such as preventing wars and maintaining world peace, stopping the arms race and eliminating nuclear weapons, ensuring social equality and justice for all nations and people on earth, and other global social, political, economic, and ecological problems. The collectivist and humanistic morality of socialism asserts genuinely humane relations among people, relations of friendship and cooperation between all nations.

Voprosy filosofii, No. 5, 1986*



The information provided by your publications on imperialism helps me in various discussions. Some of the facts cited in them are never highlighted by Western media. Most of the population in Sierra Leone is very poor and become poorer every day, and the rich become richer. I don't believe much of what is told about you here.

M. A. Bah,
Sierra Leone

Your publications are no doubt a window through which a person imbued with Western ideology can

better see the West itself, just because we don't often have a chance to learn the Soviet point of view.

Jjawaya Masanja,
Uganda

I think your publications are very good. They broaden our vision, provide valuable information, are convincing and well-grounded. They express the Soviet point of view on topical world issues. I often use them in discussions.

Marco Emilio Borghi,
Cuba

IS THERE AN ECONOMIC CRISIS IN THE USSR?

Pretentiously playing up the critical remarks made at the 27th CPSU Congress and in the Soviet press on some bottlenecks in the Soviet economy, the mass media in the West launched a large-scale campaign seeking to discredit socialism's economic system, and impress on the public the idea of a "crisis" in it.

Now let us look at the real state of affairs in the Soviet economy and see if a crisis exists.

Comments by Gennady KOPYAKOV, a journalist, follow.

FACTS TESTIFY...

Let's turn to figures which, I believe, will help a person to judge for himself.

National income is known to be a source of the ever growing development of social production, of strengthening the economic might of any country and improving people's welfare. It is also an indicator which most fully reflects the economic development of a state. Today, in our country the average material wealth per capita is almost 12 thousand roubles, twice the 1970 figure. The USSR's average annual national income increase between 1951 and 1981 was 7.3 per cent, in the USA it amounted to 3.4 per cent.

As for the volume of Soviet industrial output from 1971 to 1980 it almost doubled. It took Great Britain, the FRG, France and the USA, 26, 18, 18 and 17 years, respectively to double theirs. During this period US industrial production suffered a recession three times. In the USSR, industrial growth rates at that particular time averaged out at 5.9 per cent a year, in Britain 1 per cent, Italy 3.5, Canada 3.4, the USA 3.1, France 2.9, Japan 4.5 per cent.

What kind of a crisis has hit the Soviet economy if in the last 25 years the USSR has left the US behind in the production of many major industrial items? In 1960, Soviet production of oil (gas condensate included) was 42 and of natural gas 12 per cent of the corresponding

levels in the USA, in 1985 the figures were 136 and 116 per cent, respectively. If we take steel, mineral fertilizer and cement, their production in those years jumped and the corresponding percentage ratios were 71 and 191, 43 and 158, 81 and 170.

Other, less important indicators over different years also witness the fact that economically the USSR is catching up with the USA. And now, although the Soviet Union ranks second in the world (after the US) in the sum total of economic indicators, it has surpassed the United States in a number of most important areas.

Our agriculture is steadily progressing. Its gross output rose 2.4 times between 1940 and 1981. In the 1951-1981 period the average annual increase in farm produce was 2.9 per cent in the Soviet Union and 1.8 per cent in the United States. Labour productivity grew at an average of 6.2 per cent a year in this country and 2 per cent in the USA.

Soviet people's welfare is also improving. Large-scale social programmes have been started which are regularly raising the population's real incomes, expanding the production of consumer goods, increasing the scale of housing construction, etc. Each five-year plan period saw imposing investments in the social sphere, and these have borne fruit. To illustrate.

In twenty-five years per capita real incomes increased 2.6 times. In 1965, only four per cent of the population earned more than 100 roubles a month, in 1970 this stratum made up 18 per cent, and in 1985 over 60 per cent. Average monthly wages and salaries in 1985 were double the 1965 figures, and payments to collective farmers were 2.5 times higher. In 1985, a decision was passed on raising the earnings of some categories of medical personnel, workers in science and technology, and on bettering the living standards of a significant proportion of pensioners. In the last ten years consumer goods production has almost doubled and the new houses built in the USSR over the last twenty years constitute 70 per cent of the total built in the country under Soviet power.

All-round development of Soviet science moved it to the forefront in the fields of mathematics, mechanics, quantum electronics, solid state physics, nuclear power engineering, and so on. The achievements made in space exploration are a concentrated expression of scientific progress in the USSR.

Well, the reader may ask quite a logical question: if Soviet society and its economy has progressed so successfully, why then all this talk about the fundamental restructuring mapped out by the 27th Congress of Soviet Communists. During his talk with the Chief Editor of the Algerian magazine *Révolution Africaine*, M. S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, answered that question thus: "The point is that while giving credit to what has been

accomplished, we want to move forward faster, on a new qualitative basis. The creative potentialities of socialism are such that we can now tackle much more complicated and ambitious tasks than we could before. Complacency contradicts the very nature of the Communist Party, the nature of socialist society and our morals. That is why our mistakes and oversights, as well as our accomplishments, were openly and honestly discussed at the 27th Congress."

ACCELERATION STRATEGY

In the late 70s-early 80s some negative tendencies were discerned in the Soviet economy's development. These were due to several factors, mainly, an unfavourable demographic situation (resulting in labour shortages) and enormous material spending on arms forced upon the Soviet Union. However, there are other factors. Namely, we did not properly assess the new economic situation which had taken shape after the extensive growth lived its day; we were not persistent enough in introducing the achievements of science and technology, in restructuring the economy and managerial system in line with the new situation. Other negative tendencies, too, had their effect. As a result, economic growth rates reduced somewhat.

Having critically analysed the state of affairs in our country the CPSU adopted measures that would accelerate socio-economic development. What does this mean? It means, above all, raising the economic growth rates. But there is more to it than just that. As noted in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress, the acceleration means a new quality of growth; all-round intensification of production on the basis of the achievements of science and technology; restructuring of the economy; more effective forms of management, better organization and stimulation of labour. Steps are being made to do this, to strengthen labour and state discipline and introduce strict economy. In other words, great, intensive efforts are being made in every sphere of social life, and they are bearing fruit. This is proved by the results achieved in our national economy in the first ten months of 1986.

As N. V. Talyzin, First Deputy-Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Chairman of the State Planning Committee, noted in his report at the November 1986 session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, high growth rates have been attained in almost all branches of the economy. The increase in the national income and industrial output has been the highest in the current decade. The produced national income is 4.3 per cent more than that in the first ten months of 1985; the total volume of industrial production has grown 5.2 per cent. These are the results of the first year of the twelfth five-year plan period (1986-1990), and they show that in its major areas the Soviet

economy is approaching the average annual targets set in the five-year plan.

The development of engineering, the chemical and petrochemical industries has been accorded priority. It is precisely these branches that ensure the national economy's progress. The output of the latest production equipment is expanding, and the key industries—metallurgy, the coal and oil industries—are making steady headway.

The output and state purchases of grain, potatoes, vegetables, fruits and animal produce have expanded. The growth rates of agricultural production are almost double the average annual plan targets. The gross yield of grain was about 210 million tons in 1986, almost 30 million tons more than the average annual amount of grain produced between 1981 and 1985.

Large-scale technological reconstruction and retooling of enterprises are gaining momentum. Some 25 per cent more funds than in 1985 have been earmarked for the purpose.

Labour productivity in industry has grown 4.8 per cent which is above the annual target (4.1 per cent). This was equivalent to a 95 per cent increase in industrial growth.

Measures are being taken to raise people's living standards. Average monthly wages and salaries amounted to 194 roubles in 1986 as against 189 roubles in 1985. Over the same period farmers' wages increased 4 per cent. Housing, social and cultural construction has grown in scale significantly. In the country as a whole 14 per cent more houses were built in the first ten months of 1986 than in the same period in 1985, the number of schools, pre-school institutions, hospitals and out-patient clinics also rose, 13, 27 and 60 per cent, respectively.

What else will be achieved in the twelfth five-year period? What economic results can we expect? National income, which reflects the end results and efficiency of the economic activity, will swell to 124 billion roubles (79 billion in the eleventh five-year period). The planned increase in industrial production will amount to 200 billion roubles (133 billion in the previous period). The average annual output of farm produce will be 29 billion roubles worth (10 billion in the previous period).

A characteristic feature of the plan is to raise the incomes of almost all strata of the population, and solve social problems. About four-fifths of the national income will go to improve people's welfare. Some 90 million white- and blue-collar workers (as against 20 million in the eleventh five-year period) will get higher pay. Better living conditions will be provided for war and labour veterans, and more funds will be allocated to help families having children. These measures will improve the living standards of more than 55 million pensioners and mothers.

In the 1986-1990 plan period the average wages and salaries will jump almost 15 per cent to reach 218 roubles a month in 1990. As for the collective farmers, the respective figures will be 18 per cent and 180 roubles. And if one takes into account the money rural dwellers derive from their personal holdings, then it will be clear that their real incomes will actually equal those of blue- and white-collar workers.

The housing problem will be in the focus of attention in 1986-1990. Some 595 million square metres of housing is to be built. By the year 2000 every family will have its separate flat or a house.

The main aim of the current five-year plan period is to restructure all economic spheres and go over to an intensive development of the Soviet economy.

There is no denying that existing socialism has not yet solved all of its problems, and these are being discussed in the socialist countries openly and honestly. Difficulties arise in any society. However, reports about an "economic crisis in the USSR" made in the West are a gross misrepresentation of the real state of affairs. The point to be made here is that bourgeois ideologists view Soviet realities through the prism of the interests of the ruling class which they serve. Because of this they cannot be objective in their evaluations. Socialist economy will never know the crises inherent in capitalist society. Soviet society faces difficulties but only those that arise as its economy develops.

THE STAR WARS PROGRAMME: POLITICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Igor MALASHENKO

In our nuclear age international security can be guaranteed not by military, but by political means. Security should not be based on the doctrines of "deterrence" or a "balance of fear". These doctrines fuel the arms race which may become uncontrollable some day. The Soviet Union proposes achieving security along the lines of detente and international cooperation, of confidence-building and overcoming mutual suspicions.

What is the alternative offered by Washington?

The Reagan Administration is trying to sell its Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) which will, allegedly, fundamentally change the existing military-strategic situation.

In order to secure the political "rear" for this programme official Washington has launched an unprecedented campaign of ideological and psychological brainwashing of both the broad public and the political academic circles. Great efforts are being exerted to conceal the dangerous consequences the realization of the SDI would have for the military-strategic situation.

HOW THE AVERAGE AMERICAN IS CONDITIONED

Reagan's promise to create an "impregnable" shield over the territory of America and thus effectively "isolate" the USA from the

● I. MALASHENKO, Cand. Sc. (History), specializes in the study of nuclear disarmament problems.

nuclear threat has evoked a strong response in mass consciousness. In the span of almost two centuries the United States has been militarily invulnerable, which has made a deep imprint on the Americans' mentality. Many of them are unable to grasp the fact that in this nuclear-missile age the erstwhile advantages obtained from the country's "insular" geographical position have almost completely disappeared. The nostalgia for the times when America was an impregnable "fortress" still lingers in the country. This is exploited by the sponsors of the SDI or the Star Wars programme in their propaganda campaign.

The emotional perception of the nuclear threat by the Americans and their striving to ward it off by any means is largely linked with their acute awareness of the loss of US military invulnerability. Realization of this has compelled many of them to adopt an anti-nuclear stance and seek a revision of the military-political guidelines of the Washington leadership. Such moods and sentiments which are evident in the upsurge of the anti-war movement have raised serious political problems for the Reagan Administration which is forcing an unprecedented buildup of US nuclear capability and which, initially, openly declared its belief in the possibility of waging and winning a nuclear war.

The Reagan Administration first tried to neutralize the opposition by engaging in "peace-making" rhetoric. Eventually, it turned to other means for manipulating mass consciousness, exploiting simultaneously the fear of nuclear catastrophe and the tenacious illusions that the United States can regain its invulnerability. Reagan's Strategic Defence Initiative was consistent with the national values and, therefore, it could not but appeal to Americans who really believed it could protect the country against all nuclear weapons.

The nuclear threat can be eliminated by joint effort, through international cooperation. But the Reagan Administration's scheme for ridding the Americans of the fear of nuclear war unilaterally has ideological and psychological strings attached.

In the American approach to the "wider world" there has always been a tendency to resolve international issues one-sidedly. Rooted in the tradition of isolationism, this tendency has grown into the "arrogance of strength", in step with the growth of the military-political might of the United States, into the feeling that the United States can deal with any question according to its lights, without regard for the rest of the world.

This is especially conspicuous in the US approach to security problems. In the nuclear age the Americans find it hard to get used to the idea that their attempts to further their security at the expense of the other side will inevitably evoke a response which, in the end, will diminish the US security. However, the Washington Administr-

ation deliberately fosters the illusory hopes that it is possible to remove the nuclear threat and restore America's status of invulnerability. Nor does it conceal that "absolute security" for the United States would spell a total lack of security for the Soviet Union and other countries.

Here official Washington uses for its purposes not only the feelings of national egoism but also anti-Soviet stereotypes dinned into the Americans by the mass media. The image of the Soviet Union as an "evil empire" justifies, in the view of the Star Wars advocates, their striving to protect the USA with an impregnable shield and their attempt to put the USSR in a position of absolute vulnerability.

Appealing to the traditional notions and stereotypes in order to persuade the public into accepting the Strategic Defence Initiative, the Reagan Administration intimates that this programme is technically feasible. Here, too, the proponents of the Star Wars programme exploit the Americans' faith in the technical omnipotence of their country which can allegedly achieve anything in the way of new technology.

The Americans support the SDI mainly when it is palmed off as a "space defence" project. When it is defined in a poll as a programme for deploying new weapons in outer space, most Americans declare against the Star Wars. The matter is that, on the psychological plane, "defensive" systems appear preferable to "offensive" ones with which mass consciousness associates the nuclear threat. Most Americans don't yet realize the objective link between the means of defence and attack.

Thus, the Americans' attitude to the Strategic Defence Initiative is ambivalent and contradictory, as is the case with the problems of which the US public has only superficial knowledge. The Administration is trying to use for its political ends the fact that the "average" American is poorly informed of the SDI, and fosters illusions in mass consciousness about the aims and technical feasibility of the Star Wars programme.

The deployment of a large-scale anti-missile defence system with space-based elements will not deliver mankind from the nuclear threat, nor will it ensure "mutual guaranteed security". It will only destabilize the strategic situation and heighten the danger of a nuclear war. Under cover of the rhetoric on its desire to eliminate the nuclear danger the Reagan Administration effectively appeals to the more archaic notions so as to muster support for the Star Wars programme and allay public fears with respect to the space militarization plans.

SEEKING ALLIES AMONG SCIENTISTS

The proponents of the Star Wars programme know full well that

the effectiveness of the ideological and psychological conditioning of the US people and, indeed, the destiny of the programme as a whole largely depend on the stand taken by politologists and academics, and on the extent of enlisting their support. Representatives of this community are much more aware than the general public of the technical obstacles that may crop up during the development of the space shield and of the dangerous military-strategic and politico-psychological consequences of the realization of the SDI. To secure the consensus of this section of the American public the Administration has to use more sophisticated ideological and psychological methods and stratagems. While referring to the SDI, for public consumption, as a means rendering nuclear weapons "ineffectual and obsolescent", it furnishes a more "elitist" rationale for the programme. Insisting that the SDI would add to nuclear deterrence, the Administration seeks to use the interest which the discussion of strategic defence questions generates in the US politico-academic quarters.

In part, this is linked with the fact that many US defence experts have become convinced of the futility of the attempts to outplay the Soviet Union today in the field of the offensive weapons' quantitative buildup and qualitative advancement. For four decades the US military establishment has been elaborating sundry variants and versions of military-strategic doctrines and concepts, and now they not infrequently come to the conclusion that they can no longer invent anything new in this field. Many are seeking a way out of the impasse by trading on the idea of strategic defence and are, all too often, competing in the formulation of corresponding concepts.

To secure support for the SDI from politologists and academics its advocates are enlisting the services of specialists.

The Administration is deliberately imparting an ambiguous character to the Star Wars programme in an effort to win the maximum number of "academics" to its side and create an inner political consensus in favour of the SDI. In a bid to create a situation in which the new Administration will not be in a position to relinquish the programme, the current Washington leadership supports any interpretation of the SDI that favours the fulfilment of this programme.

The authors of the Star Wars idea cannot but reckon with the fact that massive opposition to the implementation of the SDI now exists within the US political and scientific community. Representatives of this opposition quite often speak against the projected programme guided above all by pragmatic motives—citing its immense costs, technical infeasibility, etc. In attempts to neutralize the opposition the Reagan Administration and its allies are turning it into an ideological touchstone, declaring an attitude to the SDI to be a criterion of loyalty not only to the Administration but also to the USA as a whole. Star Wars propagandists are developing an anti-Soviet reflex in the mass

consciousness, contending that "true patriots" stand for the SDI while covert and overt alarmists, not wishing America's might and prestige to increase, oppose it. The design is to make the opponents of the SDI "think twice" before publicly denouncing it.

Star Wars advocates are actively exploiting the technocratic ambitions rife amongst scientists, using and fomenting this "technological optimism", and the faith in the unbounded capabilities of American technological genius. President Reagan in his speech of March 23, 1983, directly called upon the scientific community to devote their "great talents" to the implementation of the SDI. Other ranking office-holders are also actively brainwashing the scientists. One more aspect of the technocratic approach is being played upon—making no difference between political and technological problems. Thus, the SDI is presented as a cure-all for solving the entire tangle of military-political problems.

It is further argued that the SDI is nothing but a research programme designed to test the feasibility of strategic defence ideas. Here the emphasis is often placed on the impossibility of stopping scientific and technological progress and relinquishing research. This sort of demagoguery also finds a response in the politico-academic community who are thus blinded as to the real intentions of the Administration out to give the investigations an impetus leading to the development and deployment of new weapon systems.

As we can see, in the Administration's strategy aimed at the maximum ideological and psychological backing for the Star Wars programme at home one can discern two principal approaches. The first one caters for the mass of the American public and focuses on the "revolutionary" character of the SDI which is expected to put an end to the nuclear threat, the situation of "mutual deterrence", and so forth. The second one is intended for consumption by the "elite". Here the main emphasis is laid on the SDI's compatibility with the existing military-strategic doctrines and concepts (first of all, its ability to buttress "nuclear deterrence"), and also on the technical feasibility of its less ambitious variants. There is a patent contradiction between the two rationales for the programme. But SDI supporters ignore this.

It stands to reason that if the United States develops and deploys an anti-missile system with space-based elements, the USSR will take effective response measures and will not let the US gain military superiority. But should another round of the arms race begin, then, in the words of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M. S. Gorbachev, "each side would constantly feel as though it had fallen behind in something, and would be frantically looking for ever new countermeasures. All this would spur on the arms race, not only in outer space but on earth as well."

Thus, even given the preservation of Soviet-US strategic parity,

space militarization would be fraught with serious politico-psychological consequences. It will not deliver the sides from the "balance of fear", nor will it strengthen the "deterrence factor". On the contrary, it will escalate fear and destabilize the situation.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE "DETERRENCE" CONCEPT?

The Reagan Administration is impressing on the Americans that the implementation of the SDI would enable them to discard—completely or partially—the psychological burden of the "mutual assured destruction" situation by strengthening "nuclear deterrence". These propaganda exertions cannot, however, alter the fact that the realization of the SDI would actually precipitate dangerous changes in the military-strategic situation, and upset the existing "balance of fear".

The "balance of fear" formula psychologically sums up the concept of "mutual nuclear deterrence" and underlies the contemporary military-strategic situation. The Soviet Union rejects the political meaning of this concept because it does not harbour any plans for making a nuclear attack on the USA. Therefore, the US has no need to "deter" the USSR. From the military standpoint, however, "mutual nuclear deterrence" means that a nuclear war would inevitably destroy and exterminate the two contending sides.

The "nuclear deterrence" concept is essentially contradictory, as admitted by US experts. On the one hand, the given state must have nuclear forces capable of carrying out the "assured destruction" task. On the other hand, it is held that the threat of using nuclear weapons should be life-like, not imaginary. And the achievement of this aim presupposes the development of a nuclear potential for waging and winning a nuclear war, and not merely for "nuclear retribution".

Supporters of the Reagan Administration claim that in reality there is no contradiction between the two aspects of "deterrence": the better a country is prepared for war, the wider the scope of the tasks which its nuclear forces are capable of carrying out, the more effective is the deterrent restraining the potential enemy from launching an attack. But they conveniently "forget" that the other side cannot but perceive the efforts towards the development of a capability for conducting real combat operations as evidence of the other side's aggressive intentions, as an attempt to break the deadlock of "mutual assured destruction" by developing the potential for the first disarming attack.

Therefore, the fear upon which the "deterrence" is based is two-pronged: the fear of "nuclear retaliation" and the fear of the first disarming strike by the other side, which creates an especially dangerous and destabilizing atmosphere.

First it fuels the arms race continuously whipping up the buildup of weaponry and their qualitative advancement. Second, the steps dictated by the fear of a first-strike attack only reinforce the other side's conviction that it is confronted by an aggressor. Third, this fear could prove fatal in the event of the exacerbation of a crisis situation and provide an "excuse" for delivering a pre-emptive attack. This plainly shows how important for the stabilization of the present-day situation is the Soviet Union's pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

The psychological balance, given a "nuclear deterrence" situation, is more stable the stronger the conviction of each side that the enemy cannot inflict a first disarming attack upon it. This situation, in turn, depends upon the sides' mutual vulnerability or invulnerability. Each of the sides is vulnerable in the sense that the bulk of its population and industrial capacity (as a minimum) can be destroyed by the enemy. At the same time the strategic forces of every side must possess a significant degree of invulnerability that guarantees the possibility of delivering a retaliatory blow. Thereby, the "deterrence" situation is a kind of "vulnerability-invulnerability" balance.

However, this balance is also precarious. With the growth of the counterforce capability of one side the vulnerability of the other side's strategic forces grows accordingly. The psychological balance within the framework of "deterrence" is insecure: the fear of a first disarming strike increasingly comes to the fore. The "deterrence" situation grows progressively unstable.

What then are the possible ways of overcoming this situation? One is the process of limiting and reducing nuclear arms which could halt their quantitative buildup and qualitative advancement. At first it would be possible to drastically reduce and, in the long term, eliminate nuclear weapons altogether. Progress in this direction would eventually put an end to the "mutual deterrence" and gradually banish fear as the psychological basis of the strategic balance.

The Reagan Administration prefers a different path—to overcome the situation through unilateral actions, first of all by developing a highly-effective multi-tier anti-missile defence system. The main argument for the SDI as a means for "strengthening deterrence" really comes down to the deployment of an anti-missile system with space-based elements; even if it is but partially effective, it would significantly increase the uncertainty of the strategic situation for the Soviet Union.

This being so, the side under threat will quite naturally be inclined to assess at a maximum the attained effectiveness of the hostile anti-missile system and also the possibilities for its perfection in the future. As a result of crash counter-measures the nuclear threat to the country

which has deployed a partially effective anti-missile system far from diminishing may increase further.

The strategic situation will be psychologically unstable also in the event of the development of an anti-missile system with space-based elements by the side under threat in response to the deployment of such a system by the other side. In this situation each of the sides will live in constant fear that its opponent has created, or is going to create, a more effective system. These fears will fuel the arms race and destabilize the situation.

The above warrants the conclusion that the Star Wars programme will affect the military-strategic situation. It goes without saying that the USSR, as the Soviet leaders have stated on a number of occasions, will take effective counter-measures that would prevent the United States from upsetting the existing strategic parity and gaining military superiority. However, if the USA takes the path of militarizing outer space the balance would be restored at a much higher level of military confrontation, offensive and defensive systems both in outer space and on Earth would be built up and, consequently, even parity would cease being a restraining factor.

So, there would be no question of passing over to "mutual guaranteed security". The result of the development of an anti-missile defence system with space-based elements will be an uncontrollable race in all arms and the upset "balance of fear".

Contrary to claims by the Star Wars apologists there is an insuperable contradiction between the task of eliminating all nuclear weapons and the attempts to "strengthen deterrence" with the aid of the SDI. Even the most sophisticated rhetoric cannot conceal it. As M. S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pointed out, "militarization of outer space would be a heavy psychological burden upon a resident in any country and create an atmosphere of general instability and insecurity."

The Soviet Union is steadfastly espousing a different approach—and this was clearly manifest at the Soviet-US summit meeting in Reykjavik in October, 1986—instead of wasting the immediate decades ahead on the development of space arms allegedly designed to do away with the nuclear threat it is now imperative to start drastically reducing and later completely eliminate nuclear arms in order to save mankind from the precarious "balance of fear".

SShA: Ekonomika, politika, ideologiya, No. 7, 1986

MILITARISM AND THE WORKING CLASS

**Boris PONOMAREV,
Academician**

The question of militarism has long been in the centre of attention of the working class and its most advanced representatives. On numerous occasions it was on the agenda of congresses of the Socialist International held before the First World War. In 1912 the Congress held in Basel adopted a manifesto on the struggle against militarism and war. Its ardent appeal is as topical today as it was seventy-odd years ago, for since then the danger of militarism, far from reducing, has grown tremendously: "Confront your governments with the proletariat's constant vigilant and passionate will for peace! Oppose in this way the capitalist world of exploitation and mass murder with the proletarian world of peace and the brotherhood of nations!"

A SINISTER SYSTEM OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Today in the large capitalist countries, militarism has become a sinister system. It is manifest in a huge war machine, the unprecedented arms race, mounting military budgets and the use of a significant part of the entire economic and scientific potential of the capitalist countries for military purposes. Militarism has penetrated all spheres of social, economic and cultural life in present-day capitalist society.

The economic, financial and social policies of the advanced capitalist states are militarist-oriented. This adversely affects the satisfaction of peoples' economic and social requirements. Cultural institutions and the system of education are also contaminated with

militarism. It is persistently and systematically implanted into the minds of people. To achieve this all means and methods are used—from "militarized toys" and respective cartoons for toddlers to the entire machinery of mass information, culture and entertainment for adults. As stressed at the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "The inhumane ideology of modern capitalism is inflicting ever greater damage on the spiritual world of people."¹

The militarist circles make every effort to incite chauvinistic reactionary sentiments in their countries. Today militarism is the main weapon in imperialism's struggle against the socialist countries and those states which have proclaimed their national independence and are building a free democratic society. To put it in a nutshell, in the setting of a general crisis of capitalism militarism is an ominous offshoot of imperialism, a source of permanent war danger for all of peace-loving mankind. Imperialism, in the international arena, stakes on force and constant and unrestrained propaganda of war and violence. As Lenin wrote, "Modern militarism is the result of capitalism."² Capitalism uses force for perpetrating acts of aggression and suppressing the economic and political struggle waged by the working class and all working people.

The period after the Second World War saw the appearance of military-industrial complexes (MIC), another offspring of militarism. These complexes have become especially powerful in the United States. The military-industrial complex is formed by the merging of large arms-manufacturing monopolies with the top military and the leaders of states and legislative bodies. As time goes by, the influence of the MICs on the home and foreign policies grows. It is worth mentioning that back in 1961 Dwight Eisenhower, former US President, warned against the dangerous effect of the military-industrial complex on the country's life. He wrote that this conglomeration of a huge war machine and large war industry is something new in American history. Its all-embracing economic, political and even spiritual influence is felt in every town, in the administration of every State and in every Federal agency.

That is really so. The American President was well aware what was behind the alliance of the military and the monopolies. The military-industrial complex is the main instigator of the arms race, and it in many respects shapes governmental policies. It goes without saying that the huge profits obtained by the monopolists and the military play no small part in this. The closely interlinked monopolies of the United States and other NATO countries making fortunes on the arms race form an ominous Transatlantic alliance of death merchants. As their

¹ *The Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. A New Edition, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1986, p. 16.

² V. I. Lenin, *Coll. Works*, vol. 15, p. 192.

ties with the governments grow stronger, they make the latter increase their military budgets and, expanding the export of weapons, they involve ever new countries into the arms race. Particularly topical today are the following Lenin's words: "Interlinked on a world-wide scale, capital is thriving on armaments and wars."³

Since 1945, in accordance with its militarist strategy, US imperialism has created a broad network of military bases far beyond the US borders. This is a fundamentally new development characteristic of the general crisis of capitalism. Today, the United States has 1,500 military bases and installations, including 360 large ones, on the territories of 32 countries manned by over 500,000 American soldiers. All in all, over 6.5 million people now serve in the US Army and work in various defence departments and in the armaments industry.

The formation of such a huge military machine and the arms race require tremendous expenditures in the capitalist countries. These great non-productive expenditures are directly deducted from the national wealth created by the working class, by hired labour. These expenditures are constantly on the increase. They create goods which have no use value and, hence, cannot satisfy the people's vital requirements.

THE MOLOCH OF WAR

According to UN data, over the past forty years the arms race has cost mankind 12 trillion dollars. This is three times as much as all the countries lost in the last two world wars. Over the past five years the average growth rates of the arms manufacturing industry greatly outpaced those of the civilian industries. In the United States, the main capitalist power today, which sets the pace of the arms race, the annual average growth rates of military expenditures are twice or even three times higher than the growth rates of the gross national product. Moreover, they keep growing. For instance, while in 1945 they amounted to 83,000 million dollars, in 1980 to 134,000 million dollars, in 1986 they topped 300,000 million dollars. The same tendency persists in other countries, such as the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain, France and Italy.

The myth about the favourable effect military spending has on economic development, spread by militarist propaganda, does not hold water. Significantly, the basic economic indicators in the countries engaged in feverish war preparations are much lower than in those where military expenditures are more moderate (compare the economic development of the US and Japan).

To justify such expenditures they in capitalist countries resort to

³ *Ibid.*, vol. 21, p. 227.

the notorious "Soviet military threat" the existence of which, however, not one militarist ring-leader has been able to prove. Peoples are becoming increasingly aware that the nonsense about a "Soviet military threat" is just a cover for building up arms and preparing military ventures.

Militarization diverts a large number of workers, mainly highly-skilled workers, from productive labour. It also aggravates the employment problem, for the huge sums spent on weapons mean the curtailment of civilian production and new thousands upon thousands of jobless. Today the United States has over eight million unemployed. Reliable trade union sources give a much higher figure—about 15 million. Britain, France and the Federal Republic of Germany each have three million unemployed.

The growing unemployment, cuts in social programmes and other factors have increased the number of people living below the official poverty line. In 1985 their number in the United States was 35 million people, or 15 per cent of the population.

To finance their ever expanding military budgets the governments of capitalist countries increase taxes and curb many social programmes, which tells most heavily on those in the low-income bracket. According to American economists' data, while in 1950 an American worker worked two hours every day to pay his taxes, in 1986 he needed four hours; during the past 35 years taxes levied on the people in the United States went up by almost 50 per cent.

It should be pointed out that the US federal budget is basically made up of the increased taxes. Moreover, it is a characteristic feature of Reaganomics that the taxes on capitalist monopolies have been sharply reduced. In 1984 they constituted only five per cent of the profits, as against 35 per cent in 1952. Besides, as in other capitalist countries, the US monopolies hide their actual profits and go out of their way to evade paying taxes. In the Federal Republic of Germany the total amount of taxes paid by the working people grew from 45 per cent in 1960 to 68 per cent in 1980. Pensions, for instance, disability pensions, went down by 10 per cent over the same period. Besides direct taxes the capitalist state also gets indirect taxes (included in the prices of goods, which also grew considerably over the past few years).

To find the huge sums for the arms race, in recent years the governments of the capitalist countries sharply reduced their social spending—unemployment benefits, allowances to families with many children, allocations for the health service and education. Young people are hit the hardest by this assault on the working people's living standards made by the capitalist governments.

Many more examples can be cited to illustrate the pernicious effect militarism has on capitalist society, the working class and all working

people. All this makes it imperative to activate all the peace forces and use all the potentialities of the working class to fight militarism and block the road to a nuclear war.

The continuous arms race, whipped up by the aggressive militarist circles resulted in a threat to the very existence of civilization assuming unprecedented proportions. Imperialism is guilty of bringing the world to a stage which can engender events well beyond human control.

Experts estimate that the nuclear weapons stockpiled now in the world are sufficient to exterminate life on Earth many times over. At least 50,000 nuclear warheads are standing by ready for action. Western Europe is oversaturated with nuclear weapons. About 7,000 nuclear warheads and thousands of delivery vehicles are deployed there. Moreover, the nuclear arms buildup continues.

In addition, NATO troops in Europe possess vacuum, cluster, napalm weapons and so on, which are comparable in their striking power to low-yield nuclear weapons. The West German Bundeswehr alone stocks almost 1,200 nuclear-capable armaments (missiles, aircraft, guns). The last restrictions on the research and development of heavy arms by the FRG have been removed. The most shocking fact is that this was done by the governments of the countries whose peoples well remember the tragedy of the Second World War, unleashed by nazi Germany, and their sufferings.

As the years go by the number of states capable of acquiring nuclear weapons grows, as does the number of people in the United States and other NATO countries who are invested with power and have access to nuclear weapons control. All this increases the risk of nuclear war breaking out as a result of misuse or an accident.

Modern science has graphically demonstrated the extremely dangerous consequences of a nuclear war for the whole of mankind. However, the mountains of arms are still piling up. Moreover, a qualitatively new element appeared in this reckless arms race—the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative of Ronald Reagan, or the Star Wars Programme, i.e. the plan to militarize outer space. Under this programme efforts are being intensified to develop a new means of warfare—space strike weapons, in addition to nuclear weapons. If this is done the danger of a nuclear war breaking out will grow immensely.

US imperialism has turned NATO, which incorporates 16 states, into its active and powerful weapon. Absolutely all the actions of this organization are directed by the United States. American generals are invariably at the head of the Supreme Commands both in Europe and in the North Atlantic.

NATO is the embodiment of militarism in the present-day world. It carries out large-scale manoeuvres of land, sea and air forces. Such manoeuvres have become increasingly frequent which testifies to

imperialists' preparations for war. This greatly worries the working class movement and all people throughout the world. Often these military "games" are used to exert pressure on countries which imperialists want to submit to their will and dictate. Cases in point are Lebanon, Libya, Nicaragua and some other states.

In the late seventies the NATO military planning committee adopted a long-term programme of arms buildup for the eighties. It envisages the buildup and modernization of all arms in Europe. Later, the NATO Council session adopted a decision to deploy 572 new American nuclear medium-range missiles (Pershing 2) and ground-based cruise missiles in the West European countries. Naturally, these missiles have increased the military threat and aggravated tensions in Europe and in the world generally.

"Of all the dogmas of the bigoted politics of our time, none has caused more harm than the one that says 'In order to have peace, you must prepare for war'.

"This great truth, whose outstanding feature is that it contains a great lie, is the battle cry that has called all Europe to arms."⁴ However today it is not Europe alone. This battle cry comes from the United States of America which once posed as a bulwark of democracy.

ANTI-MILITARIST FORCES

The picture of the present-day world with its mountains of armaments and of the future of mankind would have been far more gloomy had it not been for the forces opposing and counteracting the war threat and the arms buildup, that exist in the world besides NATO and imperialism with their policies of dictate and claims to world domination. The Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole are waging a great historic battle for peace on Earth and the security of nations. To achieve this noble aim the Soviet Union is persistent in proposing a cut in all weapons, primarily nuclear weapons. At the 27th CPSU Congress, Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, put forward a concrete and thoroughly substantiated programme for the reduction of weapons up to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, up to disarmament. This in fact is a programme for saving mankind from nuclear annihilation.

This programme includes the following proposals put forward by the Soviet Union and its allies during the past six months.

1. To stop all nuclear weapon tests. The Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing and proposed immediate negotiations on a complete ban on nuclear tests.

⁴ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1980, vol. 16, p. 439.

2. To completely liquidate nuclear weapons before the end of the century provided the development of space strike weapons (SDI) is prevented.

3. To dismantle Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe.

4. To destroy before the end of the century all chemical weapons as well as the industrial base for their manufacture.

5. To reduce armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe—from the Atlantic to the Urals.

6. To promote international cooperation in the use of outer space for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind.

7. To implement reliable verification measures at all stages of disarmament with the use of both national means and international procedures, including on-site inspections.

8. To create an all-embracing system of international security, including military, political, economic and humanitarian spheres.

These and others Soviet recent peace initiatives are evidence of a new approach, a new political thinking in this nuclear-space age.

The Soviet compromise proposals put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the Soviet-American Summit in Reykjavik in October 1986, are a concrete manifestation of this new approach to burning issues of our time, of a new way of political thinking. The meeting demonstrated to the whole world that the Soviet peace initiatives on the reduction of nuclear weapons, imbued with the feeling of responsibility for peace and international security, had not been accepted by the American side because of its stubborn unwillingness to drop the notorious Strategic Defence Initiative, or, to be more precise, the Star Wars Programme. If official Washington heeds the voice of the peoples in the world and stops implementing the Strategic Defence Initiative, there is a chance that mankind could escape a nuclear war. That is how things stand today. At the meeting in Iceland's capital, thanks to the Soviet stance, the sides came close to reaching an agreement on significant cuts in nuclear weapons by both countries and on their elimination in the foreseeable future. Such an agreement would have opened the route towards a nuclear-free world. However, the American administration lacked a political will, desire and the sense of responsibility to make such a decision.

Soviet proposals are still open, for the Soviet Union is persistent in its efforts to avert the nuclear threat. These proposals give the world a historic opportunity to radically solve the problems of war and peace and prevent a nuclear war. That is why, all the peace forces, all those who want to preserve peace on earth and save mankind from nuclear annihilation, must step up their efforts to achieve this aim.

The working class is a powerful force in the struggle against

militarism, for disarmament. It has grown immensely. If during Marx's lifetime, when the slogan "Working men of all countries, unite!" was put forward, there were approximately ten million workers, the present-day figure stands at about 700 million. This testifies to the great objective possibilities of the working class to oppose militarism, the arms race and the ominous preparations for a nuclear war.

As a result of the scientific and technological revolution the working class is undergoing certain changes and is being replenished with people from the non-proletarian strata. However, the working class has been and remains the basic productive force in society. It is educated in the spirit of collectivism by daily work and becomes steeled in the continuous struggle for its vital interests. This makes it a potent force in modern society. But at the same time workers in the capitalist countries make armaments intended for killing people.

Obviously it is very important to appeal to the heart and soul of the working class, to work tirelessly in its organizations, to explain the possible consequences of a nuclear war and promote understanding of those Soviet proposals which are aimed at ridding mankind of the horrors of a nuclear catastrophe.

In the course of many decades the working class has fought for its class interests, for the ideas of socialism. The realities of the nuclear age vest the working class with the historical mission of protecting itself and the whole of mankind from devastating wars, from nuclear annihilation. Today, the general democratic and general human values prevail over class ones. To make the anti-war struggle successful it is of cardinal importance to pool the efforts of all the people of goodwill, primarily the working class, the peasantry and intellectuals, especially physicians, teachers and engineers. There exist objective conditions for such a union, for the above mentioned population strata suffer equally from the arms race, the inflated military budgets and the ensuing high taxes, inflation, unemployment and the bankruptcy of farmers.

Pooling the efforts of the working class and all working people in the non-socialist part of the world with those of the socialist countries will put a mighty obstacle in the way of war preparations.

Recent times witness an unprecedented politicalization of the population in the capitalist countries. Masses of people are today more actively involved in foreign policies. Anti-war, anti-nuclear sentiments are growing throughout the world. Thousands upon thousands of people join in the demonstrations of protest against the militarist policy of aggressive circles. The White House now receives tens of thousands of letters from all parts of the world whose writers demand an end to nuclear testing and a freeze on armaments.

Trade unions should play a more significant part in this struggle.

Many of them are already energetically taking part in the anti-war movement. Today some 400 million people in all countries are trade union members. It is a huge force capable of doing away with militarism.

Quite recently the World Trade Union Congress was held, attended, among others, by many delegations which are not members of the World Federation of Trade Unions. The composition of the Congress and the resolutions it adopted furnish a good example of the unification of forces in the struggle against the nuclear threat irrespective of their political programmes and ideological views. What unites these forces is their common aim—to prevent a nuclear war and save mankind.

Not long ago an important document on the confidence-building and security measures was signed in Stockholm. A convention on the safety of nuclear engineering received approval in Vienna. The programme for strengthening peace and security in Asia and the Pacific region put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Vladivostok in 1986 also met with a favourable response throughout the world. The anti-war and anti-nuclear sentiments voiced by the participants in the Harare Non-Aligned Summit in 1986 expressed the will of hundreds of millions of people.

Those business circles in the West which do not take part in the arms manufacture are also becoming more active in the anti-war struggle. All people, MPs and US Congressmen, are now increasingly aware of the truth about the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear war. In spite of all that the United States goes on with its test explosions in Nevada, and the NATO manoeuvres on land, sea and in the air are regularly held. The arms race is continuing inexorably. The bitter truth of it is that in the NATO countries the arms manufacturers are working at full blast.

Today it is of paramount importance to tap and use all the possibilities for pepping up the practical actions of the various contingents of the working class movement and its allies in safeguarding peace. To achieve this several **important things** should be borne in mind:

First, the broad sections of the working people and leaders of the working class movement should be thoroughly aware of the danger of a nuclear war which jeopardizes mankind's very existence.

Second, it is necessary to better organize the working people so that decisions and correct declarations are translated into practical actions for peace and universal security; it is also imperative to build unity with all peace forces everywhere, and where hired labour is employed, to carry out a common policy of opposing militarism and blocking its aggressive course.

Third, there must be decisive actions to ensure a drastic cut in military spending and use the money thus saved for social purposes.

Fourth, it is time for the working class organizations to propose an alternative to the arms race, to oppose it with the manufacture of civilian goods for peaceful purposes and to show the path towards a peaceful economy.

Objectively, the working class has enough strength and potentialities to fight the nuclear threat. It now remains to activate them.

The international working class movement failed to avert the First and Second World Wars. Mankind paid dearly for this—with over 60 million lives and a great number of devastated towns and villages.

Today the world has a strong Soviet Union and a community of socialist countries. If their efforts are joined with those of the working class in the capitalist countries and the world anti-war movements it would be possible to stop the forces of militarism and aggression and prevent a nuclear war. It would also be possible step by step to reduce armaments and eventually eliminate them altogether.

The Soviet Union is consistently pursuing its policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. This gives the working class and all the peace forces the opportunity to make their own, highly essential contribution to the cause of peace and international security.

SDI: WHAT AMERICAN SCIENTISTS SAY

Official Washington's course towards establishing a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements known as Star Wars has caused a contradictory response of the broad American public. Military business circles, top brass and, associated with them, state bureaucracy, militarized science and ideological machinery—all part of the military-industrial complex—assumed the role of ardent champions and architects of the militarization of outer space.

At the same time the movement of opponents of the Star Wars adventurism is also mounting in the USA. The movement has in its ranks prominent political leaders, well-known scientists, members of anti-war organizations, representatives of the business community all of whom convincingly prove that the policy of the present administration is dangerous and that a space Anti-Ballistic Missile system cannot solve the problem of war and peace.

In this connection a monograph entitled *The Fallacy of Star Wars*¹ published by the Union of Concerned Scientists is of considerable interest. Among its authors are H. Bethe, Nobel Prize winner (physics), one of the architects of the Manhattan project and former member of the President's Scientific Advisory Committee, Admiral N. Gayler, former director of the National Security Agency, H. Scoville, former deputy director of the CIA. The authors of the book which has been reprinted several times within a year can hardly be qualified as incompetent or unloyal to the interests of the ruling class of the USA. And this makes their arguments on SDI's perspectives and consequences especially convincing to many Americans.

¹ *The Fallacy of Star Wars. Based on Studies Conducted by the Union of Concerned Scientists.* John Tirman, ed. New York, Vintage Books, 1984.

The idea of creating an "absolute defense" system, which in the authors' opinion, is a most dangerous combination of reliance on technology and fear caused by ideological motives, has already been considered by the US leadership. However, now formalized as the Strategic Defense Initiative this idea assumes a number of new important features. One of them is its comprehensiveness. The SDI has brought together all the existing anti-missile research and development programmes. Another new feature is that the announced common aim of all these programmes is to develop a comprehensive ABM system. And last, but not least, the authors consider, is the priority treatment given to the ABM programmes which is manifested in huge budget allocations and the accelerated pace of work.

A reasonable question can be asked: will the SDI enable the USA to achieve the aims proclaimed by the White House and the advocates of Star Wars in the military-industrial complex, namely, to provide the US population with a reliable shield against a nuclear-missile strike, strengthen the strategic stability due to a transition to defense strategy and technology, make nuclear arms useless and proceed to a nuclear disarmament?

Specialists from the Union of Concerned Scientists give a negative answer to the question. They believe that not even one of these aims can be attained. Soon after the book was published the Pentagon accused its authors of "a preconceived opinion" and "unfounded pessimism" in respect of the SDI and its prospects. However, the monograph of the American scientists proves the opposite: their conclusions are based upon most scrupulous studies of the current and future-oriented ABM research and development projects, upon a profound analysis of the military-strategic and political consequences of the "defense buildup" conceived by Washington on a global scale.

The authors convincingly lay bare one of the main myths now being peddled by the SDI advocates in the USA and elsewhere that the programme is to protect Americans against a nuclear strike. But the problem of creating a comprehensive ABM system cannot be effectively solved by current technology or that in the foreseeable future even if inevitable counter-measures by the other side are not taken into account. According to the data and calculations cited in the book, certain weapon systems proposed for the impenetrable ABM defense system can hardly ever be created. Thus American specialists arrive at the conclusion that an X-ray laser cannot be effectively used as an ABM weapon, because X-rays are incapable of destroying the vehicle. The so called particle-beam weapon also doesn't justify the hopes of the SDI advocates: the impact of the Earth's atmosphere and magnetic field will inevitably cause dispersion of the particles in the upper layers of the atmosphere and thus sharply diminish the chances of intercepting ballistic missiles during the acceleration stage, when

they are most vulnerable and the number of targets is relatively small.

Specialists from the Union of Concerned Scientists question the feasibility of creating a reliable control system for the ABM. The impossibility of full-scale tests of the ABM system before it is to be used, they say, turns the probability of malfunctioning into a major peril. The gravest dangers are contained in the battle control system (its hardware and software components), the more so if we take into account the plain fact that the most sophisticated modelling of Star Wars cannot foresee all the possible counter-measures of a real enemy.

The technological optimism of the official advocates of the SDI and its adherents in the scientific community who liken the task of developing an ABM system to certain scientific and technological projects carried out by the USA in the past, such as the landing of men on the Moon, is also sharply criticized. Specialists from the Union of Concerned Scientists warn the US ruling quarters that in a real situation the development of the ABM system will provoke a resolute Soviet reaction. And this reaction, they say, will hardly be restrained by any of the existing agreements since the very fact of the American "defense" weapons testing would be a violation of the US commitments undertaken under the ABM Treaty. This warning is most appropriate: the Soviet side has already unambiguously declared that if the US strike weapons are deployed in space, the USSR will take all necessary counter-measures.

Many such measures have been scrupulously analysed in the book from the point of view of their technological feasibility and efficiency, among them the arming of submarines with long-range cruise missiles, the shorter functioning period of the ICBM boosters, the launching of phony missile targets, direct-hit destruction of the ABM space echelons. According to the authors, all such counter-measures would be based upon the now available weapons and technologies, while the proposed US defense system will be dependent upon untested and extremely sophisticated technology. In the long run the Soviet counter-measures will be less expensive and more reliable than the US defense system, and the former will be prepared even before the latter is completed.

Assessing the feasibility of establishing an "impenetrable" anti-missile defense system for US territory American scientists conclude that a highly efficient system of intercepting missiles during their acceleration period is essential for a comprehensive ballistic missile defense system to be developed. However, they underline, such a system cannot be created because of the limited potentials of the weapons needed, the insurmountable problem of placing them in space and the number of active counter-measures that would be taken by an adversary. All this makes unfeasible the systems of

intercepting missiles both in space and at the final stage of their flight. According to the authors, such an ABM system is absolutely incapable of protecting American cities. This conclusion should damp the ardour of certain West European politicians inclined to believe Washington's allegations that the USA can protect Western Europe against missiles.

Thus the Strategic Defense Initiative as a means for building up American national security is all nonsense. As far as its real consequences are concerned, the authors believe that the SDI (if realized) will definitely undermine strategic stability. Calculations show that an ABM system with space-based elements will be very vulnerable, and it can really be effective only if the retaliatory strike is weakened by pre-emptive nuclear attack against the enemy's command posts and strategic forces. However, the ABM system could be used to "blind" the enemy—to destroy his early warning and communications satellites, the importance of which can hardly be overestimated. According to American specialists, all these features of the ABM might instigate its possessor to deliver a pre-emptive strike, or in other words, to start an unprovoked aggression. The authors are also seriously alarmed by the arguments of the SDI advocates that its realization will at least prevent part of the damage caused by a retaliatory nuclear strike. American specialists note that the connection between these functions of the ABM and the administration's statements about a possibility of a nuclear war will not be left unnoticed by the Soviet Union.

Will the SDI secure peace based on defensive strategies, as the White House promises? The book gives an unambiguous negative answer to the question. Such a sophisticated ABM system will not be reliable enough for the USA to forego its arsenal of "deterrence" (offensive strategic missiles); while a potential enemy will view the American ABM system as a source of mortal danger, as an element of the first strike capability which is supposed to reduce or repel the retaliatory strike.

Specialists in the Union of Concerned Scientists underline that the adverse consequences of the anti-missile defense system will manifest themselves long before the system is deployed. The ABM Treaty and all negotiations on limitation and reduction of strategic armaments will become the first victims of the space arms race planned by Washington. A chain of actions and counter-actions will produce technological and operative decisions, offensive and defensive weapons systems that will impede mutual evaluation of the amounts of weapons, their functions and combat efficiency, or even make it impossible. And this in its turn will make elaboration of any agreements useless.

One cannot accept all the authors' theses. Contrary to their allegations the Soviet side has never believed that durable peace can

be achieved through building up armaments, whether offensive or defensive. Soviet leaders have repeatedly underlined that the only possible road to lasting peace is constructive negotiations on reduction and subsequent liquidation of arms, particularly nuclear arms. Attempts made in the book to put part of the blame for the space arms race on the Soviet Union are equally unfounded. It is common knowledge that the USSR initiated the drafting and conclusion of the treaty of 1967, the first major agreement prohibiting militarization of outer space. The unilateral moratorium on deployment of anti-satellite weapons systems in space proclaimed by the USSR in August 1983 also proves its intention to prevent a dangerous escalation of the arms race. The results of the vote on the draft resolution, Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, at the 40th session of the UN General Assembly (1985) demonstrated a world-wide approval of the Soviet approach to the problem of preventing the arms buildup in space. This important document incorporates the main, fundamentally important elements of the Soviet proposal on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space in conditions of its non-militarization. Only the USA and the pro-American regime of Grenada abstained from the vote, and thus opposed the other 151 states.

On the whole, notwithstanding certain dubious points and wrong conclusions, the book of the Union of Concerned Scientists is an important and timely study of a burning problem of international security.

Vadim LUKOV

Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya, No. 4, 1986.

**The Soviet monthly SOCIALISM:
THEORY AND PRACTICE and
supplements to this journal are digests of
the political and theoretical press
featuring the vital problems of Marxist-
Leninist theory, the practice of socialist
and communist construction, the
peoples' struggle for peace, democracy
and socialism, and worldwide ideological
struggle.**

**All inquiries should be addressed to
SOCIALISM: THEORY AND PRACTICE
7 Bolshaya Pochtovaya Street, 107082,
Moscow, USSR, or to the Information
Department of the Soviet Embassy.**

